

BRIEF NOTICES

MICHELLE ZIMBALIST ROSALDO, an associate professor of anthropology and a feminist scholar at Stanford University, died October 11, 1981 in the Philippines. She fell from a cliff while walking between two research sites. She was thirty-seven years old, already a major figure in symbolic anthropology and in feminist studies. With her husband, Stanford professor of anthropology Renato Rosaldo, and her two young sons, Samuel and Manuel, she was in the Philippines for another year of work among the Ilongot. Earlier work in this same area led to her book, *Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life*, published by Cambridge University Press.

Language and its uses in elaborating symbolic structures and cultural values formed a major emphasis in Shelley Rosaldo's research. Her analysis of Ilongot oratory in this journal, for example, illumined the rich linguistic texture of cultural systems. During the past decade, she also played a central role in articulating theoretical questions about sex/gender systems. In her theoretical overview for the influential *Woman, Culture, and Society*, a landmark anthology in the anthropology of women that she coedited with Louise Lamphere, Shelley argued that sexual stratification is ultimately based on the opposition between domestic and public spheres of activity. More recently, however, she criticized her own earlier work as limited by "a traditionally individualistic and male-oriented sociology . . . our desire to think of women in terms of a presumed 'first cause' is itself rooted in our failure to understand adequately that the individuals who create social relationships and bonds are themselves social creations." (The uses and abuses of anthropology: Reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5 (1980), 389-417; quotations from pp. 415 and 416.)

It was characteristic of Shelley that she did not remain content with earlier analyses but continued to wrestle with the deep and difficult problems in understanding our forms of life. Her critique of universalistic assumptions in the essay on feminist questions was also apparent in work she did on speech act theory at the Center for Research in the Behavioral Sciences during 1979-1980. Perhaps, she suggested to me in discussing that work, attention to sexual asymmetry might illumine our understanding of language by forcing revision of the "individualistic and male-oriented sociology" that predominates in thinking about language as a mode of social action.

I will not detail Shelley's many contributions to scholarship. Impressive though it would be, no mere list of her achievements could convey the impact she had on others. She was electric, possessed of enormous energy and articulateness. One found oneself recharged from talking with her, thinking in new directions and with new enthusiasm. Her published work is only suggestive of the intellectual excitement she generated and which nourished others' thinking. She was so compellingly vital, so powerful a presence, that her death and her absence cannot really be grasped.

SALLY MCCONNELL-GINET
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14850

ERRATUM. The brief notice which appears in vol. 10, no. 3 (p. 491) should be headed CHRISTOPHER HOOKWAY and PHILIP PETTIT (eds.), *Action & interpretation: Studies in the philosophy of the social sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 1980. Paperback.

The notice for the Klar et al. book is as follows: Contains a number of good short studies, including, of special interest here, a valuable and cogent paper, "How languages die: A social history of unstable bilingualism among the Eastern Pomo" by S. McLendon, 137-50.
Language in Society regrets the error.