

its emergence as a vernacular in its own right with both 'high' and 'low' forms and, as it were, even 'higher' borrowings from Persian vocabulary and syntax; its instigation as one of the administrative vernaculars of the East India Company from 1837 (replacing Persian itself); to today's situation where 'a glance at present-day Urdu newspapers shows how the boundaries between Urdu and Persian and Arabic, as well as English, remain permeable' (199). Hence Majeed's polite correction: 'it may be possible to speak of varying degrees of pretentiousness in styles of Urdu, but this is not the same thing as talking about jargon'.

Majeed is no doubt correct: in any diglossic situation (and what situation is not diglossic?) there is no effectively settled vernacular *from which* a sense of jargon can be derived. Simply borrowing a particular syntax, vocabulary, register (or whatever)—and so, in a sense, borrowing what is already one's own—does not mean that we are face to face with a case of jargon. By extension, then, the term may have no precise or analytically useful referents. Majeed in particular, but also Geipel and Burns, have worked well with this almost impossible brief.

References

- Burke, P. and Porter, R., eds (1987) *The Social History of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 Burke, P. and Porter, R., eds (1994) *Language, Self and Society: A Social History of Language*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Alec McHoul

HUMANITIES, MURDOCH UNIVERSITY, AUSTRALIA

- SUE WILKINSON AND CELIA KITZINGER (EDS) *Feminism and Discourse: Psychological Perspectives*. London: Sage, 1995. 193 pp. £11.95 (pbk).
 MARGARET WETHERELL (ED.) *Identities, Groups and Social Issues*. London: Sage/The Open University, 1996. viii + 368 pp. £14.95 (pbk).

Sue Wilkinson and Celia Kitzinger's much-needed project brings together the newest scholarship on the intersection of discourse analysis, feminism, and psychology. The book is divided into an 'empirical' section, which demonstrates the utility of discourse analysis for feminists, and a 'theoretical' section, which assesses the relationship between the two perspectives. In Chapter 1, Kathryn Matthews Lovering argues that the gendered subjectivities of adolescents are produced through discursive practices about menstruation and puberty that constitute girls' bodies as different from and more shameful than boys'. The essentialist division of female and male is also the subject of Erica Burman's chapter on cultural representations of childhood (Chapter 3), in which she uses evidence from advertising, news and magazine articles, and other cultural artifacts to demonstrate the multiple and contradictory ways that the category of childhood is related to gender. The historical formation and discursive reproduction of 'anorexia nervosa' by doctors and feminists alike as an essentially female disorder is the topic of Julie Hepworth and Christine Griffin's essay (Chapter 4). Likewise, in Chapter 2, Celia Kitzinger and Alison Thomas note that 'positivist' feminist definitions of sexual harassment cannot cope with

speakers' discursive efforts to exclude their own experiences from the 'sexual harassment' label.

The second half of the book addresses such theoretical issues more fully. The critique of feminism that began in Part 1 continues in Chapter 5 with Wendy Hollway's argument that heterosexuality is a potentially liberatory practice that lacks a discursive framework within feminism. Sue Widdicombe, in Chapter 6, also finds fault with feminism, though not, as Hollway does, for its failure to accommodate the extradiscursive, but rather for its tendency to impose political interpretations that are not justified by the details of discourse. Widdicombe's chapter is thus a critique of poststructuralist discourse analysis, a stance that Rosalind Gill shares; in Chapter 9 she maintains that the relativism underlying poststructuralist discourse analysis is antithetical to feminism. More optimistic are the essays by Margaret Wetherell (Chapter 7) and Corinne Squire (Chapter 8), who both offer, from rather different theoretical vantage points, politically pragmatic solutions to the ambiguities of feminist discourse analysis.

The editorial decision not to smooth out theoretical disagreements among authors is one of the book's strengths, but this diversity of perspectives might have served as the basis for greater dialogue among authors. Cross-references between chapters are almost entirely absent, leaving readers to wonder how Lovering's representation of herself, in an interview with adolescent boys, as a victim of patriarchal discourse might be tempered by Widdicombe's view of interviews as potential sites of resistance by interviewees; how Wetherell might answer Gill's repudiation of relativism as anti-feminist; or how the divergent perspectives on bodily experience offered by Kitzinger and Thomas, by Hepworth and Griffin, and by Hollway might speak to one another.

And where theoretical agreement exists, it is often more allusive than explicit, a situation that can be frustrating for readers who work within other feminist discourse-analytical traditions (see, for example, Mills, 1995). Such readers may find it helpful to turn to Margaret Wetherell's *Identities, Groups and Social Issues*, a social psychology textbook in Sage's collaborative series with the Open University. Four of the six chapters (Chapters 3 through 6) engage with discourse analysis, and the final chapter (by Wetherell) offers an investigation of masculinity informed by a feminist perspective. As such it serves as a helpful starting point for readers of the Wilkinson and Kitzinger collection. Taken together, the two books provide a stimulating and complex picture of the state of theory and practice in politically progressive psychological discourse analysis.

Reference

- Mills, S. (1995) *Language and Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. London: Longman.

Mary Bucholtz

LINGUISTICS, UC BERKELEY