REVIEWS

Deborah Cameron & Don Kulick, *Language and sexuality*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xvi, 176. Pb $21.00.

Paul McIlvenny (ed.), *Talking gender and sexuality*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002. Pp. x, 332. Hb $106.00.

Reviewed by Rudolf P. Gaudio
*Anthropology, Purchase College, State University of New York
Purchase, NY 10577
rudolf.gaudio@purchase.edu*

Two recent books, *Language and sexuality*, by Deborah Cameron and Don Kulick, and *Talking gender and sexuality (TGS)*, edited by Paul McIlvenny, seek to elucidate the social construction of gender and sexuality by combining the methods of interactive discourse analysis with the theoretical insights of poststructuralism, feminism, and queer theory. Guided by the basic ethnomethodological question "How are gender and sexuality 'done'?", the authors of both volumes are motivated, at least implicitly, by a political commitment to deconstructing and opposing sexism and heteronormativity (the ideologically enforced assumption that all people are or should be straight). In one way or another, therefore, both books also ask, paraphrasing McIlvenny, "By what linguistic-interactional means might normative gender and sexual identities be 'undone'?" Although McIlvenny's coauthors all share his theoretical concerns at a general level, the chapters in *TGS* focus primarily on the means whereby gender and sexual categories are positively instantiated and indexed in talk; only a few explicitly engage how these modes of categorization might be resisted or transformed. Cameron & Kulick take their theorizing one step further, questioning the analytical and political utility of the concept of sexual identity itself.

Drawing heavily on Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity, both McIlvenny and Cameron & Kulick approach gender and sexuality as distinct but related modes of organizing social inequality. In their third chapter Cameron & Kulick argue that, if linguists want to understand the social conditions that oppress lesbians, gay men, and other sexual minorities, they need to pay critical attention not only to the language practices of those groups but also to linguistic constructions of heterosexuality. The point of such research is not to give heterosexuals equal time, but to elucidate how heterosexuality is linguistically constructed and oriented to as a social norm for queer and straight people alike. Because heterosexuality is rarely topicalized as such, its situational relevance

can be difficult to detect. Nevertheless, employing linguistic-anthropological notions of indexicality, Cameron & Kulick re-present four case studies from the literature on language and gender, all of which highlight the formative role of heteronormativity in the linguistic construction of conventional gender identities. These studies also show how gender and sexuality are performatively co-articulated with other identities and activities, such as age, class, gossip, and leisure. This chapter is by far the book's strongest and will be extremely useful in university courses on language and gender, where heterosexuality is often insufficiently problematized.

Cameron & Kulick's primary goal, in terms of the amount of space they devote to it, is to criticize other linguists' emphasis on sexual identity (chaps. 1 and 4) and to propose an alternative theoretical framework focusing on "language and desire" (chap. 5). Chap. 4 reviews the history of social-scientific research on language and homosexuality and reiterates Kulick's previously published criticisms of contemporary scholarship on the language practices of gay men, lesbians, and other sexual minorities. In contrast to chap. 3, which cites the work of other scholars in order to build a positive theoretical argument, the point and tone of this chapter are overwhelmingly negative. With few exceptions, other linguists' research is treated as fundamentally flawed because it focuses too narrowly on "identity" and thus "leaves unexamined everything that arguably makes sexuality sexuality: namely, fantasy, repression, pleasure, fear and the unconscious" (p. 104). By emphasizing the shortcomings of even the "better" scholarship in so-called lavender and queer linguistics, Cameron & Kulick clearly seek to depict their own theoretical framework as a radical and necessary departure from that body of work.

Yet Cameron & Kulick's proposals display some of the same logical weaknesses that they attribute to their colleagues, and the distinctiveness of their framework is more apparent than real. Thus, while it is true that some scholars construe "sexual identity" tautologically, as both cause and effect of linguistic practice, Cameron & Kulick's definition of "sexuality" is no less tautological, consisting of "ways of being sexual" and "not only whom one desires [sexually] but also what one desires to do" (10). In addition, whereas Cameron & Kulick criticize other scholars for reducing "sexuality" to "sexual identity," their own treatment of "desire" effectively reduces it to "sexual desire." The latter is especially surprising given their favorable citation of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, who insist that "desire" is manifest in such ostensibly nonsexual events as walking, sleeping, winter, and spring. Finally, although Cameron & Kulick's elaborate engagement with psychoanalytic theory distinguishes them rhetorically from the majority of their linguistic colleagues, their theoretical proposals are substantively similar. In particular, after repeatedly calling for a theory of language and sexuality that goes "beyond" identity or leaves it "behind," they proceed to advocate a theory of "identification" that focuses on the emergent, processual nature of (sexual) identity formation. The continuity of this approach with that of

other language and sexuality scholars is obvious, yet Cameron & Kulick's acknowledgment of that fact is sporadic at best.

A more fruitful – and collegial – approach would acknowledge the shared psychoanalytic heritage of both "identity" and "desire," and would review the extant literature on language, gender, and sexuality in order to problematize and operationalize both concepts for empirical discourse-analytic research. It would also consider the extent to which an emphasis on "identity" continues to pervade not just the study of language and sexuality, but sociolinguistics and anthropology at large, along with the historical and cultural-ideological reasons for that emphasis. Cameron & Kulick allude to such an approach in their second and final chapters, where they endorse ethnographic approaches to language and sexuality and briefly discuss, *inter alia*, the contested emergence of the concept of "sexual addiction," the coarticulation of sexuality and race, and the linguistic dimensions of political struggles over rape and AIDS.

Among Cameron & Kulick's most intriguing theoretical proposals are their call for discourse analysts to attend to what is "unsaid" as well as said, and their passing references to the ways sexuality is "materialized" in discourse. The former is explored with reference to the discursive psychologist Michael Billig's treatment of "repression," especially his point that prohibitions against certain statements, images, or actions are likely to incite transgressive desires for those very experiences. Cameron & Kulick consider several examples of this process, most of which focus on interactions that transgress conventional boundaries between private and public domains, such as personal ads, sadomasochistic role-play, and pornography. Many of these examples are taken from the mass media, and their contents are often sensational. Although Cameron & Kulick acknowledge that these are ripe for analysis with respect to the mutual imbrication of sexuality with political economy, ideology and the state, their analyses focus primarily on the ways these interactions construct pleasure, fear, and other emotions in "intimate" settings. In so doing, Cameron & Kulick pass up several opportunities to theorize the "materialization" of sexuality in a way that takes the materiality of discourse into account. (Another unexplored proposition is their call for distinguishing "performance" from "performativity," which Cameron & Kulick mention twice as if it were a main theme of the book, and without citing its venerable linguistic-anthropological precedents, e.g., the collaborative work of Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs.)

Investigating the relationship between said and unsaid is a project that unites many of the chapters in *TGS*. Billig's public debate with the conversation analyst Emmanuel A. Schegloff over the politics of defining "text" versus "context" figures prominently in this regard, especially as it relates to the problem of observing social inequality in talk. As noted by Cameron & Kulick, because sexism, heterosexism, and other forms of inequality are rarely oriented to as such, they are opaque – and therefore seemingly irrelevant – to the methods of sequential conversation analysis (CA). Accordingly, several chapters also make use of

membership category analysis (MCA), a framework proposed (but later abandoned) by Harvey Sacks, in order to ascertain the normative "cultural knowledge" that is implicitly indexed by participants' use of social-identity categories in talk. For example, in analyzing a group discussion involving social-science researchers and young British adults, Elizabeth H. Stokoe & Janet Smithson consider the "heterosexist" implications of one participant's statement about generic households where "the woman's staying at home with the kids" (98), the normative power of which is reinforced by the other participants' unmarked response to it. Liisa Tainio analyzes how, in the course of narrating their youthful courtship, two elderly Finnish interviewees ("the husband" and "the wife") use various grammatical means to portray themselves and each other as sexually agentive or passive. Tainio says these utterances "go against" certain Western and/or Finnish stereotypes about the sexuality of men and (old) women. Sigurd D'hondt analyzes the comments made (in Kiswahili) by three male adolescents in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, with regard to a teenage girl, Julie, who has just passed by. Although much of the extract consists of the boys' speculation over whether Julie has recently had an abortion, even more intriguing is the way the boys' own (hetero)sexuality figures in their moral negotiation over the normative category of "Muslim."

Although the insights afforded by MCA in these chapters seem sound, none of the authors satisfactorily addresses the reasons that led Sacks to abandon MCA and that continue to make conversation analysts suspicious of it. Particularly suspect is the assumption by Stokoe & Smithson and Tainio that members' "cultural knowledge" can be accessed straightforwardly, insofar as they include analysts (i.e., themselves) in the category of "member." They thus overlook the fact that claims to membership are often contested, and that members' cultural knowledge is likely to vary, along with their ideological commitments. Some engagement with ethnographic method would help rectify this problem. Other analytical choices seem inconsistent with the authors' commitment to an empirically rigorous MCA. For example, Tainio's preoccupation with age and heterosexuality leads her to ignore the male interviewee's obvious orientation to class, as indexed by his self-inclusion in the membership categories of "farm help" and "workers." D'hondt likewise overlooks the cultural implications of giving Julie a (non-Muslim) pseudonym, while identifying the male participants solely as E, F, and N.

Andrew Fish uses MCA to reanalyze the telling of a dirty joke by three teenage American boys, originally analyzed by Sacks. In Sacks's analysis, this joke, which was previously told to one of the boys by his younger sister, ironically comments on the cultural knowledge that 12-year-old girls are and are not supposed to have about sex. However, Fish's analysis of the joke's retelling suggests that the boys' references to the absent sister's presumed sexual knowledge index their own "fragile" identities as "masculine" and "grown up." Fish describes this as "the repressed on parole," a pun that brilliantly highlights the fact

that what is unsaid (repressed) is performatively indexed and incited by what is said (cf. Saussure's *parole*). As a sophisticated example of the kind of analysis advocated by Cameron & Kulick, Fish's approach is notable for the way it attends to the mutual constitution of desire and identity.

Drawing heavily on Billig's work, Fish situates his use of MCA within the larger analytical framework of discursive psychology (DP). Other authors also employ DP, but they align themselves more closely with Schegloff and sequential CA, and they make the utility of their methods their primary topic. For example, Susan A. Speer & Jonathan Potter seek to demonstrate the benefits of an "anticognitivist" version of DP – consisting essentially of CA plus rhetorical analysis – for illustrating the practical implications of Judith Butler's abstract theories of performativity, heteronormativity, and hate speech. Their analysis of how heterosexism is "managed" in three different texts – a television talk show featuring an antigay political activist; a social-scientific interview with a "liberal" straight man; and a television documentary about the Gay Games – yields a number of suggestive insights about the sexual politics of contemporary British society. Alexa Hepburn explores the compatibility of a similar version of DP with Jacques Derrida's methods of textual deconstruction. In her analysis of interviews with Scottish teachers, Hepburn notes that the teachers' "gendered accounts" of school bullying reproduce a "binary logic" whereby girls and boys are presented as having essentially different personalities. However, the rhetorical variability of the teachers' accounts also reveals a Derridean "logic of supplementarity" and reliance on metaphor that destabilize that binary. These chapters would benefit from some consideration of the practical relevance of the authors' findings to their progressive political goals. For Hepburn, this would entail a discussion of the literature on bullying and gender inequality in schools. In the case of Speer & Potter, their analysis of a gay male sports announcer's "resistance" to heterosexism needs to be considered in light of the actual or potential effects of his remarks, at least for the audiences who witnessed them, if not for (British) society at large.

Celia Kitzinger's proposal for a "feminist conversation analysis" addresses the political challenges of CA head on. The empirical focus of her investigation is university seminars in which some participants "came out" as nonheterosexual "without anyone noticing." Kitzinger's approach to coming out and (not) noticing as interactional accomplishments is classic CA, but when it comes to analyzing the political implications of these actions, she employs other research methods, such as interviews, quasi-statistical comparisons across interactional events, and her own member's knowledge as a lesbian living in a heterosexist world. Although these methods are part of the standard toolbox of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, Kitzinger characterizes them as "feminist CA" in honor of Schegloff, whom she identifies as her teacher, and as a rebuttal of Billig, whom she criticizes for ignoring work (including her own) that combines CA methods with feminist principles. Disciplinary labels aside, one aspect of

member's knowledge that Kitzinger would do well to consider is the institutional structure of university seminars, where professors, teaching assistants, and students have unequal access to such conversational resources as topic-choice, turn-allocation, and the freedom to comment on (i.e., "notice") other speakers' contributions.

Jenny Sundén uses a similar combination of methods to analyze conversational texts from an online discussion forum where a command called "@gender" allows participants to assume a variety of gender identities besides the conventional female and male. This chapter is unique among the papers in *TGS* in a number of ways. Methodologically, Sundén employs ethnographic participant observation and interviews systematically, and she presents the insights gained from these methods on a relatively equal footing with her discourse analysis. (The textual nature of her fieldsite surely facilitated this decision.) In addition, although Sundén cites a range of research on language, gender, and sexuality, she does not situate her work relative to CA, DP, or ethnomethodology per se. She is thus able to concentrate on the theoretical questions with which McIlvenny frames the volume, pertaining to the "doing" and "undoing" of gender and sexuality. She also adduces conversational evidence for a notion of "identity" that both incorporates and informs "desire." Her most important finding is that, far from facilitating a utopian transcendence of conventional gender categories, nonnormative uses of the "@gender" command actually seem to have incited participants to pay MORE explicit attention to one another's real gender/sex identities, not less. Accordingly, while Sundén accepts the poststructuralist argument that gender and sex are discursively constructed, her data also compel her to recognize that discourse itself is both materially and ideologically constrained.

(Received 20 March 2004)

Douglas Maynard, *Bad news, good news: Conversational order in everyday talk and clinical settings*. University of Chicago Press. 2003, x + pp. 327. Pb. $25.00.

Reviewed by Aaron Cicourel
Cognitive Science and Sociology, University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
cicourel@cogsci.ucsd.edu

Maynard's book seeks to make substantive and methodological contributions: the first to describe the social organization of bad news/good news pronouncements, and the second to address and bridge longstanding methodological schisms between ethnography, conversation analysis (CA), and mainline sociology. Of the eight chapters, three (2, 4, and 7) were previously published and have been modified for the book.

Several basic themes of Maynard's book are stated at the outset (p. 2). For example: "Bad news and good news are pervasive features of everyday life and experience. Waiting for, and then receiving, the news can send a recipient through cycles of dread, despair, depression, hope, elation, ecstasy, and other emotional states." Maynard thus begins with a straightforward use of everyday descriptive terms and notes how situated experiences of bad and good news can be found across a broad range of reported narratives and tape-recorded incidents. The focus, however, is on the immediate delivery and reception of news, not waiting to give or receive news nor what happens to peoples' lives afterwards. This journey through a variety of situated accounts is like a kind of survey with unknown sampling parameters and unknown circumstances in respect to the way they were obtained originally. The focus is on the dynamics of talk within brief, independent fragments of retrospective narratives and locally situated discourse, with minimal information about the setting and the participants. Maynard, however, is willing to include data sources and literature that more orthodox followers of conversation analysis (CA) do not address. The literature review enables him to challenge other forms of discourse analysis and traditional sociological research that may criticize CA. The narratives of chap. 1 have a believable level of substance about peoples' immediate reaction to "bad and good" news about their lives and depict a range of emotional reactions.

Of special substantive interest to Maynard is what he calls the "informing *process*," or the talk and interaction which he feels has been neglected in contrast to the memory-accounting process itself. He argues that situated displays of bad and good news have a common core and states, "It is precisely this interruptive and sometimes utterly disruptive feature of giving or getting news that provides the impetus for this book" (4).

The experiences reported in the narratives and exchanges are viewed as evidence that they have profoundly affected participants, and this is attributed to the notion of "flashbulb memory" as described by Brown & Kulik 1977. The notion of "flashbulb memory" is a less studied part of experimental research on the more general concepts of "declarative" or explicit memory (working, semantic, and episodic memory), and implicit or "non-declarative," that more extensive but not consciously accessible memory that is always activated by motor/verbal activities during human perception and information processing (Tulving 1972, Schacter & Tulving 1994, Squire 1987). In daily life activities, however, it is difficult to assess the extent of memory loss and the ways events can be transformed or reconstructed over the course of their being depicted in narrative accounts and conversations about past experiences (ff. Loftus 1979).

The key substantive issue for Maynard is the claim that he, like all members of some collectivity, has a reasonably commonsense understanding of bad or good news, because both notions have a "common core": Such news "momentarily interrupts our involvement in the social world whose contours we otherwise unthinkingly accept as we carry on with daily activities" (4). It is the

momentary interruption that is the focus of attention, not the prior and subsequent nature of the social world and daily activities.

Maynard's theoretical assumption about the notion of "social world" is attributed to Alfred Schütz 1962 and Harold Garfinkel 1963: the idea of a "mutual adherence among society's members to a set of primordial presumptions . . . [that Schütz] calls the attitude of daily life (ADL)." For members of some group, therefore, "the 'perceived normality' of events in the everyday world reflects participants' adherence to these presumptions." A corollary of such "presumptions" is the idea that "we take for granted that *objects are as they appear to be*."

A general point of the book is to show how "telling and receiving bad and good tidings, experience an assault on the ordinary, expected, intended, and typical predictable, moral world of everyday life" (6–7). According to Maynard:

> As through their divulging and grasping of news, participants build a new world, such a world is not the end product of their talk and social interaction. The new world is there, in the co-produced nuances of the disclosure. The closer we approach actual perception and behavior, the more we can appreciate that everyday features of social life are not best captured through hypothetical, typical, or idealized constructions as abstracted from messy negotiations and other loosely characterized behaviors. . . . To put it succinctly, bad and good news as interactively organized episodes of conduct do not represent the social construction of reality." News episodes consist of the substantial employment of embodied social practices that are the constructions or structural features of everyday life existing nowhere else but in the orderliness of those practices. This book . . . is not about the social construction of reality out of everyday life but about real social practices *in* and *as* everyday life. (7)

Maynard's book, therefore, is not about observing social practices and interviewing participants about their daily live activities before and after they receive bad or good news and about how "the new world" is socially constructed by participants, including observers and those doing CA and other forms of discourse analysis. The new world can only be observed or found "in the co-produced nuances of the disclosure" that occurs during the display of fragments of situated discourse.

To my knowledge, this problem of the role of ethnography and CA first came up at a Social Science Research Council-sponsored conference in Santa Fe, New Mexico in the summer of 1975, organized by Allen Grimshaw and David Jenness. Some of the attendees were Roger Abrams, Aaron Cicourel, Steven Feld, Charles Fillmore, Erving Goffman, Allen Grimshaw, Harvey Sacks, and Emanuel Schegloff. Other members of the original project included Charles Bird, Lily Wong Fillmore, Jenny Cook-Gumperz, John Gumperz, Michael Halliday, Ruquaia Hasan, and Adam Kendon. A key question was: How much knowledge of the local context is needed to analyze selected fragments of discourse and film or video clips? The differences among linguists, linguistic anthropologists, sociological sociolinguists, and those concerned with CA were clearly evident and

have never been resolved. The CA specialists wanted only brief, localized recorded exchanges, while others wanted more extensive recordings of the same individuals or group. The general idea of the conference was to resolve these differences, to see if both groups could examine the same discourse fragments using a simulated "double-blind" design; the CA people would analyze fragments obtained by linguistic anthropologists and provided with minimal information about the participants, and the others were free to offer their own linguistic or ethnographically derived analyses of the same fragments.

Maynard's book is unusual in several ways. First, he is exceptionally rare among students of ethnomethodology and CA for his skilled ability to engage in both of these disparate areas with dedicated ease. For example, Harold Garfinkel, to my knowledge, has never engaged in CA, and Harvey Sacks, in his dissertation and subsequently, did not link CA to ethnomethodological notions. Maynard, however, has been willing to discuss concepts from phenomenology and ethnomethodology using empirical materials, but he always remains dedicated to his use of CA methods.

Maynard has been willing to cite and quote a wide range of sociological and related works despite the fact that they have little to do with ethnomethodology or CA. These excursions into "foreign" areas that ethnomethodologists and CA students normally avoid and from which they always distance themselves make Maynard's book an important attempt to bridge the sometimes large divides between ethnomethodology, CA, linguistic anthropology, and mainstream sociology.

He also reports that "I have recurrently witnessed physicians and other experts from internal medicine, oncology, developmental disability and HIV clinics present the tidings to patients or family members, who say nothing or, if they say something, it is very little and spoken in a resigned way" (153–54). Often, as noted below, patients and family members also do nothing, sitting rather rigidly in their chairs.

On p. 19, Maynard presents his first non-narrative conversational exchange (one that is used also on subsequent occasions in the book). I focus on this exchange because it nicely illustrates both the power of CA and its weaknesses. The power can be seen in the clever way Maynard constructs his analysis. Here is the exchange:

(7) ARL3:18

```
 1 Andi:  Well we have some news for you.
 2 Betty: What?
 3 Andi:  .hhh that may come as a bit of a surprise ehhh!
 4 Betty: I see- what are you telling me?
 5 Andi:  hhhh! Bob and I are going to have a baby.
 6 Betty: Oh my good^ness hhow – (1.0) did you have a reversal –
 7        he have a reversal?
 8 Andi:  Yea:h.
 9 (1.0)
10 Andi:  .hhh[::::::::::]
```

11 Betty: [^whe::n.]
12 Andi: tch eyup. Last^March.
13 (0.4)
14 Andi: .mhhh ((sniff))
15 Betty: OH [MY G:OOD]^NESS:
16 Andi: [And (ituh)]
17 Andi: it was [very successful,] [very quickly] hh : : h .hhh
18 Betty: [OH I'M SO] [^HAPPY.]

The exchange is about someone reporting to a friend that she is pregnant and shows that the friend remembers that the husband had had a vasectomy (*did he have a reversal*). Did Maynard know the conversation was to occur because of knowing the participants? How did he learn about the pending conversation? How long ago was the vasectomy performed and what were the circumstances? Did both parties not want a child initially? How did their perspectives change? From a research analyst's perspective, it was a fantastic bit of luck. Or was it planned because the author knew in advance about the pending telephone call and was thus able to take advantage of a wonderful opportunity?

Maynard apparently knew something about the couple because he reports that the vasectomy was "something well known by their friends, including Betty [the recipient of the news]." He then speculates as follows:

Here, then, is full-blown suspension – a [phenomenological] noetic crisis. We can imagine Betty's puzzle: *How* are they going to have a baby? Is Andi pregnant? Is the forthcoming baby something they want or something forced, as with an accidental pregnancy? Are they adopting? What sort of baby will this be? Is this bad news or good news? The question about reversal, then, elicits further information that can disambiguate the situation. After Andi confirms that Bob did have a reversal (line 8) and responds (line 12) to a further question about its timing, Betty can infer that the pregnancy was a something the couple very actively sought, and relatively recently, which information provides for a more fully intended social object. The projected baby is a wanted, valued addition to Bob and Andi's lives, and the pregnancy represents quick success (line 17) after an operation that is known not always to be effective. Having learned this, Betty produces, in crescendo-like fashion, a further receipt of the news with increased volume (line 15) and a claim of being happy, which is also spoken with elevated volume and rising intonation and stress on the focal word (line 18). The noetic crisis is relieved, in other words, in a dramatic celebration or affect-laden show of positive regard for news.

What is especially important for the author and other CA research analysts is the way it is possible to build on a few fragments of conversation and create, at first glance, a convincing account that provides the reader with ethnographic-like questions and descriptive material that the author acquired in unknown ways, beginning with the good fortune of having obtained or (perhaps) witnessed the recording.

The strength (and weakness) of CA, therefore, can be found in the ability to make clever inferences about brief fragments of social interaction without having to describe the conditions that made it possible to record the fragments, and without having to specify whether the research analyst was present at the time and if he or she were able to observe or personally know about the participants.

Students of CA are preoccupied with single (often brief) events or particular situated exchanges and not with how long and in what capacity the participants have known each other, their daily or weekly or monthly contacts, nor if and how participants' lives were changed and if and how their social relations and participation in social networks were influenced by bad and good news. Maynard's often dramatic examples of how bad or good news is delivered and received on single occasions, therefore, are difficult to contextualize vis-à-vis the participants' everyday activities and the consequences of such news for their lives (e.g., adjusting to the delivery or reception of bad and good news).

A clear value of CA, however, has been the search for invariant regularities in the way speech exchanges or utterances are part of a concrete sequential context, in turns, hesitations, false starts, breathing, silences, speech tokens, prosodic manipulations, and the adjacent positioning of utterances and turns.

In chap. 3, Maynard discusses the relationship between ethnography and CA and notes:

> ... ethnographic insistence on the relevance of larger and wider institutional structures can mean a loss of data in and as the interaction, for attention shifts from actual utterances in the fullness of their detail and as embedded within a local interactional context to embrace narrative or other general accounts concerning social surroundings. (72)

My understanding, however, is that within linguistic anthropology, the concern has been to provide both "the relevance of larger and wider institutional structures" AND RECORDINGS (whenever possible) "in the fullness of their detail and as embedded within a local interactional context..."

Maynard's use of CA has long been incorporated into linguistic anthropology and used by many students of discourse analysis who consider "the concrete sequential context of any given utterance. Not only in complete utterances and turns, but in hesitations, false starts, breathing, silences, speech tokens, prosodic manipulations, and other minutia of interaction, participants accomplish socially big things by virtue of the adjacent positioning of these utterances, turns, and minutia" (73).

Maynard continues by claiming:

> Among other big things they [orderly sequences of talk] achieve, independently from possible accretions of social structure, is *intersubjectivity* – mutual understandings and orientations. Such understandings and orientations are what make actual joint activity possible in the real social world. (73)

Were intersubjectivity, joint activity, and orderly sequences of talk discovered by CA? Can they be achieved without the integration of cognition, culture, and language? CA is useful but is only a small part of cognition, culture, and language.

The notion of "limited affinity" is then introduced; it

> implies precise ways in which ethnography complements conversation analysis ... [namely] in descriptions of settings and identities of parties; in explications of terms, phrases, or courses of action unfamiliar to an investigator or reader; and in explanations of 'curious' patterns that prior sequential analysis may reveal. (73)

Unfortunately, despite acknowledging Duranti's (1997:267–77) observation that CA tends to work in its own language and that this can obscure "the extent to which ethnographic knowledge of taken for granted expressions is necessary for the detailed analysis of conversational structure," Maynard provides the reader with very few analytic or descriptive details about prior and subsequent patterns or courses of action before and after an extract that may be unfamiliar to the reader.

Maynard makes it appear that the selective choice of features and activities is necessary to avoid an infinite regress (a charge often made against ethnomethodology). The regress is avoided by "using, in a limited way, ethnographically derived descriptions of identity and setting." But the ethnographic "clarification" (74–75) he attributes to an extract by Schegloff avoids the question of how Schegloff obtained his extract and what he knew about the extract before and after it was uttered.

On pp. 80–81, Maynard refers to sociological ethnographic work as obtaining "facts about a particular research site, the biographies and demographic identities of participants – ages, ethnicities, genders, socioeconomic classes, occupational categories – and the cultures to which they belong because of these identities." Maynard does not provide such "facts" but cites research by L. McClenahan and J. Lofland, B. Glaser and A. Strauss, and R. Clark and E. LaBeff as exemplars of ethnographic research (without detailed discourse materials); he ignores, however, the large linguistic anthropology literature where detailed ethnography includes detailed discourse materials.

Maynard states:

> Ethnographic research on bad news takes on an abstract approach to the relationships involved, viewing the categorical class, occupational, and other identities of participants as influencing how the news is delivered and received. There may be correlations between categorical identities and conversational enactments, but an approach is needed that examines the full detail of informing episodes and examines how participants, in the concreteness of their actual practices and in ongoing talks and social interaction, display their relations to others and others' relations to them. (153)

The view of ethnography expressed on pp. 73, 80–81, and 153 is curious because it portrays field research as a kind of correlational enterprise that links abstract categories to "how news is delivered and received." Are these remarks intended only for "ethnographic research on bad news," or as a characterization of all ethnography, including ethnography that is combined with the analysis of speech acts in different cultural and organizational settings? Maynard is not clear about this and ignores the relevance of studying a group or community or organization over time in order to understand how social relationships and social networks can vary over clock-time, such that situated discourse in different settings can or may not be viewed as unique or transitive and thus subject to different interpretations.

Whereas Maynard's notion of ethnography appears questionable, he does provide the reader with brief but informative substantive extracts about the way bad and good news is conveyed and received by tellers and recipients. For example, in chap. 4, he underscores the local focus of bad and good news as "progressive increments of interactively produced talk . . . as participants accord events-in-the-world their in situ newsworthy status and their in vivo valence as good or bad" (117).

In chap. 5, Maynard continues with a detailed description from his previous research that is uncharacteristic of practitioners of CA and illustrates his willingness go beyond this method:

> In a powerful display of the stoic response, for fully 20 seconds Ms. M continues gazing down at the table (line 29, and figure 5.1b). The room, with its many professional participants besides Ms. M and her sister (who looks at Dr. P during this time), is void of talk and almost all activity, until Ms. M emits a sobbing kind of inbreath-outbreath-inbreath and moves forward from her chair and reaches to grab a tissue from a box on the table (lines 30–31, figure 5.2a). (158)

The last quotation was accompanied by four picture clips from a videotape of Maynard's study of a disability clinic. The local details, therefore, are fleeting but informative and graphically displayed.

In chap. 6, Maynard briefly describes and alludes to an unusual asymmetry in an HIV clinic: ". . . bad news is shrouded and only good news is exposed. . ." (197). The latter strategy is part of seeking affect from clients and trying to increase the flow of interaction and set the stage for talk about ". . . the needs of the individual and his relation to the community and its service." What remains unclear is the kind of additional field research was needed "after the evoked display of affect. . ." What kind of observation did Maynard pursue in order to document the references to local interaction among deliverers and between them and recipients during the weeks after receiving bad or good news?

In chap. 7, Maynard notes that the ways participants ". . . approach agency and responsibility differ depending on whether, for example, something has been lost or found, weight has been gained or lost, a test has been passed or failed, a

diagnosis has been confirmed or disconfirmed, or negotiations for the sale of a desired house have been blocked or consummated" (212). The situated nature of "moral discourse," therefore, varies: "It is as if bad new worlds just happen, while good new worlds are something we achieve."

If good new worlds are achieved, what can we learn about events that preceded such news, and what kinds of prior news (physical symptoms, tests, decisions about consulting professionals, discussions with others about fears and/or denials of what might have happened) preceded bad news? How do participants subsequently discuss, reconstruct, and cope with what is being called "moral discourse?"

Maynard produces generalizations that presuppose considerable observation of many professional communicative acts. Thus, professionals with bad news seek to "eviscerate displays of their agency and responsibility" while "Professionals with good news work to display their agency and to claim responsibility" while trying to avoid "possible attributions of self-praise" (219).

The generalizations described by Maynard appear to involve many observations of situated displays of bad and good news and are suggestive, as when he presents three situated excerpts from different kinds of settings. What remains unclear is the extent to which each setting was observed before and after the situated events were recorded. Readers must rely on their own experiences with different organizational structures and the latter's daily activities in order to comprehend the claims being made. Interviews appear to be presupposed when Maynard suggests (225) that individuals may seek career decisions or occupations that avoid giving "bad tidings" because of the impact such news can have on their own agency.

Maynard, therefore, gives the reader a range of suggestive, situated extracts that appear to have considerable face validity that could be seen as a strong claim that prolonged ethnography is not needed, that we can make generalizations about the delivery of news and its reception by sort of "parachuting" into an organizational or community "clearing" and somehow avoid the labor-intensive work needed first to establish and then to sustain different relationships with personnel or subjects. The study of situated talk also enables the research analyst to avoid the sometimes delicate task of distancing oneself from a research setting despite the extensive interpersonal commitments entailed in obtaining and sustaining ethnographic access to a research site. Such relationships often go beyond the period of study.

REFERENCES

Brown, R., & Kulik, J. (1977). Flashbulb memories. *Cognition* 5:73–99.
Garfinkel, Harold. (1963). A conception of, and experiments with, 'trust' as a condition of stable concerted actions. In O. J. Harvey (ed.), *Motivation and social interaction*, 187–238. New York: Ronald.

Schacter, Daniel, (ed.) (1995). *Memory distortion: How minds, brains, and societies reconstruct the past*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schacter, D.L. & Tulving, E. (1994). Memory Systems 1994. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Schütz, Alfred. (1962). *Collected papers I: The problem of social reality*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Squire, Larry. (1987). *Memory and brain*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tulving, E. 1972. Episodic and semantic memory. In E. Tulving & W. Donaldson (eds.), *Organization of memory*, 381–403. New York: Academic Press.

(Received 11 March 2004)

Mary Talbot, Karen Atkinson & David Atkinson, *Language and power in the modern world*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003. Pp. ix, 342. Pb £16.99.

Reviewed by Lisa Philips Valentine
Anthropology, University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2
valentin@uwo.ca

Centered on critical language study, *Language and power in the modern world* aims to "reveal and challenge aspects of the intense socialization to which we are all subjected, not only through language but also about language" (p. 4). The authors begin with a relatively brief introduction to the concept of power, leaning heavily on Foucault as interpreted by, especially, Norman Fairclough. The introduction, while focused on power, delves into Critical Discourse Analysis and the critical (socio)linguistics literatures to situate a quick overview of the book, which is organized around five chapters: "Language and the media," "Language and organisations," "Language and gender," "Language and youth," and "Multilingualism, ethnicity and identity." In each chapter, the authors present an initial review essay of 11 to 20 pages, followed by an "activities" section, which typically presents two or three suggested tasks for students. The bulk of each chapter, however, is the set of four or five (edited) readings of primary sources relevant to the chapter's topic. The readings, regularly addressed in the earlier chapters as "Reading 1.2" or "Reading 2.3," often with no title or author noted, are the best part of this book. The reading selections are quite recent, with only one title published before 1995, allowing the reader to catch up on some outstanding primary research that takes the five topic areas well beyond the classic studies of the 1970s and 1980s. The authors' choice of readings is well considered and fulfills their goal not to "promote one approach over another, [but] rather to illustrate a variety of approaches to the study of language and power" (4).

This book brings together an excellent array of articles which more or less closely follow the chapters' titles, although there is considerable slippage in respect to where a given excerpt might fit best. For example, selections for chap. 1, "Language and media," could just as easily have been repositioned under different chapters: Mary Talbot's (1995) excerpt from "A synthetic sisterhood: False friends in a teenage magazine" might have been placed in either "Language and gender" or "Language and youth"; both excerpts from Ian Hutchby, "The organization of talk on radio" (1991) and *Confrontation talk: Arguments, asymmetries and power on talk radio* (1996), could have been used for "Language and organisations." The readings for "Language and youth" could have been put as a whole under a heading such as "Language and emerging identities," or even subsumed under of "Multilingualism, ethnicity and identity." The authors write of "overlapping themes across chapters," especially media and gender, but it would appear that their overwhelming interests are in the areas of gender inequality and interethnic conflict, reflecting in the first instance the research of Talbot and Karen Atkinson, and in the second, the focus of CDA in the European Union. To the authors' credit, the use of the terms "power" and "language" in the book's title best reflects the linkages between the readings across the five chapters.

Except for two readings on multilingualism and identity that look at the medium of instruction in Hong Kong (English vs. Cantonese or Putonghua) and Spain (Catalan vs. Spanish), the examples are heavily weighted toward English data from the UK, USA, New Zealand, and Australia. Of the readings on "Language and youth," four focus explicitly on the place of African American Vernacular English in language practices of both African American and White youths and the fifth is a fascinating extract from Les Back 1996 on parodying racism in the UK; all examine "standard [British or American] English" as the backdrop against which a variety of emerging youth identities are formed.

Once the basic organization of the book is well understood, the essays and readings make good sense. In many ways, this book would have been clearer as an edited volume with the authors providing their introductory essays as critical reviews to follow the articles in each chapter. As I read the introductory chapter, I was quite excited about the possibility of finding a volume that, at last, brought together strands from CDA and scholars such as Foucault, Gramsci, Bourdieu, and Bakhtin, while at the same time used analyses of real-world language data. That excitement, however, dimmed somewhat as I continued to read the book. Although advertised as built for students – hence the "activities" section in each chapter – this is not a book that I would give to the uninitiated. Without a good background in some aspect of linguistics or discourse analysis, students simply do not have the background to understand how to undertake the analyses proposed. The authors of the volume and of the excerpted readings have all spent their time learning how to conduct research in these highly contested areas, but the authors of this book assume far too much knowledge of the student. For

example, the instructions for the activity in the introductory chapter are as follows: "Look at a variety of newspaper and magazine articles and/or television news items and programmes over the period of a week and see how many of them relate to issues of language and power in one way or another." Based on my reading of the introduction, this could possibly include every single item in every media venue, although I would be hard pressed to know how to address the relationships in any but the most general terms – that is, unless I were coming out of a sociology background where I could easily invoke an analysis based on Bourdieu, Gramsci, or Foucault, none of whom are particularly well known for close (micro-level) linguistic analysis. The glossary, heavily (and rightly) privileging Fairclough's work, does not provide sufficient training in the topic areas to allow students to conduct the activities suggested in a systematic manner. However, despite my complaints about the organization of the volume, the compiled readings are excellent.

A final caveat for people considering this book for the classroom is the abysmal proofreading in chaps. 1 through 4. (The proofs of the introduction and the final chapter appear to have been more carefully examined than the others.) One extended example is found on p. 135, where the last page of Deborah Cameron's excerpt from *Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture* has no capital letters. Similar problems that typically arise in scanned materials are found throughout the text, with a couple of the most interesting on p. 240, where the Yiddish definition of *nosh* is 'to cat', and on p. 202, where we find that "Accompanying this deconstruction of 'power' is an unpicking [sic] of what constitutes 'resistance'." Students, always looking for loopholes in their own writing, would have a field day with the editing in this volume.

Ultimately, this is a book that I would love to see reworked as a second edition, one that put the readings in primary position and situated the introductory statements to the chapters as review essays that highlight specific areas. To open the literature to students, this book would make more sense as an edited volume, with key issues outlined and explicated by the editors. In fact, the second edition should not be much different from the first, just well edited and organized so that one could always identify the author, the title of the excerpt, and its place in the literature. In the present form, the authors and titles of the readings are demoted to footnotes located at the bottom of the first page of each excerpt. In the running text, the readings are homogenized and rendered agentless as a numeric series under headings such as Reading 3.1, Reading 3.2, and the like. In this imaginary but hoped-for second edition, I would also rethink the prepositional phrase in the title, *Language and power in the modern world*, and find something less (or even more explicitly) colonial than "the modern world" when the only regions addressed, outside of Catalan, are English-speaking and/or past British colonies.

(Received 1 March 2004)

CHRISTINA BRATT PAULSTON & G. RICHARD TUCKER (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The essential readings*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003. Pp xviii, 502.

Reviewed by HAILONG TIAN
Tianjin University of Commerce
Tianjin 300134, PR China
thailong@public1.tpt.tj.cn

Sociolinguistics, broadly defined as "the study of language in its social contexts and the study of social life through linguistics" (Coupland & Jaworski 1997:1), turns out to be a very lively and popular field of study. Evidence for its popularity is that introductory textbooks and collections of original readings keep appearing on the desks of sociolinguistics students. Among the former we have, for instance, Holmes 1992, Mesthrie et al. 2000, Romaine 2000, and Wardhaugh 2002. Among the latter, we have Coupland & Jaworski 1997 at least. The introductory textbooks, which can serve as a second-hand synopsis of classic seminal work in the field, often cannot satisfy curious students, who feel it compulsory to do first-hand reading of the original works of influential authors.

Sociolinguistics: The essential readings comes to satisfy the curious students. As is suggested in the title, the 29 extracts this reader presents are essential readings, essential not in the sense that they are original, seminal articles from influential authors (though in fact they are), but in that they cover a variety of topics that form the discipline of sociolinguistics. What's more, the selections relating to each topic are themselves reports of primary research. For example, under the first topic heading, "History of sociolinguistics", the editors present two extracts that are investigations of the genesis or origin of sociolinguistics instead of mere accounts of its chronological development. Roger W. Shuy explores the ancestry of sociolinguistics in terms of linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and linguistic geography. Louis-Jean Calvet reflects on the origins of sociolinguistics in France and in the former Soviet Union. Paulston & Tucker, in their editorial introduction to Part I, highlight the reasons for the origin of sociolinguistics, one of which is that "the field appears to have emerged partially in response to a number of well-articulated and compelling social issues" (p. 2). According to them, sociolinguistics appeared in North America as a natural outcome of the movement of social justice, and the postcolonial sensibility also informs Calvet's essay.

Ethnography of speaking, also referred to as "ways of speaking," occupies space in almost every volume titled as sociolinguistics. Under this topic heading, Part II presents Dell Hymes's "Models of the interaction of language and social life," in which a descriptive theory is developed in order to work out the components of communicative competence. Hymes argues that these components can be identified, examined, and analyzed just as the components of the

structure of a language are. In this, he attempts to overcome Chomsky's abstract system of language and considers the social factors in language use, but he is still confined to the language ideology of mainstream linguistics. Hymes is too much an idealist to see that speech act intension does not necessarily match surface form. As Schiffrin (1994:185) points out, knowledge of these structures and functions is only part of our communicative competence. The ways that we organize and conduct our lives through language are ways of being and doing that are not only relative to other possibilities for communicating, but also deeply embedded within the particular framework by which we – as members of our own specific communities – make sense out of experience.

Valentina Pagliai's "Lands I came to sing" in the same part furthers Hymes's work, and pragmatic studies and gender studies, Part III and Part IV respectively, are schools that may have resulted from the ethnographic approach to communication (p.28). Pragmatics is not included in Coupland & Jaworski's sociolinguistics reader (1997), but it occupies the greatest space of this reader with six articles: three addressing narratives, one conversation, and two politeness. Roger Brown & Albert Gilman's "The pronouns of power and solidarity" is a much-cited article, and its inclusion will be convenient for students interested in power studies. As for the topic of language and gender, the editors present a selection from Robin Lakoff's *Language and women's place*, and an extract from *Gender and discourse* by Deborah Tannen.

Part V, "Language and variation," best reflects the editorial principle stated in the Preface. Here one hard-to-find early work and two up-to-date research papers address this indispensable topic in sociolinguistics. William Labov's "Some sociolinguistic principles," in which he spells out some of his working principles, was first published in 1969. It is followed by Walt Wolfram's "On the construction of vernacular dialect norms" and Barbara Johnstone's "The linguistic individual in an American public-opinion survey," first published in 2000 and 1991 respectively. By this arrangement, together with the discussion questions at the end of each part, the editors provide students with a fuller picture of the progress of the discipline and provoke their thinking.

The next part, "Pidgins and creoles," presents only one classic study on the sociological aspects of creole language, John E. Reinecke's "Trade jargons and creole dialects as marginal languages." But, as the editors point out (289), there is a considerable literature on pidgins and creoles which discusses issues like language education and language planning. The three selections in Part X contribute to the topic of language policy and planning, and the two selections in Part XI to the issues of multilingualism, policies, and education.

Parts VII, VIII, and IX are devoted to the sociolinguistic situations of bilingualism and multilingualism, but each part has its own emphasis. The three articles under the heading of individual bilingualism focus on the education of bilingual individuals, for the editors believe that "bilingualism or multilingualism and innovative approaches to education which involve the use of two or

more languages constitute the normal everyday experience" (301). This psychological emphasis on bilingualism shifts to the sociological literature of bilingualism in Part VIII, "Diglossia." Here students can read Charles Ferguson's 1959 classic, and Joshua Fishman's "Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism" (1967). In "Toward the systematic study of diglossia" (1991), students have Alan Hudson's review of Ferguson's concept of diglossia and Fishman's treatment of diglossia and its impact, as well as Hudson's working definition. As for group multilingualism, the two articles in Part IX concern the question of whether the coexistence of many languages is likely to lead to strife and internal crisis. Joshua Fishman's "Empirical explorations of two popular assumptions" demonstrates that it is not multilingualism itself that causes civil strife. Paulston's "Linguistic minorities and language policies" discusses language as a social resource which is available to ethnic groups in their competition for access to the goods and services of a nation.

The editorial introductions in the volume are worth special comment. Every part begins with an introduction that does not merely summarize the selections in the part. Commenting on and critiquing the classic works, these introductions present the editors' own understanding of sociolinguistics and illustrate important concepts. The above-mentioned introduction to "History of sociolinguistics" is an example of the editors' orientation; the introduction to Part VIII provides students with a clearer illustration of the concept of diglossia. The editors not only provide a history of the term but also remind students of the disagreement and confusion about the meaning of diglossia.

A word about things to be desired: As sociolinguistics is also the study of social life through language, essential readings in sociolinguistics should include readings from critical discourse analysis. In the last 20 years of the half-century development of sociolinguistics, CDA has produced abundant volumes concerning theory and method, and there are already authors who consider it an essential part of a broadly conceived sociolinguistics (e.g. Fairclough 2000). The editors have made an attempt in Part I by choosing an article addressing critical theory, but they have not followed this line in their choice of readings in the other parts. If they had, the volume might have been more international and had more contributors from outside the United States.

REFERENCES

Coupland, Nikolas, & Jaworski, Adam (1997) (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*. London: Macmillan.
Fairclough, Norman (2000). Discourse, social theory, and social research: The discourse of welfare reform. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4:163–95.
Schiffrin, Deborah (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

JAMES W. TOLLEFSON (ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002. Pp. 350. Pb $39.95.

Reviewed by NORBERT FRANCIS
College of Education, Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
norbert.francis@nau.edu

Language policies in education brings together a wide-ranging collection of essays from the United States, Canada, Australia, Yugoslavia, India and East Asia, Eastern Africa, and the Solomon Islands. Editor James Tollefson frames the discussion in his introduction and conclusion on language conflict and language rights in a way that calls our attention to the central questions. How have educational language policies maintained unequal access to teaching and learning resources for language minorities and indigenous language (IL) speakers? What affirmative measures in the realm of language policy can chart the clearest course toward redressing these inequalities? And for political entities in multilingual states in a position of language policy-making authority, what are the guiding principles of a responsible democratic approach to resolving ethnolinguistic conflicts? Though few of the authors take up the questions directly, the editor reminds readers that all discussions of educational language policy must keep in the foreground considerations of effective pedagogical practice and constraints on language learners. These more narrowly circumscribed educational, developmental, and psycholinguistic determinants are subordinated to political-ideological impositions at the risk of undermining basic democratic principles. Multilingual and multicultural accord at the nation-state level is eroded by attempts to utilize official language teaching programs as tools of national or political unification if these programs are not conceived as complementary to individuals' language learning rights and as consistent with sound first and second language pedagogy. Particularly instructive on this point are the chapters by Mary McGroarty, Terrance Wiley, Thomas Donahue, and Teresa McCarty on the current struggle between the forces of pluralism and exclusion in the United States, and surveys of political-language conflicts in the former Yugoslavia and India by Tollefson and Selma Sonntag, respectively.

The chapters reporting on the recent widespread and early introduction of English as a Foreign Language in Korea and Vietnam cast a different light on questions of inclusionary language education policy and equitable access to learning resources. Powerful global tendencies and historical imperatives, unlikely to be deflected to any significant degree for the foreseeable future, have objectively imposed hard constraints on local and national educational systems. The tension between the legacy of colonialism and the gradual unfolding of sovereignty on the one hand, and the universal need for access to languages of world communication (LWC) on the other, poses the most complex problems of lan-

guage planning and language policy. These difficult questions present themselves in terms that are even less easily disentangled in the case of recently independent countries, unlike Korea and Vietnam, with a wide diversity of vernacular lingua francas and local indigenous languages, none of which can provide full access anytime soon to basic texts and didactic resources in the sciences and related technical fields.

To their credit, the authors in this volume avoid the facile global-phobic response to the expansion of LWCs among the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia, and to the developing inter-LWC realignments almost everywhere else outside the English-speaking regions. Refreshingly absent, as well, is some of the very bad advice that is offered at times on how the learning of former colonial languages, in Africa for example, might be limited or discouraged. This argument goes as follows: Given that English, French, and Portuguese are spoken by social and political elites and rarely (as yet) by the majority in officially anglophone, francophone, and lusophone countries, maintaining their official status (e.g., teaching them to children in public schools) perpetuates inequality.

All this leads us to a consideration of my (admittedly somewhat tendentious) reading of Alamin Mazrui's chapter on the English language in African education. In by far the book's most pertinent contribution to the debate on the expansion of LWCs, the reader is reminded of the complexity of language planning issues and of the high stakes involved in policy decisions. Mazrui's measured discussion lays out the challenges that confront the East African anglophone region and South Africa. As a necessary point of departure, it is pointed out that educational authorities of newly independent countries depreciate the national/ indigenous languages of their people at their own peril. The unavoidable task of *indigenization* (276) must set realizable and progressively verifiable objectives in the area of corpus and status planning: a gradualist and deliberate approach to the introduction of African languages as media of instruction "moving upward slowly from lower to higher grades" (278). Offering advanced studies of and in the African languages at the university level counts among the permanent academic objectives of the multilingual nation. Much more fundamental than an emblem of national identity and sovereignty, the "recentering of African languages" corresponds to the immediate conditions of language and literacy development of child learners, especially the overwhelming majority who have not yet advanced significantly in their second language (L2) learning of English, in this case. In the early grades in particular, no justification or pretext should stand in the way of implementing bilingual instructional models that include a major component in literacy-related, cognitively challenging, academic discourse domains in the language that child learners know, or know best. No research evidence to date has disproved the basic hypothesis (slightly updated) of the 1953 UNESCO declaration on vernacular languages in education: Literacy learning that is supported by instruction in the language that preliterate children understand is an effective alternative to literacy instruction exclusively in languages

of which learners have no knowledge. This proposal amounts to one of bilingual instruction within the broader framework of a multilingual system. Its design features take as their starting point the most effective and efficient means of developing higher-order language abilities, and teaching literacy and second languages, crucially to include second-language literacy in a LWC, English in the case of the countries under consideration in this chapter. Mazrui does not put forward this last proposal explicitly (in fact, there may not be agreement on this point); however, I believe it follows from some of the general principles assumed in the chapter. Two additional fronts in the process of decolonialization are the transformation of English, "creating counter-hegemonic discourses within this same imperial language" (277), and a diversification of dependence and interdependence relations including, strategically, the horizontal dimension at the regional level.

In his discussion of the role of English in the struggle against apartheid (tracing the account back to Soweto 1976) and for a post-1990 democratic South Africa, Mazrui touches on the inevitability of the new linguistic realignment, but then seems to hold back from developing its full implications. For historical reasons, the evolving South African experiment in official multilingualism may well set the educational language policy and planning landmarks for the entire region. In all likelihood, all of the eleven recognized languages of the nation will continue to maintain their "official" status. Whatever specific provisions and privileges, in each case, turn out to viable in the long term, the 1996 constitutional measures on language policy will stand as an important example. On the other hand, the inevitable displacement of Afrikaans by English, reducing it from its former "co-national" standing to its rightful place alongside the now official Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, siSwati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, isiNdebele, isiXhosa, and isiZulu, will imply, probably sooner than later, the undisputed ascendancy of one "central-national" language among the official eleven. To be fair, it seems that few observers of language education in multilingual Africa have drawn out the logic of the tendencies in literacy attainment and L2 learning of former colonial languages since the early 1960s along these lines. From this point of view, correcting the imbalance between elite bilingualism and popular bilingualism is unlikely to be served by restricting access to the LWCs in the public sector, but, to the contrary, by expanding access to them. Following Mazrui's proposals of indigenization, transformation, and appropriation of the former colonial languages, and diversification of relations of interdependence and communication, we can go further: A multilingual educational system that promotes additive bilingualism, building upon the platform of indigenous language knowledge and indigenous discourse competence, is the one most favorably situated to ambitiously expand the teaching of literacy and literacy-related language abilities in children's first and second languages. Thus, the programming of second-language learning of official languages in the elementary school need not hesitate to apply the most effective and efficient methods. Saving us from at least one unneces-

sary side discussion, no contradiction is necessarily posed between the progressive inclusion of ILs in the curriculum and universal L2 content-based instruction. The challenge for linguists and educational planners lies in understanding the dynamics of multilingual systems and child bilingual development, neither of which are yet well understood. For example, in the context of rapid linguistic change (e.g. the learning of new languages by children), what are the long-term prospects of survival for indigenous languages with relatively few speakers? For now we are compelled to consider such questions as independent of and separate from those that underlie the central tasks of multilingual educational language policy.

(Received 27 February 2004)

NANCY H. HORNBERGER (ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (Bilingual Education and Biliteracy 41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2003. Pp. 370. Pb $39.95.

Reviewed by DAVID I. HANAUER
English Department, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15705
hanauer@iup.edu

The collection of articles in Nancy Hornberger's edited book *Continua of biliteracy* provides a notion of historical development and a sampling of research applications for a specific conceptualization of the phenomenon of biliteracy and multiliteracy. The collection reviews 13 years of theoretical and qualitative research generated by Hornberger's (1989) initial presentation of the continua of biliteracy. The book includes three chapters by Hornberger: the original article, the revision and development of the continua of biliteracy in light of developments in literacy research through the 1990s, written with Skilton-Sylvester (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester 2000), and finally an extension of the themes developed in the original model through the metaphor of ecology (Hornberger 2002). These three articles function as a theoretical framework consisting of the past, present, and future directions in research generated through this conceptualization. The other chapters report on research that utilizes Hornberger's framework, covering the issues of language policy, literate identities, teacher roles, and pedagogical practice in various locations, such as the United States, Latin America, Wales, South Africa, and India. This range of issues in a variety of settings demonstrates the robustness of the theory and exemplifies for the reader some of the options of application that it offers.

Philosophically, the agenda of the continua of biliteracy project can be seen as developing from the postmodern Zeitgeist. The postmodern critique applied

to issues of nationalism questions the essence of a grand narrative that provides ideological cohesiveness through the proposition of an overriding unity (Lyotard 1984). This critique, philosophical in nature, has not been ignored by researchers in the field of language. In applied linguistics, the questioning of unity is usually construed through objections to autonomous monolingual language policies imposed on a variety of hierarchically demoralized and subjugated linguistic minorities. Applied linguistics is an empirically oriented field, and its empiricism has tended to translate theoretical concerns into observable and analyzable aspects of a phenomenon. It is in this context that Hornberger's original 1989 presentation of the continua of biliteracy played a crucial role. The original paper provided an important collection and organization of the variables that function at the confrontation sites of cross-linguistic meeting. As a form of meta-analysis, the continua of biliteracy set out in a spatial three-dimensional metaphor the variables that interact in biliterate contexts, and thus summarized the variables that need to be addressed to explain the phenomenon. This is an important conceptualization because it widened the set of variables that need to be addressed and demonstrated the concept of complex interaction among variables. The continua of biliteracy functioned as a counterweight to simplistic empirical evaluations of literacy or bilingual phenomena that did not address either the complexity of interaction or the range of variables functioning within this context. Essentially, this multivariate, three-dimensional model is a conceptualization of the theoretical complexity and richness of biliteracy. In postmodern terms, when the grand narrative is questioned, factors and groupings that had been invisible under the model of national unity suddenly emerge and enter the interpretive equation.

The revision of this model in 2002 is once again a meta-analysis of research and theory that developed into a refocusing and extension of the continua of biliteracy. The major development in the revised model is its emphasis on a critical approach to biliteracy. This development reflects changes in emphasis in the field of applied linguistics that have taken on an empowerment agenda through the propagation of causes such as human linguistic rights. The underlying position is that the analysis of biliteracy through the lens of the continua of biliteracy highlights the subjugating hierarchy of some educational and national policies and practices and at the same time offers the options of seeing, for the first time, minority or marginalized linguistic practices. To a certain extent this theme is extended in the last of the Hornberger papers in this collection (Hornberger 2002). Through the metaphor of ecology, the issues of language endangerment, language evolution, and language environment are addressed. In these two revisions of the original continua of biliteracy article, the postmodern agenda is manifest through a critical pedagogy that desires to foreground the power structures that marginalize a variety of groups and linguistic practices. This agenda is followed through in several of the actual research projects presented in this volume.

Hornberger's edited book provides a serious historical overview of the development of her thought and writing in conceptualizing bi(multi)literacy. In the afterword, Brian Street poses the question: "How much does the continua framework add to what we already know on literacy, language policy and multilingualism?" (2003:342). For a theoretical conceptualization such as the continua of biliteracy, this is a serious question that addresses both the empirical manifestations of the model as a theoretical orientation and the actual model itself. Part of the answer is to be found within the studies presented in this collection. They do address the theory, but as pointed out by Street, this is to a certain extent contrived. The studies "affiliate" themselves to the model rather than grow inherently from it. This may result from the difficulties of conceptualizing interactions involving 12 variables arranged along a series of continua. The strength of the model seems to be its conceptual organization of the variables. The model has provided a unified overview of the factors that function in studying biliterate and multiliterate phenomena. But its strength as a complex network of embedded continua makes it problematic for the practical purpose of conceptualizing specific cases of interaction among variables.

From a philosophical perspective a different difficulty arises: Perhaps the idea of unifying all the variables into a single equation is in itself problematic. Certainly a postmodern sensitivity would prefer an emphasis on locality and fragmentation rather than an overriding, unified conceptualization. The phenomenon of biliteracy and the agenda of empowerment through critical analysis may benefit from micro-theories grounded in qualitative research at specific locations with particular populations. In the final analysis, this book, with its historical development of the continua of biliteracy and series of specific applications, demonstrates that this model is a work in progress that functions as a meta-analysis of research in applied linguistics. It is one option for conceptualizing the phenomenon of biliteracy that situates more specific and localized studies in a wider frame of reference. The value of this model is demonstrated in this book; the theoretical framework of the continua of biliteracy has been one of the conceptual tools that have allowed minority voices to enter the discourse of educators, language policy makers, and researchers.

REFERENCES

Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research* 59:271–96.
———— (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy* 1:27–51.
————, & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. *Language and Education* 14:96–122.
Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Anna Duszak (ed.), *Us and others: Social identities across languages, discourses, cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp 517. Hb $162.

Reviewed by Kay McCormick
English Department, University of Cape Town
Private Bag Rondebosch
Cape Town 7700 South Africa
kay@humanities.uct.ac.za

This interesting volume, edited and introduced by Anna Duszak, offers a range of perspectives on the construction of identity, particularly the formation and roles of contrasting reference groups, the "us and others" of the title. Disciplines in which the contributing studies are based include social anthropology, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, intercultural communication studies, cognitive linguistics, translation studies, neurolinguistics, neuropsychology, and social psychology. Contributing scholars present accounts of studies conducted in Africa, the Americas, Asia, Australia, and Europe. The 23 chapters are grouped under the headings "Discourses in space," "Discourses in polyphony," "Discourses of transition," "Discourses of fear," "Discourses of challenge," and "Discourses through suppression."

In the Introduction, Duszak describes the purpose of the collection as follows:

> to look into the various cognitive, social and linguistic aspects of the social identities that humans choose to construct, foreground and manage in interaction. The focus is on the linguistic mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion as they are enacted in discourse. (p. 2)

Having argued that it is natural for people to distinguish between *us* and *others*, Duszak refers to "the problem of *us-them*" and to "the *us-them* issue" and suggests that this natural process should be regarded as a problem or an issue when it relegates the other to the position of an object with whom there is or can be no dialogue. The categorization process itself is a central and therefore unavoidable component of identity construction.

For Duszak and the other contributors to this volume, identities of individuals and groups are not fixed but are constantly being constructed interactively. A key question for these scholars is whether language is (always) "a core value for how group boundaries are drawn" (3). They also consider the sense(s) in which the term "language" should be understood in the context of group differentiation. As the chapters show, what is linguistically salient in the construction of difference and similarity may be one or more of the following: named languages, dialects, lexical items, phonological and morphosyntactic features, discourse conventions, and genres.

Duszak briefly reviews the ways in which the relationship between a group and its use of language has been conceptualized by analysts working with no-

tions of "speech communities," "discourse communities," "communities of practice," "small cultures," and "networks." Her review shows that in recent years the emphasis has shifted from the assumption that there would be a one-to-one relationship among language, community, and world view, to a recognition that there are diverse subsystems within speech communities, and that some subsystems may operate across two or more communities. The chapters in the collection recognize and account for variability and nuances within broadly discernible patterns. This is one of the strengths of the book. Another is that the theoretical bases of the studies are, in most cases, strongly and clearly articulated, and well used in the interpretation of data. Unfortunately, space constraints do not allow for detailed engagement with all the chapters. This review therefore focuses on each of the sections in turn and comments on ways in which the issues have been approached.

The chapters of Part I, "Discourses in space," work with the assumption that spatial relations are fundamental in human cognition, and show how they are metaphorically extended in constructing the oppositions "insider" and "outsider," "proximity" and "distance" in social relationships. The first chapter in this section, by Johannes Helmbrecht, includes a very useful broad overview from a typological perspective of the range of functions that the first person non-singular pronoun can have. Helmbrecht shows how referentially complex this pronoun is, and accounts for the fact that the type of social group that "we" can refer to is rarely grammaticalized. Minglang Zhou's chapter focuses on the role of the spatial deictic verbs 'come' and 'go' in expressing social closeness or distance in Chinese. He argues that deictic verbs are needed for this function because the Chinese pronoun system, while fully developed for other key functions (such as the expression of politeness), is "underdeveloped" for the expression of speaker inclusiveness or exclusiveness. Soichi Kozai integrates cognitive and sociolinguistic approaches in explaining how social group membership which involves a shift of speaker's viewpoint is coded linguistically in Japanese. Also based in cognitive linguistics is Melinda Yuen-ching Chen's chapter, an illuminating analysis of the use of spatial schemata and switches in point of view in the discourses of marginalized groups in the United States. The last chapter in this section, by Birgit Apfelbaum, is a descriptive case study of identity construction in encounters in the virtual space provided by a synchronous interactive form of computer-assisted language learning.

The three chapters in Part II, "Discourses in polyphony," examine ways in which language use may be involved in identity construction of groups and individuals in situations of language contact. One of the important things to emerge in this section is evidence that language (in the sense of "a particular language") is not necessarily a core value in group identity. The writers show how speakers who command more than one language variety choose from their linguistic repertoire the language variety or strategy (such as code-switching) to enact different identities in different situations. The chapter by Clyne, Eisikovits, and Tollfree

deals with variable use of ethnolects by members of communities that have undergone language shift, depending on the extent to which they wish to foreground their ethnic identity in particular interactions. Sinner's chapter provides a fascinating insight into perceptions of Catalan Spanish by its speakers and by speakers of other dialects, and also into the contemporary insider concept of Catalan identity, which is not tied to being a native speaker of Catalan. Nkonko Kamwangamalu analyzes the reported language choices among a group of bilingual young South Africans in the post-apartheid era. His study indicates that although there may be ambivalence about code-switching, it is sometimes an acceptable mechanism for positioning oneself in relation to an interlocutor, whereas code-crossing does not yet seem to be.

Part III deals with "Discourses of transition." Most of the studies use textual analysis to examine ways in which newly formed groups use language to distinguish themselves from old ones and from other emerging groups in times when major political, social, and economic transition is affecting societal structures and relationships. Anna Duszak's paper deals with the reasons for and effects of lexical borrowing from English into Polish. She gives a sensitive analysis of this borrowing as a social index of interest groups and tensions between them in contemporary Poland. Through semantic analysis, Riitta Pyykkö shows how major political figures in different periods of Russia's 20th-century history used the first person plural pronoun to indicate their alignments, and to draw the reader into the "we" group. Krystyna Skarżyńska analyzes polarizing discourses in contemporary Poland from a psychological perspective, focusing particularly on affective polarization and different styles of thinking. Heiko Hausendorf and Wolfgang Kesselheim's excellent paper describe two types of group comparison that are used in the construction of relationships between groups. Through careful analysis of examples, they identify conversational moves and details that characterize these two comparative processes.

The studies described in Part IV, "Discourses of fear," analyze strategies of othering and of alignment in contexts where fear is a key element in the construction of a threatening other. Two chapters explore the use of these strategies among powerful groups, and two examine their use in the discourses of minority groups. Angelika Brechelmacher's chapter is on media constructions of "us" and "them" during the period of Austria's presidency of the European Union's Council of Ministers. Her analysis of approximately 300 texts that deal with the possible enlargement of the EU shows how and why the "us" group is constructed sometimes as Austria and sometimes as the existing EU. The "them" group – always the (people of) countries that have indicated a wish to join the EU – is to varying degrees seen as a threat to the current comfort zone. Detailed textual analysis reveals strategies of marginalizing, patronizing, criminalizing, and in other ways derogating the outgroup. Krisadawan Hongladarom analyzes the working of three linguistic strategies in media constructions of ethnic minorities in Thailand, collectively referred to as *chao khao* 'the hilltribes'. They are presented as an "other"

that has criminal tendencies and is in various ways a threat to the environment and to the interests of the ethnic Thai majority. Monika Schmid's chapter focuses on constructions of Jews by others in Germany over a long period, and then on constructions of their own identity by Jews who left Germany at different stages of the Nazi period. Through detailed linguistic analysis of their oral testimonies, Lisa Wagner explores the linguistic strategies used by three Argentinian women, members of Las Madres de la Plaza de Mayo, in the organization's long campaign to obtain information on the whereabouts of their missing children. Choices of how and when to speak were severely limited by the repressive network of control exercised by those in power. The paper shows how the women exploited the linguistic resources available to them in order to reach the "others," those who could provide the information they sought, while still being very opposed to them.

Part V, "Discourses of challenge," provides analyses of resistant responses to prevailing categorizations of people and their expected behavior. These studies work with conversational data and show a range of strategies that speakers can use to challenge or subvert accepted norms and boundaries. Janet Holmes and Meredith Marra explore ways in which humor is used in dealing with group identities, both in the presence and in the absence of members of the "other" group. They argue that it is "an adaptable and practical strategy used by participants . . . for constructing, maintaining, reinforcing, and sometimes challenging, many different kinds of group boundaries" (396). Şükriye Ruhi's detailed analyses of compliment exchanges shows how, in Turkey, these exchanges may serve to reify gender differences even within friendship groups. Liliana Cabral Bastos studies the linguistic and discourse features used by a company employee whose job (dealing with queries and complaints about the company from members of the public) place her on the border between company and client. Bastos's careful analysis shows changes in several aspects of the employee's use of language over time as she decides where she wants to place herself in relation to clients.

The last section contains three fine but very different articles. In choosing to place them together in one section, entitled "Discourses of suppression," Duszak is foregrounding one common aspect – each essay deals with the ways in which the powerful "other" can limit the options of the less powerful in positioning themselves. (This is, of course, also a prominent concern in some other chapters, for example in Part IV.)

Setting her inquiry within the framework of the philosophy of dialogue, Elżbieta Tabakowska identifies and illustrates a serious professional and ethical challenge facing translators. Positioned as they are between two "others" and having to intervene as mediators between two cultures, they face the question of whether or not to "domesticate" the original author's text, suppressing its foreignness in the translation so that it is accessible and acceptable to the target readership. Tabakowska sees the translator's responsibility as being "to tame

'the Other' in the eyes of 'us', so that 'the-Other-as-them' may change into 'the-Other-as-you'" (459), something that can not be achieved without a movement away from "translator's ego-centricity" (459).

Bhaskaran Nayar is concerned with the roots and effects of the ubiquitous distinction between native speaker (NS) and nonnative speaker (NNS) of English, a strong binary division into "us" and "them" which goes far beyond matters of linguistic proficiency. In "Ideological binarism in the identities of native- and non-native English speakers," he directs a powerful spotlight on what lies below the surface of postings to an Internet interest group for people involved in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. Critical linguistic analysis of these texts reveals sets of assumptions and prejudices about the inferiority of the cultures and personal and intellectual qualities of NNS learners of English.

Appropriately placed as the closing chapter is an accessible neurolinguistic account, by Maria Pąchalska and Bruce Duncan MacQueen, of one of the features of aphasia, the collapse of the "us-them" structure. One of the psychosocial consequences of aphasia may be bleak indeed: "Ultimately the patient no longer belongs to an US on any level, and the world is divided into ME and THEM" (488).

This excellent book will be a valuable resource for academics and other people interested in the processes involved in the construction of individual and group identities, in the linguistic "clues" to underlying ideological categorizations, or in the consequences of "us/you/them" divisions and revisions. I believe that it would be appropriately placed not only in academic libraries but also in those that serve the general public.

(Received 15 March 2004)

RACHEL GIORA, *On our mind: Salience, context, and figurative language*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. ix, 259. Hb $55.

Reviewed by NING YU
Modern Languages, University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK 73019
ningyu@ou.edu

The goal of this book is to explore the extent to which salient meanings – meanings that are decoded in our mental lexicon and foremost on our mind – affect our speech production and comprehension. "It aims to shed light, primarily empirically, on how, in addition to contextual information, salient meanings and senses of words and fixed expressions shape our linguistic behavior" (p. 9). According to Rachel Giora's graded salience hypothesis, salient meanings are more accessible than less salient ones. Of the multiple meanings of a given word or

expression, the most salient one, which can be either literal or figurative, is always activated first regardless of context.

The book consists of nine chapters. The first three outline the theoretical background against which the empirical studies reported in the subsequent chapters were conducted. Chap. 1 offers some linguistic and nonlinguistic examples of how our salience-bound mind works. It then introduces three information-processing models that vary in respect to the temporal stage at which context affects language comprehension. According to the interactionist, direct access view, the contextual information interacts with lexical processes very early on and enables the appropriate interpretation to be tapped directly, without involving a contextually inappropriate stage initially. The modular view, in contrast, holds that linguistic information is initially processed independently of contextual information. When the output of the linguistic module does not cohere with the contextual information, it needs to go through a later stage of revision and adjustment to the contextual knowledge. The graded salience hypothesis posits that more salient meanings are always activated before less salient meanings in the linguistic module. They are accessed upon encounter regardless of contextual information. A highly predictive context, however, may speed up derivation of the appropriate meaning while it would not obstruct inappropriate salient meanings upon encounter of the lexical stimulus.

Chap. 2 defines the notions of salience and context and their relationship. Salient meanings are cognitively prominent owing to frequency, familiarity, conventionality, or prototypicality. The notion of salience is both graded and dynamic. That is, various meanings of a word or expression are ranked in salience, and their ranking is not fixed but is subject to reshuffling over time. Context may be predictive and affect the availability of meanings early on. However, contextual processes do not interact with lexical processes initially but run in parallel. Language comprehension comprises two phases: the initial phase of activation, and the subsequent phase of integration. In the initial phase, "contextually appropriate and salient meanings are activated – the latter automatically and independently of contextual information, the former as a result of a predictive context" (38). In the subsequent phase, "the activated meanings are either retained for further processes or suppressed as contextually disruptive" (38).

Chap. 3 addresses the issue of lexical access, on which the graded salience hypothesis differs from both the direct access view and the modular model. With selective access (the direct access view), the interaction between contextual and lexical processes early on selects and activates the contextually appropriate meanings exclusively, irrespective of their salience. With exhaustive access (the modular model), lexical access is autonomous, with all the meanings of a word or expression activated regardless of context or salience. Contextual processes interact only with the output of lexical processes, selecting the contextually compatible meaning. With ordered access (the graded salience hypothesis), lexical access, though autonomous, is sensitive to salience: More salient meanings are

activated faster than less salient ones. Contextual knowledge retains or suppresses the salient meaning, and in the latter case selects a less salient but contextually compatible meaning. That is, context, though predictive of certain meanings, cannot block initial activation of salient meanings even though they are contextually incompatible.

Chaps. 4 through 7 study the comprehension of figurative language. Chap. 4 looks into how irony is processed and argues that experimental findings support the graded salience hypothesis, which makes different predictions regarding familiar and unfamiliar ironies with respect to the initial processes. With familiar ironies, their ironic interpretations, as well as their literal meanings, are salient and therefore are activated directly and automatically in the initial phase. With unfamiliar ironies, on the other hand, only their literal meanings are salient and accessed initially, and the contextual intervention in the subsequent processes will derive their ironic counterparts. In either case, however, irony retains its contextually incompatible salient (literal) meaning for contrast in irony interpretation. Only when familiar irony is used in a literally biasing context can its salient ironic interpretation be suppressed and discarded.

Chap. 5 examines how metaphors and idioms are processed. Experimental results show similar patterns in the activation of meanings for metaphors and idioms, as well as for irony. Both literal and figurative meanings of familiar metaphors and idioms are activated initially, irrespective of context, because they are both salient. The literal meaning, though contextually incompatible, is retained because it is conducive to the interpretation of the metaphor or idiom. For unfamiliar metaphors and idioms, the salient literal meaning is accessed initially and will give way to the less salient, figurative meaning in the subsequent phase of integration as dictated by contextual information. When familiar metaphors and idioms are embedded in a literally biasing context, however, their salient metaphoric or idiomatic meanings will be suppressed and discarded because they interfere with the comprehension of their literal counterparts.

Chap. 6 focuses on joke comprehension. Most jokes involve either polysemous interpretation of related meanings, or ambiguous interpretation of unrelated meanings, of a key word or expression. Under the graded salience hypothesis, jokes start with the salient meaning and end with a less salient meaning. That is, they tend to invite the processing of the more salient but eventually incompatible meaning first before leading to the activation of a less salient but congruent meaning for a reinterpretation. Although jokes and other tropes, such as irony and metaphor, share similar initial processes of activating salient meaning first, they differ in the subsequent integration processes. Whereas irony and metaphor comprehension retains salient but contextually incompatible meanings for interpretation, the comprehension of jokes needs to discard such meanings. This is because salient but contextually incompatible meanings do not play an instrumental role in the comprehension of jokes; sometimes they may even prohibit comprehension.

Chap. 7 discusses the role of salience in aesthetic innovation. According to the graded salience hypothesis, "novelty stands in some complementary relation to salience" (176); "it is not extreme novelty but 'optimal' innovation – novelty that allows for the recoverability of the familiar – that is most pleasurable" (176). In other words, pleasure is "a function of both salience and innovativeness," and is "the gratification in discovering the familiar in the novel" (182). It is also argued that optimal innovation in the use of language is a mode of subversiveness, designed not only for aesthetic purposes but also for social and political change. Such change is both induced and represented by the deviation from the linguistic norm.

Chap. 8 reviews contemporary literature to see if its findings can be accounted for by the graded salience hypothesis. The evidence is only partly consistent with the standard pragmatic view or the direct access view, but almost entirely consistent with the graded salience hypothesis. Thus, the traditional view cannot account for the fact that context actually facilitates initial comprehension of figurative language. The direct access view can, however, because it does not require that the literal meaning of figurative language be processed first. The graded salience hypothesis can, too, since it predicts that salient meanings of familiar figurative utterances would be processed initially regardless of context. On the other hand, the direct access view cannot account for the fact that the literal meaning of figurative language is activated even though it is contextually incompatible. This fact, however, can be accounted for by both the traditional view, which mandates the initial activation of the literal meaning of figurative language before contextual intervention, and the graded salience hypothesis, which predicts initial activation of the salient literal meaning of unfamiliar figurative language regardless of context. It is concluded, therefore, that the graded salience hypothesis is superior in that it enables the reconciliation of conflicting views based on conflicting findings. The implication is that the distinction between the salient and less salient, rather than between the literal and figurative, is applicable to initial processes. As is shown, figurative and literal utterances involve different processes when diverging in salience, but similar processes when converging in salience.

Chap. 9 suggests the implications of the study and raises some questions for future research. It concludes with a note on autonomy of the mind as reflected in the superiority of salient information, which could affect our thinking and understanding in various ways irrespective of contextual information.

In this book, Giora provides a comprehensive psycholinguistic account of how figurative, as well as literal, language is comprehended, based on extensive review of literature and sensible analysis of experimental findings. It is a useful book for linguists and psychologists interested in figurative language, especially in the processes of language production and comprehension.

ANNE CURZAN, *Gender shifts in the history of English* (Studies in English language). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. xii, 223. Hb $ 55.

Reviewed by GUNNAR PERSSON
Emeritus Professor of English
Klaverstraket 25, S-903 53 Umea, Sweden
gunnar.persson@lh.luth.se

In *Gender shifts in the history of English*, Anne Curzan sets out to analyze how and why the English language came to change its original grammatical gender system, which it shared with all other Germanic languages, into a natural gender system. She also addresses a number of related questions, such as the relationship between this shift and sexist language. The study is based primarily on the *Helsinki Corpus*, which comprises texts from Old, Middle, and Early Modern English, but the author also makes use of a number of other sources. Curzan's research methodology may be termed eclectic; it includes corpus linguistics, prototype theory, historical syntax, sociolinguistics, and feminist theory, as well as references to a number of other theories and schools. This eclectic mix is, however, composed with wit, elegance, and great learning, which makes it very interesting to readers of any theoretical persuasion.

In her introductory chapter Curzan points out that the very word *gender* is often ill defined in linguistics, and that in modern usage the word in its social meaning is often wrongly applied to biological designations of sex for reasons of "political correctness." She also makes the important observation, "The gender constructs in the English language reflect social constructs of gender in the world of its speakers."

In chap. 1, "Defining English gender," Curzan gives an overview of the various uses of the term *gender* in English and other languages. She claims quite correctly that the natural gender system of Modern English "[s]tands as the exception, not the rule among the world's languages." She discusses the distinction between grammatical and natural gender and the ways in which various languages with grammatical gender systems handle conflicts between the two categories syntactically. She points out that the natural gender system of English is not without its exceptions, and that it must still be regarded as a grammatical category that requires a systematic analysis of the use of anaphora in the language. In the conclusion of the chapter she defends her use of the term *natural* by stating that it does not rest solely on biological sex but on social concepts of sex and gender.

In chap. 2, "The gender shift in histories of English," Curzan presents a critical survey of the various ways in which the disappearance of grammatical gender and the development of natural gender have been described in histories of English. She describes earlier grammarians' attempts to find reasons for the gender of individual nouns such as *ship* (feminine) and *ocean* (masculine). She also quotes a number of 18th- and 19th-century grammarians who regarded grammat-

ical gender systems as "unreasonable" and "irrational" and hailed the gender system of Modern English as an enormous gain in simplicity and clearness. Curzan goes on to discuss morphological explanations for the loss of grammatical gender. She claims that while the loss of inflections in late Old and early Middle English made an important contribution to this development, that it is not a sufficient explanation of the cause of the shift. She finds a number of sociolinguistic factors to be of equal importance. She further discusses whether Middle English can be described as a creole language, a language mix that may have facilitated the loss of the grammatical gender system. Her answer is that, although there may have been significant Old Norse influence on English syntax, there is no need to look upon this as a disruptive creole situation.

In chap. 3, "A history of gender, people, and pronouns: The story of generic *he*," Curzan describes the various views on so-called generic *he* that have been advanced over time, from the traditional assertions that *he* is the natural or correct anaphoric referent to mixed-gender expressions to today's view that it is sexist. She traces the use of *he* from Old English onward. Of special interest is her description of prescriptive recommendations written in the past two centuries. While most of these advocated *he*, a significant change is now noticeable in recent handbooks, which recommend singular generic *they*.

Chap. 4, "Third-person pronouns in the gender shift: Why is that ship a *she*?," focuses on when and how English lost grammatical gender in the use of the singular third person pronouns *he*, *she*, and *it*. Curzan claims that, while grammatical gender remained stable in the Old English period, "the seeds of grammatical gender decay had already been planted in the Old English anaphoric pronouns." There was even then a clear discrepancy between grammatical and natural gender in the use of anaphoric referents. Thus, Curzan claims, natural gender was not invented in Middle English; it was rather a survival from Old English. The further development of this system was, according to Curzan's sources, strengthened above all by reanalysis of certain masculine anaphoric pronouns that came to be used with inanimate reference. This is, in her view, an good example of the principle that "syntactic change is often triggered by structural ambiguity and, it moves in a direction to avoid ambiguity." The ambiguity of the masculine forms caused them eventually to be replaced by unambiguous forms. (This seems to be an explanation very much like the one usually offered for the replacement of the ambiguous Old English third person plural forms with Old Norse *they*, *their*, and *them*.) Curzan also argues that grammatical and discursive factors may have interacted in the use of anaphoric pronouns in the development of the gender shift. In her conclusion she claims that the present-day use of masculine or feminine anaphoric reference to inanimate nouns is not just a matter of personification. It may also represent residues from old patterns of diffusion of the gender shift, as well as foreign influence on certain sets of English words.

Chap. 5, "Gender and asymmetrical word histories: When boys could be girls," is of particular interest to the present reviewer because of my own humble efforts

in this area of research. Curzan traces the historical development of a large group of words belonging to the central domain of humanity: terms for the concepts 'woman', 'girl', 'man', and 'boy'. Many of these have obscure and uncertain semantic and etymological histories. Some major trends are, however, discernible, according to Curzan. One is that non-denotational or evaluative meanings (I would prefer to use the expression "axiological meanings") may have a marked influence on the semantic development of words and eventually lead to new senses, a position to which I would like to give my whole-hearted support. Quoting a number of other sources, Curzan shows, for example, how a large number of initially neutral female terms have developed negative axiological senses that have often ousted the original sense. She also shows that derogatory terms for women and men are targeted on different aspects of their respective behaviors and personalities: Invectives about women involve sexuality, while those about men focus on their mental and/or physical competence. Curzan also traces and discusses the obscure origins and subsequent developments of words such as *girl* and *boy* and the potential pejorative senses of such terms. Another interesting paragraph deals with the use of animal metaphors for men and women, where those referring to women, especially those based on terms for domestic animals, are generally much more derogatory than those referring to men. Curzan also takes up the asymmetry between seemingly equivalent antonymous pairs such as *boy-girl*, *bachelor-spinster* and *lady-gentleman*. She points out that symmetry is difficult to define, and that pairs of this kind may become asymmetrical for a number of different reasons, since gender is just one of the factors that may affect their meanings.

Curzan argues convincingly that history does matter in the sense that old beliefs and cultural patterns that affected words in the past may also affect the usage of new words in the same domain. She claims that linguists have paid too much attention to language-internal changes while ignoring language-external ones, and that "speakers' attitudes about words can affect their development."

In her final chapter, "Implications for non-sexist language reform," Curzan points out that, in spite of general resistance to all kinds of language reform, the feminist movement has been highly successful in enforcing changes in the domain of male and female terms in a relatively short period of time. She argues that language is a social instrument, and that speakers' linguistic choices – whether conscious or unconscious – have political implications in the field of human relationships.

It is not really possible to do full justice to this excellent book in this short review. Let me just say that I wish to give it the highest possible marks for its scholarship, convincing argumentation, admirable historical insights, and exactitude. I am sure it will be a valuable textbook in a number of academic disciplines such as English, sociolinguistics, and women's studies.

(Received 23 February 2004)

MATS DEUTSCHMANN, *Apologising in British English*. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå
   University, 2003. Pp. 262.

Reviewed by GILL WOODMAN
Anglistik, Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich.
D-80799 Munich, Germany
Gillwood@t-online.de

One of the most significant problems in speech act research is doubtless the
shortage of naturally occurring spoken language in the data under observation.
Researchers have applied a battery of techniques to collect examples of speech
acts, but the vast majority of the work has been characterized by elicited lan-
guage, wherein the starting point for the research has been the function of the
speech act itself and the aim has been to investigate ways in which it is realized
linguistically. Mats Deutschmann's book marks a clear departure from this tra-
dition. His research into apologizing in British English is based solely on data
from the spoken section of the *British National Corpus* (BNC). As a result, his
starting point is also different: the form (linguistic realization) of the speech act
rather than its function. Furthermore, in addition to conducting a specific inves-
tigation of the speech act "apologizing," he sets himself the more ambitious tar-
get of revealing "general characteristics of the use of politeness formulae in British
English" (p. 13).

   Deutschmann's procedure, outlined in chap. 1, was to search the BNC for
instances of apology, which he identified by virtue of the following illocutionary
force indicating devices (IFIDs; see Searle 1969): *afraid, apologise, apology,
excuse, forgive, pardon, regret, sorry*. The results were downloaded and saved in
an Excel database. Each occurrence was evaluated in the context of the conver-
sation in which it was uttered, partly to ensure that it really was an apology (e.g.,
not an example of reported speech). Only those instances were taken where in-
formation was available about the age, gender, and social class of the speaker.
Statistical analysis was then applied to the selected instances in order to look at
different groups of speakers in various situations and to compare the total num-
ber of apologies produced and the types of offences apologized for.

   In chap. 2, against the background of the classical theories of face (Goffmann
1967, 1971) and politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987), Deutschmann pegs out
the theoretical landscape related specifically to apologizing. His aim in doing so
is largely to make it clear that traditionally apologies have been seen as negative
politeness devices (ways of limiting the threat to the hearer's face needs). The
claim in this book, however, is that, far from being a way of showing concern for
the addressee, "an apology is probably more strongly motivated by the need to
improve self-image, sometimes even at the expense of the addressee"(43). This
chapter is a lucid exposition of theoretical concepts and is most pleasing in its
recognition of the strong bearing that the researcher's view of politeness will

314   *Language in Society* **34**:2 (2005)

have on his or her interpretation of the usage of linguistic politeness markers such as apologies (29). For instance, throughout reading the book I was aware that my own approach to politeness phenomena has more of a pragmatic and psychological slant; this meant that I had some difficulty at times with an approach that sees politeness more as an on/off phenomenon, either present or absent. It is unfortunate that the reference that seemed best to address my reservations on this matter (Meier 1998) is missing from the bibliography. At the same time, there were enlightening insights at this interface of pragmatic, sociocultural, and historical theoretical perspectives.

Chap. 3 looks more closely at the forms and functions of apology that were found in the corpus, with a view to furnishing the reader with the range of taxonomies utilized in the chapters that follow. The most fundamental categorization is probably that of three main functional types: "real" (prototypical) apologies, "formulaic" apologies, and "face attack" apologies. The taxonomies adopted are partly based on systems used in previous studies of apology and partly devised specifically to deal with the needs of this research. Naturally the categorization systems imply some arbitrary decisions. It may be asked, for example, why *I'm afraid* should be excluded from analysis in cases where the speaker had no responsibility for a problem (e.g., *I'm afraid it's raining*) and why *sorry*, when functioning more as a request for repetition, should be included as an apology. It is a strength of the book, however, that these controversial decisions are addressed honestly. The author is meticulous in clarifying the origins of the lines of thought he has adopted. He is quick to point out differences between his findings and those of other researchers and tries to relate these differences very objectively to the methods employed in data collection. In this way, chap. 3 provides the reader with a textured overview of research into the speech act of apologizing and a clear analytical platform as background for reading the next three chapters.

The effects of speaker gender, age, and social class on the use of the apology form is the focus of chap. 4. The major finding to emerge in this section is that younger speakers in the corpus apologized far more frequently than older speakers, and middle-class speakers more than working-class speakers. Deutschmann's overall conclusion here is that the use of the apology form may be a way of signaling one's social identity linguistically, and that "its use is primarily part of a middle-class sociolect" (206). At the same time, the author acknowledges the difficulties involved in trying to distill out how much of "real" apologizing is real and how much is purely a signal of social-class allegiance. A very useful division in this respect might have been the distinction that is sometimes made in pragmatics between social politeness (using language as a marker of social position) and tact, which is applied more strategically (Janney & Arndt 1992).

Chap. 5 addresses the effects of conversational setting on the use of the apology form. Here conversational setting is taken to include level of formality, group size, and genre (e.g. doctor-patient vs. employer-job applicant). Deutschmann's major findings in this section are that group size plays a significant role in the

rate of apology used, and that level of formality is important in the type of apology chosen. The inclusion of audience (group size) as a significant variable in the analysis of politeness is new and potentially very important. The fact that a larger audience seems to lead to a higher apology rate lends credence to the claim that minimization of damage to the speaker's image (rather than concern for hearer's face needs) was often the motivation for apologies.

The final variable considered is the effect of the relationship existing between the speaker and the addressee on the use of the apology form. This is the focus of chap. 6 and includes such aspects as relative power and social distance between the interlocutors. A surprising finding from this section is that relatively powerful speakers apologized more to relatively less powerful speakers (downward politeness) than vice versa, albeit in a more formulaic way. Deutschmann's interpretation of this finding is striking. He picks up critically on Held's (1999:22–24) claim that our increasingly democratized societies mean that politeness is no longer used so much for deference (self-preservation) but more for self-representation; Deutschmann suggests:

> In reality … it is the privileged classes who are in charge. One strategy for minimising the gap between pseudo ideals and the real state of affairs is for the powerful to appear 'humble' when confronted with the less powerful; downward politeness is one expression of such a strategy. As this mode of rhetoric becomes the norm, downward politeness paradoxically becomes a linguistic marker of power, and a tool for exercising that power. (209)

Deutschmann's doctoral research is thorough and honest, and his findings are presented very clearly. He utilizes technology in an interesting way without ever trying to gloss over the drawbacks involved in its application. The obvious advantages of using a computerized database such as the BNC are the sheer scale of the data and the fact that the language occurred naturally. The disadvantages lie in the lack of crucial information in connection with the delivery of the apologies (such as body language and prosodic features), in the inevitable inaccuracies involved in the transcription process, and in the lack of any psychological contextual information about the participants (e.g., perceived gravity of offense, degree of affection between participants). Deutschmann himself points to the particularly method-sensitive nature of speech act research results. It will be interesting to see over the course of time to what extent his method is responsible for the strikingly different results thrown up by his research. The book is an essential read for anyone working in the field of British pragmatic patterns, especially apologizing, and in new applications for corpus linguistics

REFERENCES

Brown, Penelope, & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffmann, Erving (1961). *Interaction ritual: Essays on the face-to-face behaviour*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Held, G. (1999). Submission strategies as an expression of the ideology of politeness: Reflections on the verbalization of social power relations. *Pragmatics* 9:5–20.

Janney, R. W., & Arndt, H. (1992). Intracultural tact versus intercultural tact. In R. J. Watts et al. (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*, 21–41. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Searle, John, R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(Received 15 March 2004)

LAURA AHEARN, *Invitations to love: Literacy, love letters, and social change in Nepal*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001. Pp. xvi, 295. Pb $24.95.

Reviewed by CHAISE LADOUSA
Anthropology, Southern Connecticut State University
501 Crescent St., New Haven, CT 06515
ladousac1@southernct.edu

"Sarita, I'm helpless. . . ." Laura Ahearn begins her ethnography with a love letter, 21-year-old Bir Bahadur's first to Sarita, "whose long, black hair, fashionable Punjabi outfits, and demure giggles had caught his eye" (p. 3). Ahearn ponders the increasing use of such letters amid changes in literacy and marriage practices, understandings and expressions of emotions, and efforts of the Nepali state and other organizations to develop places like Junigau, the village in which most of the book's action takes place. By the book's conclusion, Ahearn has provided the means to understand the subtle paradox in Bir Bahadur's letter – that he asserts that he is "helpless" at the same time that he initiates an invitation. Ahearn demonstrates in exquisite detail that such expressions must be considered within the wider, shifting context of practices through which they emerge: that which instantiates the expression, literacy in all of its guises, and that which makes the expression meaningful, the emergence of a discourse of development that characterizes people, places, and activities.

Part 1, "Arrivals, introductions, and theoretical frameworks," lays the ethnographic and conceptual groundwork upon which later analyses rest. Chap. 1 provides an overview of the book and introduces the village of Junigau as an ethnographic site. Ahearn recounts her own desire to choose Junigau to begin her Peace Corps service in 1982 because most of the village's approximately 1,250 residents are Magars, a Tibeto-Burman ethnic group who, according to the agency's descriptions, are less concerned than higher-caste Hindus with purity restrictions and are generally friendly. Ahearn quickly learns that Magar identity is complex and that residents of Junigau have been increasingly, if differently, involved in political, social, and economic changes gripping Nepal. Most generally, the ability of the People's Movement to restore party democracy in 1990 has sparked new ways in which the residents of Junigau understand themselves

to be citizens of Nepal. Local notions of what democratic citizenship entails include the "ability to act according to one's own wishes," which dovetails with development discourse emphasizing "individual choice, 'progress,' and 'success'," and contrasts with the idea that one's circumstances can be explained by "fate" (16). Such understandings are mediated by radical change in local practices, including the monetization of the local economy, the departure of young men for foreign military service or manual labor, an increase in female schooling, and an escalation of elopements.

Chap. 2 is a self-reflexive introduction to Ahearn's research methods. Particularly nice is the chapter's discussion of the inherent indeterminacy in implied meaning in written communication. Ahearn deals with indeterminacy by noting that letters engage in pragmatic activity that, to be understood, requires some narrowing of all meanings possible. Likely interpretations can be identified as one learns more about the typical contexts from which they emerge. Ahearn here and elsewhere (1998, 2001) calls this a "practice theory of meaning constraint," making explicit in the description her debt to Pierre Bourdieu.

Chap. 3 provides what Ahearn, borrowing from Williams 1993, calls a "glossary" of five terms used in the book. "Literacy," "love," "gender," "social change," and "agency" come loaded with connotations inherited from countless past uses, and Ahearn makes explicit what she intends them to mean. This chapter was a boon to my students in an advanced course in linguistic anthropology. They expressed great appreciation for the clarity of Ahearn's explanations of concepts that many of the students had encountered in other work but had found opaque. We especially appreciated the clarity of Ahearn's treatment of agency, "the culturally constrained capacity to act" (54), and her conceptualization of its relationship with resistance, a concept frequently invoked recently in anthropology. Ahearn concludes the chapter with ethnographic examples that demonstrate the ambivalent relationship between agency and resistance and the contingent nature of social practices. For example, Pema Kumari, an educated young woman, writes a threatening letter to her father, an unprecedented addition to the usual practice of secluding oneself in the attic upon learning of one's impending marriage. The act fails to prevent the marriage, but nevertheless signals a shift in links between literacy, other social practices, and ideas about autonomous action fostered by discourses of development.

Part 2, "Transformation in gender and marriage," focuses on recent changes in marriage practices and expressions of love. Chap. 4 charts shifts in marriage practices in Junigau by delineating three types of marriage – arranged marriage, capture marriage, and elopement – and recording the occurrence of the three types over time. In 1993, Ahearn collected data from 161 people in Junigau's central ward who had ever married. She followed with another census in the central ward in 1998 in which she included 33 people who had married since the first census. The results were striking. Sixteen of eighteen marriages between censuses were elopements (a fourfold increase from elopements in 1993), and

none were capture marriages. Finally, Ahearn uses the shifts to demonstrate that the young in Junigau have increasingly violated prohibitions against marrying one's father's sister's daughter or one's mother's brother's son. Such marriages severely disrupt postmarital kin relationships, and their increasing occurrence marks massive social change.

Chap. 5 departs from the quantitative base of the previous chapter to provide numerous ethnographic descriptions of marital histories. In addition, people reflect on their own and others' marriages in the chapter's liberal quotations. Several trends emerge, including the possibility that talk about one's capture marriage might cause embarrassment, and the increasing possibility that elopement can indicate a forward and developed disposition. Such trends illustrate the subtle ways in which new "structures of feeling" – the nexus of action and potential reflections on agency – unlike those presupposed by the ideologically dominant arranged marriage, are evident across particular circumstances of elopements (as well as particular reflections on capture or arranged marriages). But Ahearn is careful to point out that the parts agency and gender play in such changing possibilities are multiplex and often ambivalent. For example, the narration of most elopements includes coercion, usually pointing beyond the groom to family pressures. At the same time, women can deny their agency just as they point to its expanding limits.

Chap. 6 focuses on the role of letters in courtship. Ahearn draws upon 66 letters passed between Shila Devi and Vajra Bahadur in order to accomplish a number of ethnographic tasks. Expressions of love in the letters reveal the complexity of the concept itself, the importance of rumor and community knowledge, the salience of the relationship between the youths' future plans and their changing economic circumstances, and ways that each youth reflects on her or his own agency (and that of the other) in the context of a future life together.

Part 3, "Love, literacy, and development," further explores changing structures of feeling through literacy practices fostered by the Nepali state or engaged in locally. Chap. 7 probes a vast array of literate materials, including textbooks, magazines, novels, and guidebooks to writing love letters, in an effort to understand how Junigau residents encounter connections among nationalism, gender, and development formulated elsewhere. Though such texts espouse the virtues of autonomy, the efficacy of individual initiative, and capitalist enterprise, Ahearn is especially careful to point to equivocal messages in the texts concerning gender.

Chap. 8 explores the ways that literacy practices are socially and institutionally embedded in Junigau, again with an emphasis on gendered interpolations through social change. Ahearn quantifies the rates at which women are increasingly involved in literacy practices via schooling, but notes that a social club built by Junigau youth is predominantly used by young men. Finally, she shifts the focus to Tansen, a town in which some of her subjects attend university, to explore other spaces in which literacy practices occur, including bookstores, teashops, and the cinema. In the last context, Ahearn notes gendered inconsisten-

cies in the ways that film characters and their actions convey ideals of development framing the film's plot.

Chap. 9 complements chap. 6. Ahearn follows a couple's courtship through letters and foregrounds both the gendered risks involved in love-letter exchange and the complexities involved in the establishment of trust between the letters' authors. Ahearn is particularly adept at demonstrating the complexity involved in each author's negotiation of the evolving relationship. Shaping such negotiations are changing life circumstances and interpersonal relationships, on the one hand, and different assertions of agency possible in discourses of fate and discourses of development, on the other. Hard and fast dichotomies are absent: People use fate and autonomy variably in relation to their own changing circumstances.

Chap. 10 revisits the book's major themes and expands its discussion of the complex and, ultimately, unpredictable interplay between agency and social change.

The ethnography's contributions are numerous. To the established and growing interest in ways that literacy is mediated by local and more widespread sociocultural understandings and practices (see Collins & Blot 2003 and Street 1985 for critical reviews), Ahearn brings the study of a community in the midst of radical change. To the interest in ways that discourses of development – initiated from afar – shape and are shaped by local sociocultural practices, she brings the notion of the self and its multiple, shifting representations. And to studies of gender, she brings an ethnography that richly illustrates the ambivalent ways in which discourses of development facilitate new possibilities for gendered practices.

REFERENCES

Ahearn, Laura (1998). "A twisted rope binds my waist": Locating constraints on meaning in a Tij songfest. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 8:60–86.
———— (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30:109–37.
Street, Brian (1985). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Collins, James, & Blot, Richard (2003). *Literacy and literacies: Texts, power, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Williams, Raymond (1983). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press.