likewise addresses a theoretical issue, namely the commonplace distinction between vocabulary breadth and vocabulary depth. Drawing on their own empirical research, Meara and Wolter persuasively argue for replacing these constructs with vocabulary size and vocabulary organization, respectively.

Also a review chapter, "Second Language Reading and Incidental Vocabulary Learning" surveys state-of-the-art research on the relationships between L2 reading and incidental lexical acquisition. In their survey, Waring and Nation challenge the long-held view that L2 learners build their vocabulary "from their reading," noting that "the returns are somewhat low" (p. 101). Observing that most research in this vein fails to address long-term vocabulary retention, the authors suggest that future research and pedagogy should focus on vocabulary coverage, repetition, and decay.

Co-authored by Haastrup, Albrechtsen, and Henriksen, the seventh entry in this volume, "Lexical Inferencing Processes in L1 and L2: Same or Different?" reports the results of a study of adolescent and adult Danish EFL learners, with an emphasis on methodological features. This investigation targets interactions among composing processes, lexical inferencing, and vocabulary knowledge. On the basis of comparisons across participant groups, the researchers point out that the impact of these interactions varies by participants' educational level, the language of the task (first language or L2), task type, and the lexical contents of the task. The final chapter in the volume, "The Relationship Between Vocabulary Size and Reading Comprehension in the L2," examines the links between L2 vocabulary size and L2 reading comprehension among secondary and postsecondary EFL students in Denmark. Congruent with previous L2 vocabulary research, outcomes reveal a strong correlation between L2 vocabulary size and L2 reading performance. Researchers Henriksen, Albrechtsen, and Haastrup propose that, in addition to vocabulary size, variables such as lexical inferencing and the organizational structure of the emergent lexicon constitute a probability zone wherein likely increases in L2 reading proficiency can be predicted.

Concluding with a substantial book review, this volume presents a surprisingly unified collection of empirically and theoretically grounded chapters on L2 writing and lexical development, many of which include work by recognized experts. The currency and novelty of the scholarship contained in this slim volume should inform and appeal to L2 researchers and educators alike.

(*Received 19 December 2005*)

John Hedgcock
Monterey Institute of International Studies

DOI: 10.1017/S0272263107260061

THE 'LANGUAGE INSTINCT' DEBATE: REVISED EDITION. *Geoffrey Sampson*. New York: Continuum, 2005. Pp. xiii + 224. $130 cloth, $39.95 paper.

This volume, a revised version of Sampson's (1997) *Educating Eve*, is an empiricist response to linguistic nativism. Accordingly, the volumes's primary objective is to challenge the view that there is an innate component specifically responsible for the human linguistic capacity. This new edition presents insights from corpus linguistics, which are used to refute the original poverty-of-the-stimulus arguments. The introductory chapter

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107260061 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gives a historical overview of the nativist doctrine by distinguishing between the original writings of Chomsky and present-day nativists such as Bickerton and Pinker. In this chapter, Sampson also introduces his view of language acquisition as a hypothesis-testing interplay between the learner and the environment, ideas that he attributes to Popper.

In chapter 2, Sampson reviews seven original arguments for linguistic nativism, such as the remarkable speed with which children acquire their first language (L1), the notion of a critical period for language, and convergence among grammars despite differences in intelligence, exposure to input, or both. Sampson then skillfully refutes each argument by citing counterexamples, inherent contradictions, and factual inconsistencies. His response to the notion of a critical period for language learning briefly mentions SLA, which he ultimately dismisses as being "neither here nor there as far as the nativist issue is concerned" (p. 40), given that second language (L2) learners exploit mastery of their L1 (which is, by definition, acquired before the end of the critical period). The chapter concludes with a discussion of overly simplified assumptions in nativist argumentation, such as the instantaneous nature of language acquisition and the notion of an ideal speaker-hearer.

Chapter 3 presents data from the British National Corpus to counter two linguistic properties frequently cited as evidence for the poverty-of-the-stimulus argument: auxiliary sequences and structure-dependent question formation. An interesting component of this chapter is the discussion of negative evidence, the lack of which constitutes the logical problem of language acquisition in nativist terms. Sampson argues that negative evidence is not necessary for any realm of scientific discovery, including language acquisition. Chapter 4 examines more recent nativist arguments, specifically the work of Bickerton, Jackendoff, and Pinker. Here, the notion of critical period and SLA is brought to the forefront. Sampson acknowledges that all types of learning deteriorate with age, but he attributes adults' difficulties with L2s solely to a lack of integrative motivation—that is, the desire to adopt the target culture.

Chapter 5 examines language universals, focusing primarily on tree structuring in grammar, island constraints, and X-bar structure. In this chapter, Sampson draws a crucial parallel between language and complex organisms created by evolutionary processes, both of which have tree structuring as a matter of necessity. The volume concludes with an abstract discussion of philosophical questions, such as the creativity of the human mind (vs. the kind of creativity postulated by Chomsky), the duality of mind and matter, and the concept of emergence.

In general, Sampson's volume is well argued and skillfully written. It succeeds in making a convincing case against linguistic nativism but does not go into great detail about the alternative approach—that is, an empiricist model of language learning. This is, understandably, not the immediate goal of the volume, especially because such models have been outlined in detail by researchers such as MacWhinney (1998, 2004) and, most recently, O'Grady (2005).

With respect to SLA, Sampson repeatedly argues against the notion of a biological critical period, given that less-than-successful acquisition of a L2 is often seen as evidence for the nativist position. However, one can reject nativism without denying the evidence in this area, which has shown robust age effects for various language areas (cf. DeKeyser, 2000). Empiricist models are perfectly compatible with the idea that L2 learning is susceptible to age-related effects. In the connectionist view, for example, L2 learners' difficulties are a logical consequence of the fine-tuning of activation weights that occurs during L1 learning. The more mature (and entrenched) the L1 system becomes, the more difficult it is to perceive and produce new linguistic contrasts.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107260061 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In his conclusion, Sampson speculates on the extraordinary success of linguistic nativism despite the paucity of evidence to support it. He suggests that nativism is the more inherently attractive position, whereas the alternative view leaves "far less for researchers to study" (p. 192). For language acquisition researchers, this is not necessarily the case. Once innate constraints are set aside, we are left with the enormous task of explaining how languages, in all of their complexity and diversity, are actually learned.

REFERENCES

DeKeyser, R. (2000). The robustness of critical period effects in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *22*, 499–533.
MacWhinney, B. (1998). Models of the emergence of language. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 199–227.
MacWhinney, B. (2004). A multiple process solution to the logical problem of language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, *31*, 883–914.
O'Grady, W. (2005). *Syntactic carpentry: An emergentist approach to syntax*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Sampson, G. (1997). *Educating Eve*. New York: Continuum.

(*Received 4 January 2006*)

Eve Zyzik
Michigan State University

DOI: 10.1017/S0272263107270068

COLLOCATIONS IN A LEARNER CORPUS. *Nadia Nesselhauf*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2004. Pp. xii + 331. $126.00 cloth.

Based on the author's dissertation, this volume provides a close look at the verb-noun collocations used by native German speakers writing argumentative or descriptive essays in English. A subset of 318 essays from the international corpus of learner English (ICLE) provides the 154,191-word corpus used in this study.

After an overview of previous collocation studies, chapter 1 clearly spells out the scope and goals of the study. By focusing on a specific type of collocation (i.e., verb-noun) used by writers from the same first language (L1; in this case, German), Nesselhauf is able to identify which collocations present challenges and to uncover patterns of errors in the types of collocation used by German learners writing in English. After an introduction to collocations, chapter 2 provides a thorough description of the methods used in this study. It would be easy for a researcher to duplicate this study or, more importantly, to carry out a similar study using another L1 group from the ICLE. The next three chapters focus on various aspects of the analyses of collocations found in the corpus.

The third chapter can be seen as the heart of the volume, with almost 100 pages devoted to a discussion of the use of collocations in this learner corpus. The chapter begins by categorizing collocations into three types—acceptable, questionable, and not acceptable—with the goal of identifying patterns that are particularly problematic for advanced second language (L2) German writers. These patterns are then further examined to tease apart the areas of difficulty. Deviations inside collocations (e.g., adjectives) versus incorrect collocations are explored.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263107260061 Published online by Cambridge University Press