

variety of languages described; we find the study of a vast array of phenomena each taking place in a different language, thus we have *Spanish Clitic Climbing*, *Subject Marking in Korean*, *Nominal Agent Incorporation in Indonesian*, etc.

The last chapter comprises not only the conclusions that Myhill presents in relation to the work exposed in his book, but also a discussion of the approach he has followed in the study of the various linguistic phenomena he has presented throughout it (i.e. quantitative typological discourse analysis), explaining its scope, how it relates to cross-linguistic comparison, to mental processes, etc.

Myhill's *Typological Discourse Analysis* is a book of great interest not only for linguists working on this specific theory of analysis but also for those interested in other fields, since, as it incorporates studies of phenomena considering a wide variety of languages, it could provide important information for linguists interested on grammars of specific languages as well as for those dedicated to language typology. [María del Carmen FUMERO PÉREZ, *Universidad de La Laguna*]

SIMPSON, Paul. 1993. **Ideology and Point of View**. London: Routledge. Pp. 198

Studies on stylistic analysis are constantly evolving. Over the last ten years, we have witnessed great efforts by researchers to extend new findings in linguistics to stylistic analysis. Moreover, the linguistic approach to literary texts has also been clearly enriched with the latest developments in sociology, philosophy, pragmatics, poetics and gender studies.

In this sense, *Language, Ideology and Point of View* can be said to appear at the

right time. Paul Simpson (University of Belfast) has successfully brought together different perspectives to the study of narrative point of view. The author pans smoothly from the fields of critical linguistics to the arenas of poetics, pragmatics or gender studies with no perceptible leaps. A varied number of case studies are chosen throughout the book to demonstrate how linguistic techniques are equally useful for the study of different types of discourses.

Written clearly in informal language—very much in the style of the Routledge *Interface series*—the book lacks neither systematicity nor precision. It is addressed to students of stylistics, linguistics and academics in general. Metalanguage is used pertinently and models of description are carefully described and discussed prior to the analyses in each section.

The book is organized in eight chapters. The study works on the premise that the study of literature cannot be divorced from the study of language and social conditions. Thus, the introduction (chapter 1) is devoted to building a bridge between stylistics and critical linguistics, as a compulsory connection in which narrative point of view should be related to ideological issues.

Chapter 2 offers a critical survey of the best known approaches to the study of point of view. Uspensky's and Fowler's categories—psychological, spatio-temporal, and ideological point of view—as well as Leech's classification of speech and thought presentation serve as a starting point to the author's arguments. Major attention is dedicated to the review of psychological point of view. In this regard, structuralist, generative and interpersonal (Hallidayan) frameworks are also skillfully discussed. There are some interesting connections established between Genette's definition of *focalization*, Banfield's "unspeakable" sentences, and the solutions offered by the functional/interpersonal model which the author espouses.

The former theoretical critical review constitutes the basis of what I call Simpson's "grammaticalization" of the study of narrative point of view. The author's proposal is made in the tradition of the Hallidayan grammar: Simpson manages to bring together poetics and principles of functional grammar into a coherent whole. The modality system of the language serves to reformulate Fowler's categories of psychological point of view. The transitivity system of the language serves the same purpose in the case of ideological point of view.

Chapter 3 is devoted entirely to describing a new approach to the study of psychological point of view. And, as such, it is the best and most innovative section of this book. Two main categories are proposed here: "A narratives" (1st person narration) and "B narratives" (disembodied narrator). Type A is divided into three subcategories—positive, negative and neutral—depending on the use of deontic and boulomatic, epistemic, or absence of modality, respectively. Type B initially distinguishes between narratorial (omniscient) mode and reflector (intrusive) mode. Each of these categories is again divided into positive, negative and neutral depending on the type of modality the text shows.

The innovative character of this section does not mean that it is merely "another" framework. Rather, it is the perfect fit between the interpersonal function of language, the modality system and point of view as part of the study of narrative that makes it look attractive and systematic.

The framework also serves to resolve certain cases of overlapping which were not clearly spelt out in Fowler's model. The clearest example is that of texts which apparently look like Fowler's *internal type A* (1st person participating narrator) but "sound" like *external type D*. This is due, according to Simpson, to the use of epistemic modality when deontic and boulomatic modality should be expected.

In this way, cases of overlapping between Fowler's *internal type A* and *external type D* would be resolved by Simpson's *type A negative* category—a first-person narrator exhibiting epistemic modality.

The connection established in chapter 6 between ideological point of view, the transitivity system as part of the ideational/experiential function of language and critical linguistics is likewise systematic although not as novel as the former one. Critical linguistics has often made use of transitivity, particularly applied to media and political discourses. The author emphasizes here its added usefulness when applied to literary discourse. The importance of this section lies principally in the coherence given to the model, but also in: A. the author's ability to deal with areas of conflict and B. how the connection between transitivity and critical linguistics can suggest further areas of investigation in the field of meaning negotiation.

The works of Sharrock & Anderson, Montgomery and Thompson are reviewed for the discussion of the main areas of conflict with regard to whether critical linguistics is useful to the analysis of ideological point of view. First, they question the reliability of the method directing their argument to issues related to value-free interpretation, i.e. how writing about the political world of an author already means a political activity. And second, they signal the undesirable leap which exists between analysis and further interpretation in the practice of critical linguistics.

The last two chapters of the book (Chapters 5 & 6) are concerned with the field of pragmatics and gender studies. The connection with former chapters lies in the negotiation of meaning. After a brief discussion of the connection between semantics and pragmatics, there is a successful attempt in chapter 5 to align linguistic models with everyday speech. The semantic and pragmatic concepts handled here are those of entailment, presuppositions, prag-

matic presuppositions and implicatures. Examples are taken mainly from newspaper and advertising language in order to show: A. how different types of discourse always contain at least some type of interactive element and B. how ideological point of view can be successfully connected to the framework of pragmatics.

The last chapter (Chapter 6) is devoted to exploring the connection between gender studies, ideology and point of view. Contrary to the author's practice in previous chapters, there is no a single framework proposed here. Rather, tools of analysis already used previously in the book are used for the purpose of the analysis of gender issues. The initial theoretical discussion revolves around the question of whether: A. language is inherently sexist, or rather, B. language is used consciously or unconsciously in a sexist fashion. The author takes a strong position against critics such as Spender who stand for an androcentric nature of language. Simpson connects Spender's ideas of man's domination through language to some sort of

Whorfian determinism. He claims that this determinist position should be replaced within a more functional view of language. Thus, the way that language is used is what makes it significantly sexist rather than language being sexist itself. Burton's model of transitivity presents feminist critical linguistics as a good example to "uncover asymmetries and inconsistencies in the way the language is used" (Burton 1981: 201; in Carter, R. ed. *Language and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Stylistics*. London: Allen & Unwin. Pp. 194-214).

This is definitely a highly commendable book. It provides strong arguments for a more open-minded approach to the study of point of view solidly founded on current linguistic criteria. The connection between language models and ideology is masterly handled. The case studies, varied and illustrating, provide a strong support for the argument—anything from literary language to media, advertising, political discourses or everyday conversation. [Marta FALCES SIERRA, *Universidad de Granada*]

 **INDICE**