

Schutz, Alfred (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Trans. by G. Walsh and F. Lehnert. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
 Willis, Paul. 1990. *Common culture*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

(Received 11 February 2002)

Language in Society 31 (2002). Printed in the United States of America
 DOI: 10.1017.S0047404502314088

PIETER MUYSKEN, *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Pp. xvi, 306. Hb \$ 59.95.

Reviewed by MELISSA G. MOYER
 Dept. de Filologia Anglesa, Edifici B
 Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
 08193 Bellaterra, Spain
 melissa.moyer@uab.es

Bilingual speech takes research on code-mixing a step further toward achieving a better understanding of the differences in what in the past has been referred to simply as the mixing of two languages in the sentence (or intrasentential code-switching). In addition, Muysken presents the state of the discipline of language contact in the year 2000 from the perspective of the grammar and structure of language contact phenomena. He brings together and analyzes an extensive set of language pairs from a wide variety of communities and social contexts. Good familiarity with such varied multilingual data provides the author with a strong base on which to support his three-way classification (INSERTION, ALTERNATION, and CONGRUENT LEXICALIZATION) of code-mixing phenomena at the sentence level.

The book is organized in nine chapters. Chap. 1 summarizes the main proposals put forth in the code-mixing literature, along with a brief introduction to Muysken's three-way classification of code-mixing data. Chap. 2 discusses, with data, several issues related to the interaction of typologically different languages with distinct grammars and lexicons. Chaps. 3, 4, and 5 present each of his three code-mixing types with reference to specific questions raised by different data sets. Chap. 6 takes up the role of a specific set of closed class items or functional categories, and the non-equivalence between languages of syntactic categories such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives. Chap. 7 examines the often special behavior of bilingual verbs. Chap. 8 seeks to link the different mixing patterns with different bilingual communities and also with the various sorts of extra-linguistic factors that may influence the mixing types proposed. Finally, chap. 9 looks at the way these patterns of mixing contribute to language shift. According to Muysken, no single explanation of code-mixing accounts for the variety of mixed structures that have been described in bilingual settings. The shortcomings of the three models in the field that are perhaps best known – Poplack's (1980) variationist perspective, Myers-Scotton's (1993, 1995) 4-M model, and DiSciullo et al.'s (1986) generative grammar government constraint – are discussed in light of concrete problems raised by the code-mixing data.

The three processes of mixing are constrained by different structural conditions tied to paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. Code-mixing at the sentence level is limited by the grammars of the participating languages, but to determine a grammar for a sentence is not always a straightforward task. This is a special problem because researchers in the field do not agree on what sentence-level syntax is in specific terms, nor on whether sentence-level syntax is manifested at a surface or abstract level. Some of the criteria that have been put forth for assigning a grammar to a code-mixed sentence are (i) the language with the greatest number of lexical items; (ii) the language of the major sentential functional categories (i.e. tense, INFL); (iii) the surface word order of the sentence; and finally (iv), the language of the main verb that determines the argument structure of the sentence. Diagnosing the matrix-language grammar of a mixed sentence becomes more complicated when the languages participating in code-mixing share these key grammatical features. On a syntagmatic plane, code-mixing may develop more complex interactions between two grammars depending on the categorial/grammatical equivalence construed by bilingual speakers. Different communities tend to adopt one of the mixing processes proposed, but the mixing practices of a community are not fixed and absolute. Rather, they may undergo change in processes of shift or convergence. There are also communities that use more than one strategy.

INSERTION involves the incorporation of lexical items or entire constituents from one language into a structure of another language. This is a form of unidirectional language influence. In order to explain code-mixing, there is no need for Poplack's distinction between "borrowings" and "nonce-borrowings": both phenomena can be considered instances of insertion. A generative syntactic approach that assumes categorial equivalence and functional elements as heads of syntactic constituents explains cases of insertion. Muysken centers on noun constructions in order to illustrate this notion, although he explicitly recognizes that insertion can be extended to include other categorial constructions. At the level of observation, code-mixing of noun constructions is the most frequent kind of switching observed in most language pairs, but in a formal syntactic analysis, not all noun constructions can be analyzed in the same way. This is illustrated in the discussion of the difference between Dutch/Moroccan Arabic and French/Moroccan Arabic mixing.

ALTERNATION is defined as the switching between structures from separate languages. The boundary of the switches may be a clause, or some peripheral element such as a discourse marker or tag form. The grammars of two languages are being used in an autonomous or independent way. The syntactic connections between alternating constructions involve constituents that have been adjoined; thus, they are not basic to the clause structure. The absence of bounded syntactic relations or selection (i.e. argument, syntactic role or subcategorization) makes code-mixing a strong candidate for being classified as alternation. This contrasts with insertion in that alternating forms have not been incorporated in a nested

structure. As a result, there are no syntactic dependencies. At a discourse level, alternation also corresponds with what has been described as intersentential code-switching, where a single speaker may say one utterance in one language and another in a different one. Several issues are raised by alternating structures. The doubling of prepositions observed by Poplack in Finnish-English code-mixing and by Nishimura in Japanese-English code-mixing has not been explained adequately by any code-switching models. Muysken claims that these instances of doubling are alternation and are thus evidence for an adjustment taking place in the planning of the sentence. Another type of phenomenon is what Poplack has identified as “flagged switching.” In this case, Muysken argues that these hesitations (as observed by Poplack with Finnish-English mixing) are ways of drawing attention to the switch in language, and they are simply efforts on the part of speakers to overcome conflicts in word order or linearization patterns. Regarding the transition point between two alternating constructions/structures in cases where the linear order of words in the sentence is parallel, it may be the case that this equivalence plays a role at the level of sentence processing, allowing for switches or alternation even when there are grammatical links between the different parts of the sentence. Finally, an unresolved syntactic question that Muysken raises is whether (i) the sentence containing alternation should be dominated by a language A or B structure, or (ii) whether it is the sum of constituents from language A and B, or (iii) whether it is simply a non-language-specific node (i.e., sentence CP or IP), in which case categorial equivalence is assumed.

CONGRUENT LEXICALIZATION is the third category of code-mixing distinguished. It is defined on a purely observational level as the combination of items from different lexical inventories into a shared grammatical structure. Both languages contribute to the grammatical structure of the sentence, which in many instances is shared. This point raises the question of what aspects of the two grammars can be different and which must be alike. A definite answer is not provided, although different data sets are examined with respect to this point. Congruent lexicalization as opposed to the mixing which fits insertion or alternation types is basically the same as dialect/standard variation and style-shifting in the Labovian sense. Evidence from Giesber’s study of the dialect in the Dutch town of Ottersum shows, according to Muysken, that the mixes occurring in this community are instances of congruent lexicalization. Another important feature of congruent lexicalization is that it involves what Poplack calls “ragged” or “non-constituent” mixing, where the elements incorporated from a different language do not form any syntactic unit that would permit a formal syntactic account as with insertion. Multi-word mixing (of both constituents and non-constituents together) is expected because the two languages being combined for the most part share the same grammatical structure. Some additional features of congruent lexicalization include bidirectional code-mixing with frequent back-and-forth switches, language pairs with homophonous diamorphs, and many mixed collocations and idioms. An important point regarding congruent lexicalization is that

it is related to language change through processes of structural convergence. The observable grammatical similarity between the two mixed languages and the cognitive ability of speakers to establish equivalence even when surface structure may not be identical point to a totally different strategy of mixing than one sees with insertion and alternation.

A relevant question raised by Muysken is whether bilingual communities can be characterized by the type of code-mixing pattern they adopt. The author proposes a classification for both stable and immigrant bilingual communities undergoing language shift. While the major part of the book is dedicated to the processes and constraints on the different types of code-mixing, it is explicitly recognized that a structural explanation of bilingual data is only one dimension for understanding code-mixing; one needs to take into account other dimensions, including the structural resemblance of the languages, the stage in the process of language shift, level of bilingual proficiency, community attitude toward code-mixing, and the fixedness of language norms in the community.

Bilingual speech makes an important contribution to the field of language contact. It is not, however, an introductory text for persons wishing to find out about code-mixing from a more general perspective. Familiarity with the issues and debates in the area of code-mixing and bilingual research is helpful in order to understand variations in synonymous terms adopted throughout the book to refer to various language contact phenomena. A formal knowledge of generative linguistics is also needed to follow some of the discussions. Several typographical errors are present in the text, which sometimes make it difficult to follow certain examples and lines of argumentation, but these errors do not invalidate the claims put forth. This is an obligatory reference for those working in the field of language contact from a grammatical perspective. It is a clear point of departure that future researchers cannot ignore if they seek to give a comprehensive explanation of the code-mixing facts that Muysken presents in his book.

(Received 1 February 2002)

Language in Society 31 (2002). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017.S004740450231409X

PAUL SAENGER, *Space between words: The origins of silent reading*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997. Pp. xviii, 480. Hb \$75, pb \$25.95.

Reviewed by MARK ARONOFF
Linguistics, Stony Brook University
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4376
mark.aronoff@stonybrook.edu

This is an impressive, fascinating, and exasperating work of scholarship, based on an astonishingly exhaustive survey of manuscript codices produced in the British Isles and western continental Europe between the 7th and the 13th centuries. Saenger traces the transition from continuous to word-divided script, which,