

(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 Köpffe'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

MILROY, LESLEY, & PIETER MUYSKEN.
(Eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Pp. xiii, 365. \$59.95, cloth; \$24.95, paper.

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-

ics, interlocutors, situations, and other macrosocial factors is not enough. What counts most is the act of switching, and not into, or out of, what language one switches. The switching act itself being meaningful, it is favored by bilinguals for certain types of messages, such as disagreements and negations, the switch itself replacing what in monolingual speech are often moves of a different kind, relating to intonation and pause.

To the logically prior question of which interlocutors will engage in switching, Milroy and Wei provide an insightful answer based on extending Milroy's social network analysis, which proved useful in the study of monolingual settings, to complex bilingual communities. Reporting on psychological experiments, Grosjean shows that the metaphors for the brains of bilinguals should not include levers and switches that get turned on or off, but rather seamless interconnected networks that are activated to greater or lesser extents.

Three very good papers by linguists put some order on the apparent chaos of language mixing, dealing well with grammatical factors that constrain code-switching. In a field that sometimes values obscurity and devalues observation, Poplack's paper is most accessible, and most credible in its empirical grounding, providing a well-documented answer to the question: Where do the bilinguals' two linguistic systems make them more likely to switch? Answer: Where the two languages overlap the most in categorical word order. And now, is the observed mixing to be understood all as code-switching? No: A lot of it is simply borrowing, Poplack's carefully calibrated quantitative methods demonstrating that many items are being subjected synchronically to the same morphological and phonological adaptations that are familiar from diachronic evidence.

The list of insightful findings from different disciplines could be multiplied (e.g., there are papers on classroom discourse and on the switching of aphasics), thus justifying the pride of the editors in the unifying virtues of the covers between which they gathered their scholarly flock. But still, there is more parallel play than real unity here. Although each of the papers in each of the very different sections is good in itself, the volume does not contain enough substantive interdisciplinary commentary. Neither the contributors in their chapters, nor the editors in the introduction, nor Tabouret-Keller in the conclusion provide sufficiently unifying discussions. And although it is not easy to pinpoint converging ideas or to uncover apparent discrepancies, perhaps more could have been expected from scholars who had a chance to interact widely.

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., Dabène & 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 psy-

cholingistic research that describes its inscription in the brain. For a pink rhinoceros, not bad at all.

RICARDO OTHEGUY

City College of New York

CHINESE

DEFRANCIS, JOHN. (Ed.). *ABC (Alphabetically Based Computerized) Chinese-English Dictionary*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996. Pp. xix, 897. \$28.00, paper.

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 *línbā* "lymph" to *línfēng* "facing against the wind," *ling*-initial words begin to appear; only after another three pages will one return to *lin*-initial *línhǎi* "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 *cūbào* "rude" and *nǎngshí* "of yore" to *nánguā* "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