915 Logan St.
Wayne, NE 68787
[carudin1@wsc.edu]

The acquisition of heritage languages. By Silvina Montrul. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. 364. ISBN 9781107007246. $125 (Hb).

Reviewed by Julio Torres, *University of California, Irvine*

Silvina Montrul, a prominent scholar and voice in the field of heritage language acquisition, has published a new book that successfully positions the study of heritage languages in the mainstream as well as in the crossroads between subdisciplines in language science and applied studies. M accomplishes this task by providing the reader with a synthesis and analysis of cross-disciplinary research that has paved the way to a deeper understanding of the theoretical and empirical issues pertinent to the bilingual experience of heritage speakers. Her central claim in this book is that heritage languages are indeed native languages, but in a bilingual environment, which leads to divergent developmental patterns and outcomes in comparison to the experience of monolingual native speakers. Further, this experience is complicated by the nonuniformity of developmental profiles among individuals, which in conjunction with distinct grammatical properties lead to various degrees of linguistic knowledge and performance in the heritage language. As such, *The acquisition of heritage languages* seeks to provide evidence for these claims through an overview of twenty years of scholarly work summarized in nine chapters.

The introductory chapter (Ch. 1, 'Introduction') lays out the foundation for the premise of the book and a particular argument against perceiving the field of heritage languages as atheoretical. Rather, the field has benefited from theoretical claims from other linguistic subfields, and relevant comparisons can be made between heritage languages and first and second languages. In Ch. 2 ('Heritage languages and heritage speakers'), M argues that defining who qualifies as a heritage speaker is rather complex, and she elaborates on all of the factors that characterize a variety of heritage speaker profiles. Ch. 3 ('The language of heritage speakers') summarizes common patterns observed across heritage languages and contexts in different linguistic domains such as lexis, syntax, phonology, and phonetics. Proficiency levels among heritage bilingual speakers are quite variable, and Ch. 4 ('The bilingual development of heritage speakers') examines the individual learner factors and experiences (e.g. quantity and quality of input) that lead to the vast differences often observed in heritage speakers' linguistic knowledge. In Ch. 5 ('Theoretical approaches'), M discusses the contention that the field of heritage language acquisition ought to be grounded within contemporary theories of language, with particular attention to a multilingual perspective. The subsequent chapter (Ch. 6, 'Methodological considerations') focuses on current practices and issues regarding research methods employed across heritage language empirical studies, including a critical section on determining a baseline for comparison purposes. Ch. 7 ('How native are heritage speakers?') addresses differences and similarities between heritage speakers and monolingual native speakers across linguistic domains, and, most importantly, M provides reasons that may account for these differences. Ch. 8 ('Are heritage speakers like second language learners?') makes comparisons between heritage and second language learners by taking into account theoretical issues that have been pertinent to adult second language acquisition. M ends the book with a chapter on how heritage language research can inform theoretical claims in language science, teaching and curriculum design in language education, and language policies (Ch. 9, 'Some implications').

This book is a mandatory read for new and seasoned scholars in the field of heritage language acquisition, as it provides the reader with a synthesis of theoretical and empirical knowledge relevant to researchers and practitioners who work with heritage language bilinguals. While the book makes several contributions, I highlight here two specific issues that are critical as the field

moves forward. One is validating the key contributions heritage language research has made to an array of theoretical positions regarding language science. While scholars have argued for a theory of heritage language acquisition (e.g. Lynch 2003), M provides a compelling argument for adapting existing theories of language (e.g. universal grammar, emergentism, variationist sociolinguistics); these theories can contribute to as well as benefit from data from heritage language studies. This symbiotic relationship would further elucidate inquiries into the nature of language acquisition. However, whether the field needs to develop its own theory of heritage language acquisition merits further discussion. In philosophy of science, Laudan (1996) views science as a problem-solving endeavor: a particular field of study posits a number of problems that ought to be solved through conceptual and empirical analyses. Interestingly, on p. 150, M provides readers with a list of observable facts about heritage language acquisition (table 5.2). For example, one of the items listed is that the outcome of heritage language acquisition is variable, since heritage speakers do not reach full competence across all linguistic domains, at least in comparison to monolingual native speakers. Scholars in the field would agree with this observable fact, as the data on heritage speakers' variable outcomes are clear. According to Laudan's theory-construction approach, observable facts are potential problems in need of an explanation, and a theory of heritage language acquisition or the adaptation of an existing one would thus need to provide an explanation for these potential problems. So, in the concrete example above, a good theory would need to solve the potential problem of heritage language variability. In normal monolingual acquisition, by contrast, although no two speakers are exactly the same, they do not exhibit the same variability as heritage speakers. Therefore, we must question whether a theory devised for monolingual acquisition can also address the potential problems in heritage bilingual acquisition. Whether the field eventually needs its own theory(ies) to explain the linguistic phenomena observed in heritage language acquisition must be the subject of continued dialogue.

The second point is that heritage speakers are native speakers of the heritage language. In some cases, we ought to consider heritage speakers to be BILINGUAL NATIVES, whose linguistic outcomes will differ from monolingual natives, especially in light of how bilinguals should not be expected to behave as two monolinguals in one (Grosjean 2008). To this point, the information on baseline comparisons (Ch. 6) is critical in highlighting an emerging shift in perspective whereby evaluating heritage speakers' grammars against those of monolingual native speakers is strictly discontinued. Perhaps this is a result of scholars problematizing the term *incomplete acquisition* to characterize heritage speakers' grammars (see Rothman et al. 2016) as well as a (multi-)bilingual shift in adult second language acquisition (Ortega 2013). Of course, this does not mean that we should discard monolingual native speakers from study designs and discussions, but rather that we must be cautious about the types of inferences we make due to including different comparison groups. A trend in the field of heritage language acquisition has been to include first-generation immigrants in order to track linguistic changes from one generation to the next. Therefore, as M argues, the inclusion of different comparison groups may be contingent on the types of research questions that we posit, and the term *incomplete acquisition* was not meant to judge heritage speakers' grammars, but to understand vulnerable structures in heritage language acquisition. Crucially, then, given that research in heritage language acquisition can inform practices in curriculum design, teaching, and language policies, it is critical that researchers explicitly state the reasons for including different comparison groups (e.g. to validate an experimental task). This way we do not send an equivocal message to stakeholders and practitioners that heritage bilingual outcomes are deficient.

Finally, any author that undertakes the daunting task of writing a comprehensive book of this nature will inadvertently leave out certain aspects or information. This can also be an indication of an area that the field of study needs to develop. An area not addressed in the book, most likely because it was beyond its scope, but that needs more exploration in the field, is the issue of bilingual cognition. For example, one question in this area is: when do cognitive advantages (e.g. executive control), an issue often addressed in the media, emerge among bilinguals? The bilingual advantage is not always replicated across studies, so a need exists to examine the cognitive outcomes of heritage bilingual experiences across different settings and ages (see Torres & Sanz 2015). Presum-

ably, studies of cognitive control include heritage speakers in their samples, and while the mind and the brain do not discriminate whether the input they are receiving is a heritage language per se, we do know that the heritage bilingual experience can tell us a lot about quantity/quality of input, language use, and sociolinguistic context. These variables and others certainly contribute to the complexity of bilingual experiences, which, in turn, can lead to differences in linguistic and cognitive behavior. Therefore, teasing apart different bilingual experiences in (neuro)cognitive studies and replications is important in order to gain a more comprehensive view of how the acquisition of heritage languages also alters cognitive functions.

REFERENCES

Grosjean, François. 2008. *Studying bilinguals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laudan, Larry. 1996. A problem-solving approach to scientific progress. *Beyond positivism and relativism: Theory, method, and evidence*, ed. by Larry Laudan, 77–87. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Lynch, Andrew. 2003. Toward a theory of heritage language acquisition: Spanish in the United States. *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States*, ed. by Ana Roca and M. Cecilia Colombi, 25–50. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Ortega, Lourdes. 2013. SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning* 63(1).1–24. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00735.x.

Rothman, Jason; Ianthi Maria Tsimpli; and Diego Pascual y Cabo. 2016. Formal linguistic approaches to heritage language acquisition: Bridges for pedagogically oriented research. *Advances in Spanish as a heritage language*, ed. by Diego Pascual y Cabo, 13–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Torres, Julio, and Cristina Sanz. 2015. Is there a cognitive advantage for Spanish heritage bilinguals? A first look. *Heritage Language Journal* 12(3).292–309.

Department of Spanish and Portuguese
University of California, Irvine
Humanities Hall, #322
Irvine, CA 92697
[torresju@uci.edu]

Focus-related operations at the right edge in Spanish: Subjects and ellipsis. By Iván Ortega-Santos. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2016. Pp. 204. ISBN 9789027258069. $143 (Hb).

Reviewed by Timothy Gupton, *University of Georgia*

Ch. 1 of Iván Ortega-Santos's book begins with a justification of syntactic inquiry into information structure in general and focalization processes in Spanish in particular. The fact that focalization phenomena incorporate multiple linguistic domains vis-à-vis alterations to word order, prosody, semantics, and pragmatics makes it a compelling challenge for any theoretical account of human language. O-S establishes the goals of the book: to motivate an analysis of subjects that appear at the rightmost edge of the sentence in Spanish. He suggests that right-edge subjects come to appear in this position as the result of three independent processes: (i) movement of a focused phrase to the leftmost clause edge (i.e. the left periphery) followed by topicalization movement of the remnant Tense Projection (TP), (ii) rightward movement, and (iii) absence of movement (i.e. in-situ position) for subjects of select unaccusative predicates. O-S notes that although the data set examined in the book consists primarily of intuition-based grammaticality judgments from Northern Iberian Spanish and Chilean Spanish, he also discusses experimentally gathered data and corpus data. This is largely reflective of the theoretical orientation of this work, which is formal syntactic analysis situated within Chomsky's (1995 et seq.) minimalist program and the associated advances of multiple spell-out and phase theory (see e.g. Chomsky 1998, Uriagereka 1999). Although the author briefly sketches out the theoretical assumptions associated with the analysis undertaken in this work in a clear and concise manner, the intended au-