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but the second brings readers past 1963—the dawn of the new age that commenced, in Philip Larkin’s view, between the scrapping of prudence with the failure to prosecute the publishers of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and the first album by the Beatles (273). Thus illiberality of the attacks on ‘Cockney rhymes’ is now balanced by the illiberality directed against those who have mastered the prestige dialect and are mocked for it. These efforts against RP are often an attempt to ‘level’ Sheridan’s language down to another uniform and nonregional standard. ‘‘I picked up RP in an attempt to fit in—and now that have it, I don’t’,’ laments the journalist Victoria Moore’ (276).

This last sentence captures what is to me an irritating feature of this new edition, the prefixing of descriptive nouns to personal names: ‘The poet Gerard Manley Hopkins’ (88), ‘Gerard Manley Hopkins’ (1st edn., 101); ‘The writer and politician William Cobbett’ (30), ‘William Cobbett’ (1st edn., 36); ‘The sociolinguist William Labov (44), ‘William Labov’ (1st edn., 57).

It would be puristic to complain. And probably bootless.
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Reviewed by **Pieter Muysken, Radboud University Nijmegen**

This volume contains nine papers on bilingual language processing. Five have first authors connected with the University of Arizona; four papers are written by outsiders. The volume intends to present ‘a survey of current research in the area of language processing in the second language learner and the bilingual’ (xi), part of a series ‘designed to introduce and explain major
research areas in linguistic theory and practice’ (inside front cover). The papers cover a wide variety of topics in processing. A central question in evaluating the individual articles, as well as the book as a whole, is how they serve to present an overview of the field, as well as yield new research results. Language pairs discussed include Spanish-English (six articles), French-English (one), Chinese-English (one), and ASL-English (one).

Francois Grosjean (1–22) provides a clear overview of his work on the language modes that a bilingual has at his or her disposal, how they are regulated, and the available evidence for the existence of language modes. The article ends with the methodological implications of the language mode for bilingualism research and with the question of how language modes can be assessed.

In their very illuminating paper, Mary L. Zampini and Kerry P. Green (23–48) study how the voicing contrast between Spanish and English is perceived and produced. Phonetically, the contrast between English /p t k/ and /b d g/ is one of the duration of the lag between release burst and the onset of vocal fold vibration (VOT) during production. In Spanish, voiced /b d g/ are produced with vocal fold vibration preceding the stop release (prevoice closure). In addition, there are differences with respect to the duration of the voiceless closure interval before the stop’s release. It turns out that early, fluent bilinguals can produce, once Grosjean’s language modes are controlled for, the same VOT values in both of their languages as monolinguals in either of these languages. However, for voiceless closure interval, bilinguals show absolute differences from monolinguals, even though the relative proportions of the difference between /b d g/ and /p t k/ in both languages are maintained. Second language learners of Spanish have difficulty in producing the prevoiced closure of Spanish voiced stops and in other respects show complex results. In another series of experiments, Zampini and Green show that there is no clear evidence for either the perception-leads-production nor the production-leads-perception hypotheses in L2 phonetic acquisition. The way bilinguals use perception clues in both of their languages suggests that bilinguals have highly complex representations and are flexible in using perception clues with either language.

Judith F. Kroll and Natasha Tokowicz (49–71) focus on the development of conceptual representations for words in a second language (French and Spanish). After summarizing the evidence that beginning L2 learners access the concepts of the L2 words though L1 words, Kroll and Tokowicz present the revised hierarchical model, which opens up a more dynamic perspective on L2 conceptual development. In relation to this model a whole series of different issues is discussed, culminating in an interesting proposal about individual differences in L2 learning. These may have to do, it is argued, with the degree of control learners have over the way the two languages are operative or not at a given moment.

In the densely argued paper by Kenneth I. Forster and Nan Jiang (72–83), evidence about the nature of the bilingual lexicon from masked priming experiments is presented, leading to the conclusion that the different lexicons of a bilingual are stored separately, the L2 lexicon being stored primarily in episodic memory, particularly with early L2 learners.

Carol Myers-Scotton and Janice L. Jake (84–117) present an interesting exposition of the recent developments in their work on codeswitching and language contact. They bring to bear the 4-M model for the classification of morphemes and the abstract level model for the structure of lexical entries on a series of questions: Why are there sometimes ‘double morphemes’ in codeswitching? Why do English verbs so frequently form part of an embedded English clause in Arabic-English codeswitching? Why are there so few full English noun phrases in Spanish-English codeswitched sentences? The paper, full of examples and observations, attempts to answer these questions through the use of the set of related assumptions developed in Myers-Scotton and Jake’s earlier work.

The contribution of Janet L. Nicol, Matthew Teller, and Delia Greth (117–34) focuses on the distributivity effect in verb agreement errors. The distributivity effect arises when a singular noun with a plural modifier (the address on the envelopes) triggers plural verb agreement. In English this does not happen, while there is an effect with pronominal and reflexive agreement. In Spanish the distributivity effect does occur with verbs in a significant number of cases,
however. Results with English learners of Spanish were inconclusive (they do not seem to acquire the distributivity effect very easily), but early Spanish-English bilinguals showed a strong distributivity effect even in their English productions. The authors offer several hypotheses that may account for the differences between Spanish and English, hypotheses that would suggest further experiments.

The paper by Montserrat Sanz and Thomas G. Bever (134–59), somewhat grandiosely titled ‘A theory of syntactic interference in the bilingual’, sketches a minimalist account of the way the atelic/telic distinction is syntactically encoded in Spanish but not in English, in terms of a projection Event Phrase. This distinction leads to parsing differences and may have consequences for bilingual production and perception.

Paola E. Dussias (159–76) discusses bilingual parsing. She first outlines a number of possibilities discussed in the literature to account for the way language users interpret ambiguous sentences such as Someone shot the servant of the actress who was on the balcony. English speakers tend to conclude from this that the actress was on the balcony (low attachment), whereas Spanish speakers tend to interpret the Spanish equivalent of this sentence as implying that the servant was on the balcony (high attachment). From a series of questionnaire and self-paced reading task studies, Dussias concludes that beginning L2 learners tend to overgeneralize their L1 parsing strategies but that more advanced learners can adopt L2 parsing strategies, given sufficient exposure. For early bilinguals the pattern is more complex. Dussias concludes that evidence from bilinguals can provide a way to test the various models for parsing strategies; the evidence seems to point in the direction of input-driven models.

The paper by Samuel J. Supalla, Tina R. Wix, and Cecile McKee (177–90) reports on a highly experimental reading program for Deaf children, involving newly developed graphemes to represent ASL signs as a way of familiarizing the Deaf children with graphemic representations. Deaf children otherwise have considerable difficulty in learning to read, since the English writing system depends on the knowledge of sounds. The grapheme system proposed has only thirty-one symbols, while earlier related systems had eighty and fifty-five graphemes, respectively. A second experimental feature of the reading program was the use of glossing, a hybrid system in which English spelled words were used with graphemes for ASL grammatical markers and ASL word order. There are no reported experimental results yet on the success of the program, but videotapes of classroom interactions showed initial positive results.

This is a very useful book, covering a substantial range of topics in bilingual processing in an accessible way, and introducing the reader both to a lot of the research literature and to some of the research paradigms employed. A specific selling point worth mentioning is the attempt, often successful, to link research on stable early bilinguals to the field of second language acquisition. Both the similarities and the differences between learners and stable bilinguals become clear, and this is clearly an area where much further research is called for. Furthermore, the papers do present the conceptual background to the different subdomains in bilingual processing research. This makes the book useful as a textbook as well in an advanced undergraduate or graduate course on bilingual processing.

A natural question to ask is what subfields have been left out of the discussion. In the field of adult bilingualism, it seems that pretty much everything has been covered: phonetics, syntax, the lexicon, and both perception and production. Absent is the issue of child bilingual development, of bilingual processing and language disorders, and most notably, the increasing amount of work in the area of neuro-imaging and bilingualism. A future overview will certainly have this as one of its central topics.

The volume is very well edited, and I did not see any misprints. The single bibliography at the back gives a wealth of useful references.
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