edition should be affordable. If the publishers produced a modest accompanying workbook with review questions, exercises, and activities, the result could be the best available survey of the English language.

English majors traditionally study literature, with only modest (if any) attention to the language in which that literature is written. The English language is moreover the principal vehicle for the transmission of the whole culture of our society. It is our particular version of the general language ability that makes us human. It is a subject that appeals or, when appropriately presented, can appeal to everyone, for it is constantly being used by all of us.

All English majors need a course that informs them reliably about the wonders of the English language and the range of its use and study, that does so interestingly and reliably, and that sparks further interest and suggests ways of satisfying that interest. This book can provide the skeleton, the flesh, and the blood of such a course. It is a first-rate work.

LAVENDER LINGUISTICS

Beyond the Lavender Lexicon: Authenticity, Imagination, and Appropriation in Lesbian and Gay Languages. Edited by William L. Leap. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Publishers, 1995. Pp. xix + 360.

Word's Out: Gay Men's English. By William L. Leap. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996. Pp. xxii + 180.

Reviewed by GREG JACOBS, *York University*

In a recent review of the literature on lesbian and gay male language use, I came to the following conclusion:

Many of the individual studies and commentaries on lesbian and gay male language use may in fact suffer from the same gaps that have plagued language and gender research to date. The critique outlined by Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) can be applied to the current state of the research on language and sexual orientation, most notably the tendency to simplify how gender is constructed across communities. . . . Obviously, more study is needed to determine how lesbians and gay men actually use language (not forgetting to "look locally"), along with analyses delineating how this communicative behavior relates to gender construction and power relations (remembering to "think practically"). [Jacobs 1996, 67]

That article was written prior to the appearance of William Leap's edited collection of essays, *Beyond the Lavender Lexicon* (*BLL*), and his own monograph *Word's Out* (*WO*). Happily, these two new books directly address the

points raised above. Their strength lies in the fact that they steer language and gender research towards locally and practically focused case studies. Taken together, they cover well the complexities involved in gay and lesbian language use.

I will begin by reviewing the articles contained in *BLL*, along with its concluding chapter by Glorianne M. Leck, and then I will turn to Leap's monograph *WO*.

The first section of *BLL* contains articles under the theme of "imagination," or in Leap's own words, "the process of constructing images" (xv). This relates to Leap's major research question for lavender linguistics:[1] How do lesbians/gay men work together to build text "cooperatively"? We should note here that Leap defines cooperative speech as follows: "Intentionality and coherence ... [are] forms of cooperative process, as are carefully negotiated styles of turn taking, the use of descriptive imagery and metaphor, inference strategies, and a range of additional techniques ensuring listener- as well as speaker-involvement in each exchange" (*WO*, 16).

Edward David Miller's "Inside the Switchboards of Desire: Storytelling on Phone-Sex Lines" (3–17) uses Goffman's interactional sociolinguistic and Hymes's ethnographic approaches to explore the discursive strategies of gay men using phone sex lines in the United States. Miller highlights the mutual understandings (including appropriate discursive practices and performances that are particular to this setting) that render an encounter successful or not.

Michelle Maher and Wende Pusch's "Speaking 'Out': The Implications of Negotiating Lesbian Identity" (19–44) examines the discourse topics of nine lesbians whom they interviewed to find out "what being lesbian means for them" (22). They found that much of the discussion centered around three themes: "coming out and being out," "the label lesbian," and "being on guard and finding safety." Working under a somewhat strong Whorfian assumption—they explain that their starting assumption is that "language frames thinking" (20)—they argue that lesbian talk about being lesbian (re)constructs their experiences of being lesbian.

Birch Moonwomon's "Lesbian Discourse, Lesbian Knowledge" (45–64) applies the frameworks of Labov and Polanyi to the analysis of lesbian storytelling and arrives at similar conclusions to Maher and Pusch. Moonwomon focuses more on "societal discourse" (i.e., the social and political knowledge constructed through discourse) than on "linguistic discourse" (i.e., linguistic performance). On the basis of data from two separate interviews, with two lesbians per interview, Moonwomon argues that both societal and linguistic discourse reconstruct the lesbian identity of the participants.

Francisco Ibañez's "From Confession to Dialogue: A Cross-Cultural Ethnographic Exploration of the Translations by Gay Males of the AIDS Prevention Education Discourse on and About 'Safe Sex' into Sexual Practices" (65–86) continues the life story narration theme of the previous articles (Maher and Pusch, Moonwomon), offering a comparative analysis of North American and Latin American HIV/AIDS prevention-education discourse. Although Ibañez tends to get sidetracked in a philosophical critique of ethnographic research methods, the conclusions he reaches have important implications for frontline practitioners responsible for developing culturally-specific literature for HIV/AIDS education and prevention.

Barbara Joans's "Dykes on Bikes Meet Ladies of Harley" (87–106) offers a thorough ethnographic comparison of two all-women biking groups: one lesbian, one primarily heterosexual. She found little difference in the women's talk in this context: they were there to talk about biking. Joans's analysis is a reminder that sexual orientation is not always a salient variable in a given speech situation, any more than gender is (see Thorne 1990 for a discussion of the nonsaliency of gender in face-to-face interaction).

Ross Higgins's "Murder Will Out: Gay Identity and Media Discourse in Montreal" (107–32) considers the extent to which gay identity is reflected and reconstructed in Montreal newspaper accounts of three gay-related events in the 1950s. He analyzes quantitatively the relative effects of the language of the paper (French versus English) and type of paper (tabloid versus mainstream). Qualitative data are offered to contextalize his findings. Most interestingly, Higgins discusses the inferences that gays were able to draw upon in order to identify a story as being gay-related, even when the story itself did not explicitly state the sexuality of the participants.

Mary A. Porter's "Talking at the Margins: Kenyan Discourses on Homosexuality" (133–53) takes readers on an extensive ethnographic tour to Kenya to investigate "how the what-is-said about homosexuality is both a reflection and an expression of contemporary power struggles over gender, status, ethnicity and national identities in post-colonial Kenya" (135).

Samuel Gerald Collins's "Imaging Gender: Representations of Lesbians and Gays in Science Fiction" (155–69) is a literary exploration of gender construction in science fiction. Similar to Ibañez's study, this article seems, to the linguist at least, rather removed from the book's goal, the investigation of specific instances of language use.

Section 2 of *BLL* is concerned with the theme of "appropriation," or "the reworking of heterosexual content along lines more sympathetic to lesbian/gay needs" (xvi). The articles grouped in this section provide insights into the processes by which the language of the dominant speech community is reworked and redefined by the stigmatized speech community.

Ralph Bolton's "Sex Talk: Bodies and Behaviors in Gay Erotica" (173–206) sets out to describe the linguistic content and structure of gay men's sexual encounters. Based on a study of pornographic FICTION, his analysis is in line with the existing literature, which has concluded that gay men do in fact talk about sex differently: "When gay men talk about sex, they do so using their own vocabulary and categories" (204). However, it is difficult to see how Bolton arrives at this conclusion, since he does not cite a comparable analysis of heterosexual erotica. In addition, it must be kept in mind that the data he uses may not provide useful insights into the content of ACTUAL encounters.

Rusty Barrett's "Supermodels of the World Unite!: Political Economy and the Language of Performance Among African American Drag Queens" (207–26) explores the complexity behind the process of language reclamation by minority groups. The humor displayed by the African-American drag queens in Barrett's examples concurs with the analyses proposed by others of gay male humor. For example, Goodwin (1989) notes that mockery of the dominant group(s) "offers a means of insulting the people who are so adept at stigmatizing gays, a way of expressing contempt that frequently passes unrecognized by those who have been insulted" (15). Barrett finds the use of stereotypical features of North American white women's speech appropriated, to comic effect. As an aside, I take exception to his presentation of Lakoff's "women's language" as "structural features found in actual usage" (1975, 213). These features are now widely considered to be a STEREOTYPIC reflection of women's speech, rather than as empirically based description.

Roman Graf and Barbara Lippa's "The Queen's English" (227–34) focuses on the practice of some gay men to use feminine terms and appellations as terms of address and reference for other gay men (e.g., *she, girlfriend, bitch*). They contrast two different groups of men (roughly, academic versus managerial) and discuss and analyze between-group variation. Although the study's methodology is problematic (the authors rely on their own memories to recall quite specific usage), the study nonetheless draws attention to the importance of considering the diversity that exists within the gay male community.

Ruth Morgan and Kathleen Wood's "Lesbians in the Living Room: Collusion, Co-construction and Co-narration in Conversation" (235–48) discusses instances of cooperative text-building strategies employed by six lesbians having an informal conversation in the living room. Readers familiar with the language and gender literature are probably familiar with the critique of women's supposedly "cooperative" talk (cf. Cameron 1985); the authors at least acknowledge that these particular six lesbians may in

fact just be working to recreate this "fiction." (Readers may wonder whether Morgan and Wood would find the same results at a queer caucus meeting!)

Martin F. Manalansan IV's "'Performing' Filipino Gay Experiences in America: Linguistic Strategies in a Transnational Context" (249–66) provides a recounting of features of the Filipino-American gay lexicon, an argot labeled as "swardspeak." Again, this study emphasizes the diversity within the gay male community and how this diversity is reflected in language.

Jason Cromwell's "Talking About Without Talking About: The Use of Protective Language and Transvestites and Transsexuals" (267–95) looks at the effect of social context on shifts in register by transsexuals and transvestites. Interestingly, his term of a "protective code" (i.e., the language used in private conversations among transvestites/transsexuals in public places in order to conceal their "secret" identities) mirrors the "language of risk" (*WO*, Leap 1993) used in "secret settings" (Hayes 1976, 1981) by lesbians and gays for the same purpose. Cromwell reminds lavender linguistic researchers that sexual orientation should not be equated simplistically with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and straight; instead, the term must include all minorities oppressed on the basis of their sexuality. It is unfortunate, however, that Cromwell's linguistic analysis is rather simplistic. His knowledge of the language and gender literature seems to be limited to early work by Robin Lakoff (1975) and to Deborah Tannen's books for a general readership (1986, 1990, 1994).

Stephen O. Murray's "Stigma Transformation and Relexification in the International Diffusion of *Gay*" (297–315) details the meanings of the word *gay*, and their mutations, as the word has spread throughout North America, Latin America, Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand. The word has been infused with the meanings intended by the initiating speech community yet simultaneously depoliticized by the strength of the dominant ideology. Murray's essay is further testament to an emerging body of literature on the power of the dominant culture to appropriate the linguistic innovations of minorities (cf. Ehrlich and King 1994; Jacobs 1995).

Finally, in the concluding chapter of this volume, Glorianne M. Leck's "A Lavender-Tongued Reliably-Queer Lesbian Does Language on Language" (319–28) offers a first-person account of the power of language in general and its real-world effects on the lives of lesbians and gay men.

I will now turn to Leap's monograph *Word's Out*, the first comprehensive linguistic ethnography of the North American gay male speech community. *WO* is a significant contribution to language and gender research in general and to lavender linguistics in particular. By focusing on discursive

strategies employed by gay males and drawing on methodologies and theories from interactional sociolinguistics, the ethnography of speaking, conversation analysis, pragmatics, and speech act theory, Leap gets at what many gay men feel intuitively: namely, there is an authentic gay male language. This "language" does not reside uniquely in intonation or the lexicon. In Leap's own words in his introduction to *BLL*: "There is more to lesbian and gay communication than coded words with special meanings, and more to lesbian and gay linguistic research than the compilation of dictionaries or the tracing of single-word etymologies" (xvii). Gay men's language includes the ability of gay men to construct meaningful texts together, or as Leap suggests, "cooperatively." As I mentioned above, he deserves credit for rising to the challenge of Eckert and McConnell-Ginet's observation (1992) of language and gender researchers who have failed to "look locally" and "think practically."

In chapter 1, "Can There Be Gay Discourse without Gay Language?" (1–11), and chapter 2, "Gay English as Cooperative Discourse" (12–23), Leap introduces the readers to some of the metaphors and imagery familiar to many North American gay men that he will use to explain the notion of what it means to construct a gay text. He provides sample exchanges from informal settings (e.g., an after-dinner gathering, a Sunday brunch— both in gay men's homes) to exemplify the shared understandings of the gay participants that allow them to draw inferences and make sense of the texts. In chapter 3, "Ensuring Cooperative Discourse: Exaggeration, Turn Taking, Pauses, and Terminals" (24–48), Leap turns to a conversational analysis to delineate the specific linguistic features involved in turn taking that allow for the smooth flow of conversation.

Chapter 4, "The Risk Outside: Gay English, 'Suspect Gays,' and Hetero-sexuals" (49–73), explores the phenomenon of how gays go about reveal-ing their gay identities to other "suspect gays" in nongay (i.e., risky) settings. Leap shows how metaphors and imagery that might seem innocu-ous to those unfamiliar with the gay community lead gays (and those familiar with the gay community) to identify each other.

Chapter 5, "Claiming Gay Space: Bathroom Graffiti, Songs about Cities, and 'Queer' Reference" (74–108), engages in three separate discussions that investigate the impact that place and space may have on Gay English discourse. By "gay space," Leap is not necessarily referring to an erotic or cruising site but rather to any place where gays can exchange information and create a sense of security. Leap starts the discussion with the analysis of a cluster of gay-related graffiti that appeared in a restroom over the course of an academic year on the campus at which he teaches. Leap parallels this

development with language use that Gay English speakers may encounter in real-life conversations in public places. In particular, Leap discusses the effect of silencing: the one explicitly gay-positive graffito that appeared was not responded to by subsequent graffiti writers, which Leap suggests closely resembles "the social consequences of speaking Gay English in public domains" (88). Leap proceeds to a discussion of narratives (from fiction, song lyrics, and "real-life" interviews) of gay men describing their early years and their desire to move from their hometowns to larger urban centers. The discussion points to the importance of imagery created by the notion of city in the minds of many gay men: anticipation, success, and opportunity. The third discussion revolves around the relatively recent use of the word *queer* by gays themselves. By choosing their own labels, gays have created their own "space" (used metaphorically in this instance) rather than having it defined for them.

Chapter 6, "Language, Risk, and Space in a Health Club Locker Room" (109–24), is a focused example of the phenomenon discussed in chapter 4, namely how Gay Men's English is shaped by the complexities involved in discreetly declaring one's gay identity in a public space. Leap outlines the important role of the health club in North American gay communities. Many health clubs (especially those close to the gay areas in urban centers) have large, but not entirely, gay clientele, thus making them an ideal locale for gay men to openly declare their homosexuality, albeit with some constraints, given that the space is shared with quite possibly homophobic heterosexuals.

Chapter 7, "Gay English in a 'Desert of Nothing': Language and Gay Socialization" (125–39), looks at how Gay English is acquired and how its acquisition is central to the construction of a gay identity. From life-story narratives provided by gay men (some from interviews conducted by Leap himself, and some taken from published sources), he found that young gay men learn how to locate and retrieve gay messages in heterosexual contexts from written texts (books, magazines, newspapers), entertainment and the media (talk shows, music), gay-related folk knowledge, and best friends. He notes the important role that language played in the lives of these informants with regard to the construction of their gay identities.

Chapter 8, "Gay English and the Language of AIDS" (140–58), describes how gay men talk about AIDS. First, Leap describes narratives of gay men living with AIDS, which reveal similarities to Gay English in general: namely, AIDS was referred to with ambiguous terminology, thus relying on the strong inference-making processes of the interloctors. Second, he analyzes letters that he received in response to two advertisements placed in a New

York City gay men's magazine. One advertisement specified that the person placing the ad insisted on condom use, the other ad explicitly stated that no condoms were to be used. Leap compares the language of the responses in terms of "focus of the respondents' comments," "explicitness in references to erotics," "references to health," "references to respondents' physical attributes," "references to safe sex," and "references to AIDS." Once again, Leap observes that AIDS remains unnamed, and he suggests that this is due to the stigma attached to the disease.

The conclusion, "Gay English, Authenticity, and Performative Effect" (159–63), involves a discussion of Austin's speech act theory as it relates to Gay Men's English, drawing on the notion that speaking is a way of doing. "Doing" could be creating an erotic milieu, finding out if one's listener is gay, or establishing a gay space. Leap links this to the work of Eve Sedgwick (1993) and Judith Butler (1990) to discuss the notion of a "QUEER performativity" that, Leap argues, "[disrupts] ties to heterosexual sanction and displaces the expectations about gender that people otherwise accept on face value" (161).

In his conclusion, Leap confesses: "I am certain that some gay men will not agree with some of my subjective claims or will find fault with the technical analysis of my data" (159), and he is right. For the most part, Leap appropriately relies on his expertise in reconstructing dialogues using note-taking skills he honed as an Amerindianist, standard practice in order to later explore a conversational exchange from an interactional or ethnographic sociolinguistic perspective. But I do question Leap's occasional reliance on examples of linguistic data taken from novels or the recollections of specific conversations supplied by friends and other researchers to support his conclusions regarding "real-life" language behavior. I also draw the line at adopting the methodology of conversation analysis that Leap applies to reconstructed data, as opposed to actual recorded data, as in chapter 3's investigation into turn taking, pauses, and terminals (used for speaker turn closure and transition).

Another problem relates to the impression of a homogeneous North American gay male community that may be left with some readers unfamiliar with the community under investigation. I would like to emphasize a point repeatedly raised by Leap himself regarding the diversity of the community under observation. This is inevitably an analysis of a speech community in which Leap moves. Leap (a very out-of-the-closet, comfortable gay man holding a powerful, privileged, respected, and protected position) and some gay men can enjoy the experience of cooperatively constructing gay texts on airplanes, in shops, or in the health club locker

room. But readers should remember that still missing from the analysis are gay men who are wholly or partially closeted, openly gay men who are not involved in the community, gay men who may not be familiar with the metaphors and imagery on which Leap's examples rely heavily for interpretation, and gay men who simply just do not use speaking as a way of "doing." The gay men we hear about in Leap's book are hardly as representative of the community as some readers might be left believing. In all fairness, Leap does acknowledge such diversity in the introduction and conclusion, but I must caution readers to keep in mind that *WO* is not a complete description of gay men or their speech.

Those looking for a list of features of Gay Men's English will be disappointed in these two books, but to my mind, this is their strength: they refuse to compromise by feeding into the notion that there are structural features that unambiguously distinguish lesbian and gay speech. Rather, the more discourse-centered, qualitative approach used by Leap and the authors of *BLL* get at where the real richness of queer communication takes place. Taken together, they do not sacrifice the integrity of the subject matter by adopting any simplistic notions of what it means to talk "not straight." Taken together, they recognize the diversity of the members of the community and the speech situations.

NOTE

1. I have borrowed this term from the annual Lavender Languages and Linguistics Conference, which is organized by Leap and has been held annually at the American University in Washington, DC, since 1993.

REFERENCES

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge.

Cameron, Deborah. 1985. *Feminism and Linguistic Theory.* London: MacMillan.

Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 1992. "Think Practically and Look Locally: Language and Gender as Community-Based Practice." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 461–90.

Ehrlich, Susan, and Ruth King. 1994. "Feminist Meanings and the (De)Politicization of the Lexicon." *Language in Society* 23: 59–76.

Goodwin, Joseph P. 1989. *More Man than You'll Ever Be: Gay Folklore and Acculturation in Middle America.* Bloomington: Indiana UP.

Hayes, Joseph J. 1976. "Gayspeak." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 62: 256–66.

———. 1981. "Gayspeak." *Gayspeak: Gay Male and Lesbian Communication.* Ed. James W. Chesebro. New York: Pilgrim, 43–57.

Jacobs, Greg. 1996. "Lesbian and Gay Male Language Use: A Critical Review of the Literature." *American Speech* 71: 49–71.

———. 1995. "'Homosexual', 'Gay', or 'Queer': The Struggle over Naming and Its Real-World Effects." *Papers of the Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association (PAMAPLA).* Ed. Donna Lillian. Charlottetown: U of Prince Edward Island.

Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place.* New York: Harper.

Leap, William L. 1993. "Gay Men's English: Cooperative Discourse in a Language of Risk." *New York Folklore* 19: 45–70.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 1993. "Queer Performativity: Henry James's *The Art of the Novel.*" *GLQ* 1: 1–16.

Tannen, Deborah. 1986. *That's Not What I Meant! How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships.* New York: Ballantine.

———. 1990. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation.* New York: Ballantine.

———. 1994. *Talking from 9 to 5.* New York: Morrow.

Thorne, Barrie. 1990. "Children and Gender: Constructions of Difference." *Theoretical Perspectives on Sexual Difference.* Ed. Deborah Rhode. New Haven: Yale UP, 100–13.

FIFTY YEARS OF LINGUISTICS AND COGNITIVE SCIENCE: A RETROSPECTIVE COLLECTION

Readings in Language and Mind. Edited by Heimir Geirsson and Michael Losonsky. Cambridge, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996. Pp. xi + 585.

Reviewed by LAURA A. JANDA, *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

Readings in Language and Mind (RILAM) is a hefty anthology comprised of 28 articles drawn from the various fields and subfields that impact on linguistics: psychology, artificial intelligence (programming, connectionism), mathematics (dynamics), and, most substantially, philosophy. The articles span the past half-century and are significant in that they have served as the focus of controversy and/or presented alternative viewpoints—from Tarski's seminal work on semantics to Chomsky's criticism of Skinner, to Rumelhart and McClelland's parallel distributed processing model for the learning of English past tense forms.

The architecture of an anthology is ideally analogous to a museum installation, and this anthology fulfills the analogy remarkably well. Three "wings" of this 6.5" x 9.5" "museum" house nine thematic "galleries," each displaying from one to four representative works of major figures: (1) The Meaning of Language: Natural and Formal Languages, Language and