(p. 199), when the same could be said about northern German dialects. Finally, paucity of data, for instance the limited occurrence of passive structures in the German data in Köppe’s study of NP-movement, may lead some readers to skepticism about the generalizations based on the DUFDE project.

WILLIAM D. KEEL
University of Kansas


A book like this one is, as the editors put it, “as rare as a pink rhinoceros” (p. 11). Seldom, they remind us, are students of language gathered in the same venue to discuss a single issue, in this case code-switching, from so many different vantage points. In the four sections here, the alternating use of two languages by bilinguals is analyzed from institutional, social, linguistic, and psychological perspectives. The authors, as we are told, had an opportunity to meet and exchange views and manuscripts under the sponsorship of the European Science Foundation, a luxury that contributed crucially to the advertised uniqueness of the volume.

Because the writing is good, the editors responsible, and the production of high quality, with a detailed index, orienting headings, short, one-sitting chapters, complete reviews of the literature, and pleasant (if somewhat smallish) type, the 15 papers in the book will indeed be extremely useful and informative to many different kinds of readers.

As this book makes clear, there are still many unanswered questions and deep disagreements among scholars. But because research on code-switching has gone well beyond the U.S. setting and been applied to many other languages besides English and Spanish, the findings are becoming much more convincing and the ever-present universalistic rhetoric much more justified than in the past.

For those interested in the impact of social factors on code-switching, Auer makes the point that to predict where, and thus to understand why, a switch takes place one needs a conversational perspective. Knowing about domains, top-
The psychologists assure us that multiple languages are represented as continuous, connected webs in the brain. Bilinguals, it seems, are prisoners of their languages, their brains never letting go of either one, no matter how much they may sometimes sound just like monolinguals. Yet the sharp discreteness of language systems is (as the conclusion does note) an almost universal assumption by scholars in all the other fields. This separate status of language systems is in fact very strongly formulated in some cases, as in the theory of the matrix language frame by Myers-Scotton and the in-principle impossible switching by Muysken. If not conflicting, these two ideas are at least heading in different directions, and cry out for interdisciplinary discussion. Should structural research relax its two-systems approach because of the results of psychological research? Should psychological research take note that the more successful structural theories rely strongly on discrete systems?

Similarly, the ethnographers and sociolinguists (e.g., Gardner-Chloros) claim that code-switching is indistinguishable from borrowing and pidginization. They also report (e.g., Dabepe & Moore) that for their work with oral data the construct of the Sentence has proven of dubious validity, so that a totally different notion, that of the Act, has had to be pressed into service instead. Yet, as far as one can see, neither the editors nor the other authors take notice of these two very interesting points. The connections, or lacks thereof, between code-switching and the more severe forms of linguistic interpenetration are barely mentioned. And reliance on the notion of the Sentence is, among most of the other researchers here, unquestioning and complete. Readers are left wondering why Milroy, Muysken, and Tabouret-Keller, whose deep knowledge of the field is beyond question, did not address these divergent conceptions head-on, or ask their authors to react to what their brethren in other fields were saying. Even within the same field, differences of opinion are noted no differently than in volumes without the unifying thrust of this one (e.g., Poplack vs. Myers-Scotton on whether borrowing and code-switching have to be distinguished).

But all this, perhaps, is for the next book. From this one, the reader will come away with a thorough grounding on the state of the art on the questions of the social and political characteristics of speakers and settings that correlate with switching behavior, on the conversational meanings that explain its use, on the linguistic factors that constrain its realization, and on the psycholinguistic research that describes its inscription in the brain. For a pink rhinoceros, not bad at all.

RICARDO OTHEGUY
City College of New York

CHINESE


The ABC Chinese-English Dictionary (hereafter ABC) is yet another milestone in the illustrious career of John DeFrancis. No dictionary produced in the last 30 years has been geared so clearly and completely toward the needs of the learner of spoken modern standard Chinese. The key is that DeFrancis has chosen to use the spoken word rather than the written character as the basis for entry organization. However, ABC does not ignore the written orthography; every entry also has the corresponding characters in simplified form.

Because of its purely alphabetical ordering, users of ABC must "forget" what they know about the inventory of syllables in Mandarin and focus strictly on the spelling. Thus, for example, one will not find all words containing a word-initial lin syllable in sequence. Once one has moved through the alphabet from linbā “lymph” to linfēng “facing against the wind,” linginitial words begin to appear; only after another three pages will one return to lin-initial linhā “forest.” Indeed, for the relative master of the written language, well conditioned to dealing with character headings as the organizational unit in a dictionary, purely pinyin-dependent sequencing such as cuānzi “small pot” to cāibāo “rude” and nāngshī “of yore” to nāngūā “pumpkin” may be at least initially confusing.

This leads one to consider the audience for whom ABC is most appropriate. If one believes that the principal goal of Chinese language study is access to the written language, then there would be little justification for the appearance of ABC. But as a number of research studies have revealed, many of our students have no such predispositions as to what will be the primary modality (spoken or written) for the application of