

M's KY grammar is a well done and extremely valuable contribution to our knowledge of this highly endangered language. It will not only help to promote the studies of Yukaghir itself (both synchronically and diachronically), but will serve as an important database for typological research. Its orientation towards basic linguistic theory and the unbiased descriptive quality guarantee that it can be used in a variety of frameworks. [WOLFGANG SCHULZE, *University of Munich*.]

**Using Japanese: A guide to contemporary usage.** By WILLIAM MCCLURE. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Pp. 336. ISBN 0521641551. \$65 (Hb).

Japanese has the eighth largest number of speakers in the world, with the native population of Japan comprising more than 125 million people. Japanese is well known for its myriad of forms marking politeness—verbs can take polite, honorific, humble, and familiar forms. For modern English speakers, navigating these levels of politeness can be tricky, as interest in formal speech and writing in Western societies has declined throughout the twentieth century.

McClure's contemporary guide to Japanese usage is both timely and highly insightful, providing needed practical advice. The first section deals with syntactic and phonological aspects of Japanese, showing the range of expressions available to express degrees of meaning, even in the neutral form. Some insightful examples of actual dialogue are presented to highlight various complexities, such as word choice being affected by the gender of participants in a conversation. For native English speakers, strategies for communicating apologies and honorifics are reviewed in detail. Regional variation in Japanese dialects is also presented, as speakers often express regional pride through both intonation and vocabulary.

In the second section, native word meanings and formation, as well as the effect of word borrowing, are discussed. Japanese words can have Japanese, Chinese, or 'foreign' origins, each variety having its own grammar. Word formations are particularly important for correct homonym usage, and the role of *urigana* symbols in guiding pronunciation is elucidated through examples. Almost one third of the book is devoted to word usage, and this is certainly not excessive given its central role in constructing contextually appropriate language.

The third section is concerned with individual grammatical elements and their nuances, covering the particles *wa*, *mo*, *no*, *de*, and *to*. This section includes discussions of topic marking and topic changing, direct and indirect objects, locations, lim-

its, and idioms. The difficult area of omissions is handled masterfully.

The final section examines how language is used in various social rituals, including greetings, condolences, and congratulations. Students will find it helpful to review the material presented in the first three sections in the context of various social customs.

The combination of strictly grammatical aspects of Japanese along with examples of usage in these different contexts makes M's book a valuable resource for intermediate and advanced speakers of Japanese. [PAUL A. WATTERS, *Macquarie University*.]

**Celtica, vol. 24:** In memory of Brian Ó Cuív. Ed. by MALACHY MCKENNA and FERGUS KELLY. Dublin: School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 2003. Pp. 369. ISBN 1855001861. €26.

After a long interval of near inactivity in the nineties, Dublin's School of Celtic Studies has recently resumed the regular publication of its journal *Celtica*. Most of the contributions in this volume are dedicated to Irish philology and literature. Only articles of linguistic interest are discussed here.

JOSEPH ESKA, in 'On syntax and semantics in Alise-Sainte-Reine (Côte-D'Or), again' (101–20), reviews recent scholarship devoted to one of the best-studied Gaulish texts (RIG L-13); yet uncertainties remain in its analysis. A bone of contention is whether the syntagma *etic gobedbi* is to be interpreted as a dative plural 'and to the smiths', or as a comitative instrumental 'and with the smiths', an analysis in vogue in recent years (105–7). Eska's aim in this well-argued article is 'to address these new arguments in defence of the traditional interpretation' (103). To this end he first demonstrates that the syntagma 'connector + comitative instrumental' would be exceptional in Indo-European syntax (105–7) and that attempts at interpreting *etic* as the 3rd singular of the copula 'is' + connective *-c*, used as a relative marker, meet with syntactic objections (108–10). He then proceeds to show that the discontinuity between the two constituents of the main verb's dative argument (*Ucuete* 'to Ucuētis' and *etic gobedbi dugijontijo Ucuetin in Alisija* 'and to the smiths who honor Ucuētis in Alisia', separated by the accusative *sosin celicnon* 'this edifice') may be explained by a rightward shift of 'heavy' constituents to sentence-final position (113–15). But although the discontinuity can be justified in the suggested grammatical way, it can also be ascribed to metrical requirements: Pace Eska (107–8), the inscription is divided into two halves. The high amount of parallelism between them (equal number of stressed words,

nearly equal number of syllables in (half)lines, correspondence in constituent positions) suggests a conscious stylistic design. As to Eska's suggestion that *-bi* is a dative plural ending, cp. the inscription Ic <duφniφanuαφi> on helmet A from Ženjak-Negau, possibly a dative plural (Heiner Eichner *apud* Robert Nedoma, *Die Inschrift auf dem Helm B von Negau*, Vienna: Fassbaender, 1995, p. 20).

In a traditionally short contribution, ERIC P. HAMP, in 'Gaulish *ci*, *-c*, Old Irish *cé*, Ogam *KOP*' (129), explains the demonstrative particles mentioned in the title as diachronically and morphologically different locative formations of the PIE demonstrative stem *\*ko-/-ke-*. KIM McCONE, in 'Old Irish *na nni*: A case of *quid pro quo*?' (168–81), starts with a review of Peter Schrijver's *Studies in the history of Celtic pronouns and particles* (Maynooth, 1997), rightly rejecting Schrijver's claim that the PIE nom/acc singular neuter demonstrative pronoun was *\*iid*; the Celtic evidence ties in perfectly with the *communis opinio* of PIE *\*tod* (168–72). McCONE then discusses the PIE interrogative/indefinite pronominal stems *\*k<sup>h</sup>o-/k<sup>h</sup>i-*, for which a suppletion of the type suggested by Schrijver for the demonstrative can be posited with more confidence. From a PIE pre-form *\*nek<sup>h</sup>id*, the Old Irish neuter indefinite pronouns *ní* (stressed) and *na<sup>h</sup>* (unstressed) can be derived directly by the application, in this order, of two uncontroversial Insular Celtic sound laws: (i) loss of final *\*d /ð/*, and (ii) loss of absolute word final short *\*i* (174–78). This derivation allows a similar explanation for another irregular pronominal neuter *aill* '(an)other' (178).

MALACHY MCKENNA's aim in 'Grammatical gender in a nineteenth-century Ulster text' (182–204) is 'to discuss what the evidence is for determining the gender in [the modern Irish text] *The spiritual rose*'. He sets up a list of twenty-seven grammatical criteria that can help to determine noun gender (184–97) and then applies them to his text. A number of nouns ambiguous as to gender remain (203), since their behavior regarding the criteria is contradictory. KEVIN MURRAY, in '*Lulgach* «a milch cow»' (223–24), adduces extralinguistic material from cattle-breeding to support an old etymology for Old Irish *lulgach* 'milch cow < *\*lu-laig-ach* 'having a small calf'.

Two notable review articles by ANTHONY GREEN include a review of *Resonance elements in phonology: A study in Munster Irish* by Eugeniusz Cyran, (Lublin, 1997) and of *Element interactions in phonology: A study in Connemara Irish* by Anna Bloch-Rozmej (Lublin, 1998), two books that apply government phonology to modern Irish dialects (285–305). ALEXANDER FALILEYEV's review (344–48) of *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien: Lettre D* by Pierre-Yves Lambert (Dublin, 1996) adds to the etymology of Old Irish. [DAVID STIFTER, *University of Vienna*.]

**Gender and politeness.** By SARA MILLS. Oxford: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Pp. viii, 270. ISBN 0521009197. \$24.

Mills's intent is to challenge research paradigms that have relied heavily on flawed assumptions about gender and politeness. She asserts that traditional linguistic views are too simplistic because concepts about politeness vary across contexts and people. Along with challenging historical research on politeness, she confronts long-held notions concerning the construction of gender. M has difficulty with the 'common sense models' that linguists employ in the construction of hypotheses and data analysis. She alleges that linguists are less critical of data than those who practice cultural analysis. For instance, she asserts that transcribed conversations leave out nontext translatable aspects of the environment that clearly affect the unfolding conversation. She disagrees with the idea, which she believes is held by numerous linguists, that interaction 'is a product, rather than a process' (38) because the construction of normal dialogue is too chaotic to be viewed so.

She challenges almost every tool, qualitative and quantitative, that linguists have put to use in gender and politeness research. For example, she reemphasizes the well-known assumption that survey respondents often provide answers that reflect stereotypes or incorrect assessments about how they react to real-life situations.

M partially discounts Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson's analysis of politeness, claiming that the reason it works across so many languages is because their idea of politeness is so narrowly constructed. She argues that politeness encompasses behaviors outside this limited view, and polite patterns may be employed for reasons other than politeness. Additionally, speakers' intentions are affected by context, among other factors, that may guide perceptions of politeness.

M observes that impoliteness has been little studied, which she attributes to the fact that research has focused on cooperation in the construction of conversations to maintain amicable relationships. In reality, speakers do not always intend to cooperate. Furthermore, M claims that traditional views foster the idea that all speech that is not polite is the opposite. She makes the intriguing point that 'impoliteness has to be seen as an assessment of someone's behavior rather than a quality intrinsic to an utterance' (122), an observation with implications for how research should be constructed.

M traces the shift from theory geared towards a dominance paradigm, that women's speech reflects their lack of power, to theories oriented towards gender differences. She contends that a closer look at gendered identities is necessary to avoid a static