

REVIEWS

patient – *Coherence in psychotic discourse* stands as a solid exemplar of qualitative discourse analysis.

NOTES

¹ Although the interviews took place in Brazilian Portuguese, Ribeiro uses her English translations almost exclusively throughout the book; she provides the original language only in places where it is critical to understanding her point. The Portuguese form *Dona Jurema* is maintained in all examples because no form in English corresponds to the most common formal address form in Brazilian Portuguese, which is title + first name.

REFERENCES

- Goffman, Erving (1961). *Asylums*. New York: Anchor.
_____. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
Gumperz, John (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
Keenan, Elinor, & Schieffelin, Bambi (1976). Topic as a discourse notion. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 335–84. New York: Academic.
Mishler, Elliot G. (1984). *The discourse of medicine: Dialectics of medical interviews*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

(Received 13 January 1995)

ANNETTE M. B. DE GROOT & CHRIS BARRY (eds.), *The multilingual community: Bilingualism*. (*European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 4:4.) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1992. Pp. 241–365. Hb \$33.50.

Reviewed by PIETER MUYSKEN
Algemene Taalwetenschap, Universiteit van Amsterdam
Spuistr. 210, 1012 VT Amsterdam, The Netherlands

This volume is a collection of seven research articles, with an introduction by the editors. The opening of de Groot & Barry's introduction sets the stage: "To become a member of a language community, a speaker must master an impressive array of cognitive processes" (241). However, the book is much less about members of communities, multilingual or not, than about cognitive processes. Indeed, the former play only a limited role in the studies, many of which deal with the classical issue of the bilingual lexicon. I focus here on the general relation between psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic research concerns, rather than on the specific research reported. Before turning to this general issue, however, I briefly discuss the articles in the book.

The editors call to mind Weinreich's classic distinction (1953) between compound and coordinate bilinguals – in more recent terminology, between separate and common storage. Five out of seven articles deal with this distinction or a related one. A first theme has to do with the difference between

TABLE 1. *Journals cited more than once in the five research articles on the bilingual lexicon*

<i>Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior</i>	27
<i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: Language, Memory, Cognition</i>	21
<i>Journal of Memory and Language</i>	12
<i>Memory and Cognition</i>	10
<i>Journal of Experimental Psychological Human Perception and Performance</i>	9
<i>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</i>	9
<i>Canadian Journal of Psychology</i>	6
<i>Journal of Experimental Psychology General</i>	6
<i>Psychological Review</i>	4
<i>Perception and Psychophysics</i>	4
<i>Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory</i>	2
<i>Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology</i>	2
<i>Cognition</i>	2
<i>Psychonomic Science</i>	2
<i>Journal of Psycholinguistic Research</i>	2

the representation of word forms and that of word meanings. C. Keatley & B. de Gelder (on French/Dutch bilinguals) and J. Tzelgov & S. Eben-Ezra (on Hebrew/English bilinguals) deal with this through the effect of semantic priming, primarily on lexical decision. (Is a letter string a word or not?) Their results are not directly compatible. R. Sánchez-Casas et al. (Spanish/English bilinguals) approach the issue from the perspective of the distinction between cognate and non-cognate bilingual word pairs. E. Abunuwara applies various tests to the relation between words in the different languages of Arabic/Hebrew/English trilinguals. J. Grainger & K. O'Regan further investigate the English/French language-priming effect: is a word harder to recognize when presented in the context of words from another language? They conclude that this effect is quite robust.

The last two articles focus on L2 acquisition. J. H. Hulstijn & B. Bossers study the relation between differences in L1 (Dutch) proficiency and differences in L2 (English) proficiency; they argue for a more integrated perspective on the performance of L2 tasks (including L1 knowledge related to the same task). E. Mägiste compares Swedish L2 acquisition by German students aged 6–11 to that by students aged 13–19, and concludes that the younger children perform better on some tasks.

It is sobering to realize how diverse the field of bilingualism research has become since the time of Weinreich 1953 – which is identified as the key reference by the editors in their introduction, even if it is barely cited in the articles. Table 1 shows the references in the first five papers (if a journal was cited by two authors, it is counted twice).

This table may serve as a guide where to look for relevant articles in the subdiscipline of psycholinguistic bilingualism. It is clear that the journals are

not those commonly referred to by sociolinguists. However, the phenomena discussed in de Groot & Barry's collection, as its title indicates, are very much of concern to researchers in bilingualism, once the results are placed in the context of bilingual speech behavior.

I have mentioned that some of the research conclusions are somewhat contradictory, as is often the case in studies of the bilingual lexicon. This is where sociolinguistics as a discipline could come in. As noted by the editors: "Another approach to reconcile the findings of these two studies would be to look for more fine-grained, but possibly critical, differences between them, e.g. differences between the populations from which the subjects were drawn ... bilingual word representation may differ across individual bilinguals and groups of bilinguals" (246).

Clearly, sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic research meet in the account of the characteristics of speakers, and this is one focal point for urgently needed future collaboration. When we look at the populations studied, we find that very little information is given about the participants' background (other than language knowledge), and that often very similar groups are being studied. This is how the five studies describe the speakers (all the information given):

"20 Hebrew-English bilinguals born in Israel" (Tzelgov & Eben Ezra)

"32 native French-speaking French-Dutch bilinguals studying to be professional translators ... from fully French-speaking families + 16 Dutch-speaking Dutch-French bilingual subjects ... from Dutch-speaking families" (Keatley & de Gelder)

"21 bilingual students and teachers from the University of St. Louis (Madrid Campus) ... 18 of them had learnt English as their second language after puberty, and 3 had learnt both languages at the same time" (Sánchez-Casas et al.)

"Ten Haifa University students participated in this experiment. All of them were Arabs with Arabic as their first language ... seven of them ranked Hebrew as their second language, and English as their third" (Abunawara)

"The two authors (JG and KO'R) served as subjects. Both are native speakers of English with French as a second language" (Granger & O'Regan).

My point is not to criticize these descriptions, but rather to open up discussion about what would be needed in them if we were to build a bridge between the two research traditions. That we need to build such a bridge is acknowledged in much recent sociolinguistic work on bilingual speech (e.g. Myers-Scotton 1993a,b).

The following desiderata, among others, would be relevant if we were to consider such a rapprochement: (a) Participants should be drawn from bilin-

gual communities. (b) We need detailed information about language use of participants, in addition to linguistic proficiency. (c) Participants should be drawn from a variety of social backgrounds, with a wider range of languages. (d) Research techniques must be based on real-world bilingual language behavior.

It may well be that methodological considerations – in part, the constraints imposed by such a daunting task as studying the highly complex and multi-componential phenomenon of the bilingual lexicon – will prevent many adjustments in the experimental procedures as such. However, more awareness of the characteristics of bilingual speakers can only be of value.

REFERENCES

- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993a). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
 _____ (1993b). *Social motivations for codeswitching*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
 Weinreich, Uriel (1953). *Language contact*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

(Received 28 November 1994)

JOSHUA A. FISHMAN (ed.), *The earliest stage of language planning: The "First Congress" phenomenon*. (Contributions to the sociology of language, 65.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993. Pp. viii, 351. Hb DM 208.00.

Reviewed by GLENN GILBERT
 Linguistics, Southern Illinois University
 Carbondale, IL 62901-4517

Fishman applies the term "First Congress [FC] phenomenon" to such events as the First World Conference for Yiddish, held at Tshernovits in 1908. The process of identifying such First Congresses and assessing their impact is subject to the maxim of historians that Fishman himself quotes: *Post hoc ergo propter hoc* (341). Ethnomethodologists will delight in FC analysis as a textbook example of what they call reflexivity: the phenomenon creates itself, much like Escher's famous "Drawing hands." Many of my thoughts and (mentally planned) comments on reading this book were pre-empted by Fishman in his concluding essay "The 'First Congress' phenomenon" (333–48). His explanations are lucidly and convincingly presented, and I am in essential agreement with him on many points, as I expect the majority of readers of the work will be. Nonetheless, there is more to say about the FC notion itself, as exemplified by the 18 languages treated by the various chapters in the book. Also, the book's make-up and editing needs to be examined – if for nothing else, because of the uneven treatment and states of mind represented by the authors.