

Andy KIRKPATRICK, *World Englishes. Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*, 2007, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, x + 257 pp.

It has to be said from the outset that Andy Kirkpatrick's book is not just yet another addition to the ever-growing body of studies of World Englishes. The author approaches the topic from an original and important perspective, placing the study of varieties of English in the context of ELT. The book thus primarily targets an audience of learners and teachers of English. A notable plus is the audio CD with authentic samples of varieties of English which accompanies the book.

The book is divided into three parts. "Part A: The Framework" (pp. 5–37) has three chapters. In chapter 1, "Key sociolinguistic concepts" (pp. 5–15), the author discusses the following issues: native varieties vs nativized varieties of English vs *lingua franca* Englishes; the native vs the non-native speaker; the functions of language and the "identity-communication continuum"; pidgins vs creoles vs varieties of English; linguistic prejudice. Two points made in this chapter are particularly worth mentioning. According to the author, language has three functions: communication, identity – i.e. the use of language as a signal of the speaker's identity, and culture – i.e. the use of language to express the speaker's culture, each of them associated with a particular variety (p. 10). The author suggests an "identity-communication continuum" (p. 11), representing the links between the identity and communication functions and the corresponding varieties. On this view, communication is better served by more standard varieties, whereas informal ones are better signals of identity. Chapter 2, "Key linguistic terms" (pp. 16–26), introduces readers not familiar with linguistics to the basics of phonetics and phonology, vocabulary, morphology and syntax as well as to cultural conventions and schemas reflected in particular linguistic choices. Chapter 3, "Models of Englishes" (pp. 27–37), discusses the various models of World Englishes proposed in the literature. After a presentation of the traditional ENL, ESL and EFL classification and of the "Three circles" model, which distinguishes "Inner Circle", "Outer Circle" and "Expanding Circle" countries, particular attention is paid to evolutionary approaches positing developmental cycles.

"Part B: Variation and varieties" consists of eight chapters describing the key phonological, morpho-syntactic and pragmatic characteristics of selected varieties (both native and non-native) of English. Chapter 4, "Variation and impurity in British English" (pp. 39–53) looks at the emergence and historical development of English in England and in Scotland. Chapter 5, "The powerful variety: American English" (pp. 55–67), briefly outlines the emergence and development of American English and focuses on two varieties: African American English and White Southern American English. Standard Australian English and Australian Aboriginal English are covered in chapter 6, "A younger 'cousin' and indigenous identity" (pp. 69–83). In chapter 7, "Englishes of the subcontinent" (pp. 85–98), the author looks at two South Asian varieties of English: Indian English (and its many sub-varieties, including Indian Pidgin English) and Sri Lankan English. Chapter 8, "Voices of Africa" (pp. 101–116), discusses African Englishes, with emphasis on Nigerian English (including Nigerian Pidgin English) and on two of the varieties spoken in South Africa, Indian South African English and Black South African English. Singapore, Malaysian and Philippines English constitute the topic of chapter 9, "Englishes of South-East Asia – colonial descendants" (pp. 119–134). In chapter 10, "Emerging Englishes: Hong Kong and China" (pp. 137–152), the author addresses the issue of whether Hong Kong English and English in China can be considered varieties of English in their own right. Finally, in chapter 11, "English as a *lingua franca*" (pp. 155–170), the author, building on his

previous research, describes the *lingua franca* English used in the specific setting of the Association of South-East Asian Nations and extrapolates the findings to other settings, such as English in the European Union and to the so-called Euro-English; also included is a useful summary of the research into the theoretical and corpus-based research on English as *lingua franca*.

“Part C: Implications” is made up of two chapters. Chapter 12, “Summary of key themes” (pp. 171–183), briefly revisits the topics discussed and summarizes the findings. The last chapter of the book, chapter 13 “Implications for English language teaching” (pp. 184–197), essentially addresses two issues, the choice of an exonormative vs. an endonormative model and the role of the native and respectively non-native teacher, both of which have been a matter of heated debate in the literature. The author makes an impassionate and convincing plea for multilingual and multicultural teachers in outer/postcolonial and expanding/EFL circle countries as well as in regions where English functions as a *lingua franca*, and suggests (pp. 195–197) a list of requirements for ELT teachers and of principles relevant to ELT training courses.

The “Appendix – Transcripts of samples of varieties of English” (pp. 198–230), consists of the transcripts of 60 tracks on the accompanying CD and 3 written samples. The varieties (including sub-varieties) covered are: the Buchan Doric dialect of Scots; Southern, General and African American English; Australian English; Sri Lankan English; White South African English; Nigerian English; Malaysian English; Hong Kong English; English in China; English as a *lingua franca* (as used by Bruneian, Cambodian, Filipino, Indonesian, Malaysian, Singaporean and Vietnamese speakers). Included are brief presentations of the speakers recorded, and where necessary, “translations” of the excerpts and/or of the meaning of selected lexical items.

A few final comments and remarks are in order. Phonetic realizations should have been indicated between slashes instead of square brackets.

The typical syntactic function associated with the dative case in Old English is not of agent (p. 41), but rather that of indirect object. The author writes that “the Old English suffix of ‘-en’ remains in some ‘irregular’ plurals, as in ‘children’” (p. 41). Actually, the Old English plural of *cild* was *cildru*; in Middle English it changed into *childre/childrer*, to which the “superfluous” *-en* suffix was added, hence the current plural form *children*¹. According to the author “the following pairs have the OE word mentioned first and the French one second: *will* and *testament* [...] *final* and *conclusive*” (p. 43). In fact, *testament* is from Latin, while *final* is comes from French. Note that the etymology of the words at issue is correctly given in the source² indicated. It is stated that the features retained by many varieties of English include “/n/ - /ng/ so ‘huntin’ becomes ‘hunting’, although ‘huntin’ remains common” (p. 47). It is rather the other way round, with *hunting* frequently realized phonetically as [hʌntɪŋ].

The conditional structure of the type with *had have* + past participle, e.g. “if you had have said to me” is said to be a distinctive syntactic feature of Australian English (p. 75). However, this use of *had have* is also attested in other varieties of English, namely New Zealand English³.

The author states that “Malaysian speakers sound post-vocalic /r/ in certain contexts” (p. 123), but provides no examples. According to recent descriptions, however, Malaysian English appears to be non-rhotic⁴.

It is not clear why the “criteria for an emerging variety of English” (p. 142) are applied only when establishing the status of Hong Kong English (pp. 142–145) and respectively of English in

¹ See e.g. D. Freeborn, 1998, *From Old English to Standard English. A Course Book in Language Variation across Time*, London Macmillan, p. 105.

² D. Crystal, 2004, *The Stories of English*, London, Allen Lane, p. 153.

³ Cf. the examples of “intrusive have”, in: J. Hay, M. Maclagan and E. Gordon, 2008, *New Zealand English*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, p. 51.

⁴ L. Baskaran, 2008, “Malaysian English: phonology”, in R. Mesthrie (ed.) *Varieties of English*, vol. 4, Africa, South and Southeast Asia, Berlin · New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 278–291. Relevant examples are found on pp. 283–286.

China (pp. 151). Also, it is debatable whether the two varieties are really on a relatively equal footing. While English in China is for the overwhelming majority of its speakers a foreign language, Hong Kong English is already considered by some as close to being a variety of English in its own right⁵.

The author claims that in Japan there exists a variety of English which he illustrates with two examples (p. 193): *ron-pari* (< London, Paris) ‘cross-eyed’ and *peepaadoraibaa* (< paper, driver) ‘someone who has a driving licence, but seldom actually drives’. He further writes (p. 193) that “despite its existence [...] it will be a long time before this variety of Japanese English becomes formalized and taught in schools”. In fact, no such variety of English exists. The words quoted are actually instances of what Japanese linguistics calls *wasei eigo* ‘[lit. Japan-made English] an English word coined in Japan’, i.e. combinations of existing loanwords, which occasionally make use of English derivational affixes as well⁶.

There are a few editorial shortcomings. These include repetitions: Figure 1: The identity-communication continuum (pp. 11 and 173); the quote from an interview with Bill Clinton (pp. 15 and 65); the samples A through F of South Asian English (pp. 85–86 and 86–88); the list of “Common linguistic features of African Englishes” (pp. 109–110 and 173–172). Consider also the following typos: Old English *pone* (twice, p. 42) should read *bone*; French-influenced Cameroon English *acadmique* (p. 103) should read *academique*; Ndbele (p. 107) should read Ndebele; in the table (p. 131) of Philippine English consonants (Ø) should read (θ); Mulhausler (p. 243) should read Mühlhäusler.

Obviously, the observations above do not detract from the value of *World Englishes. Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*, for which the author is to be commended.

Andrei A. Avram

University of Bucharest, Department of English

David DETERDING, *Singapore English*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2007, vii + 135 pp.

David Deterding’s *Singapore English* is published in the series *Dialects of English*, whose aim is to document varieties of English around the world.

Chapter 1 “Introduction” (pp. 1–11) starts by briefly presenting the history of Singapore, the languages spoken, the varieties of Singapore English (ethnic accents, educated Singapore English and colloquial Singapore English, also known as “Singlish”). This is followed by a discussion of the substantial variation characteristic of Singapore English and a presentation of the data, which consist of one hour of recorded conversation (for the chapter on phonetics and phonology), data from the National Institute of Education Corpus of Spoken Singapore English, and from recent blogs (for the chapters on morphology and respectively on syntax and discourse and lexis).

The analysis in chapter 2 “Phonetics and Phonology” (pp. 12–39) is based on the data from a 34-year-old ethnically Chinese, female speaker, with English as her primary language (p. 9), but it also builds, among others, on the author’s previous work⁷. The sections on segmental phenomena

⁵ For a recent discussion see J. Setter, C. S. P. Wong and B. H. S. Chan, 2010, *Hong Kong English*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, pp. 112–116.

⁶ For details and other examples, see M. Shibatani, 1990, *The Languages of Japan*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 151, and L. J. Loveday, 1996, *Language Contact in Japan. A Sociolinguistic History*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 138–156.

⁷ Which includes acoustic analyses in particular of the vowels of Singapore English, and two edited volumes: A. Brown, D. Deterding and L. E. Ling (eds.), 2000, *The English Language in*

(pp. 13–31) illustrate and discuss: the tendency to replace the dental fricatives [θ] and [ð] with [t] and [d] respectively; the simplification of consonant clusters in word-final position; the addition of [t] after words; the realization as a glottal stop [ʔ] of /t/ and /k/ when they occur in word-final simple codas; aspiration; /l/-vocalization; the increasing incidence of post-vocalic /r/; the labio-dental realization [v] of /r/; the absence of length distinction, such that the lexical sets⁸ KIT and FLEECE both have [i], FOOT and GOOSE both have [u], LOT, THOUGHT, CLOTH, FORCE, and NORTH all have [ɔ], and STRUT, BATH, PALM and START all have [ʌ]; the vowel in DRESS, TRAP, FACE, GOAT, POOR and CURE; the non-occurrence of triphthongs; the relative absence of reduced vowels. The remaining sections (pp. 31–39) deal with suprasegmental phenomena: rhythm; lexical stress; sentence stress; deaccenting; the sharp rise in pitch early in the utterance known as “early booster”; intonation.

In chapter 3 “Morphology and Syntax” (pp. 40–61) the author first looks at three inflectional suffixes (pp. 41–45): the past tense suffix *-ed*, the plural suffix *-s*, and the 3rd person singular suffix *-s*. Also addressed are the issues of the comparative merits of a phonological (in terms of cluster simplification) versus a morphological account of the deletion of the suffix *-s*, the pluralization of what are non-count nouns in other varieties of English, and variability in the use of these suffixes. The next four sections (pp. 46–53) discuss tenses, the use of *will* to refer to regularly occurring events, tentative *would*, the absence of the copula *be*, and the use of *already* as a perfective aspect marker or, occasionally, with an inchoative meaning. In the remainder of the chapter, the author examines: the use of *till* and *until* to indicate that something continues to be true beyond the stated time limit; the rare occurrence in relative clauses of *that* with a [+human] antecedent; reduplication and its meanings; the use of the invariant tags *is it*, *isn't it* and *right*; the use of prepositional verbs without a preposition and the use of non-prepositional verbs with a preposition; the frequent occurrence of null subjects.

Chapter 4 “Discourse and Lexis” (pp. 62–84) is almost equally divided between a presentation of the most typical discourse patterns in Singapore English (pp. 62–74) and of the main characteristics of its vocabulary (pp. 74–84). The issue of null subjects is taken up again from the perspective of the so-called topic prominence⁹. This is followed by a discussion of resumptive pronouns and of what the author calls the “tolerance for repetition” (p. 65). Particular attention is paid to the use of discourse particles: those analyzed include *lah* – “the one word that is most emblematic of Singapore English” (p. 66), *ah*, *lor* and *yah*. The topics related to the vocabulary of Singapore English cover the following: the lexical borrowings from Cantonese, Hokkien and Malay; compounds; clippings; the frequent use of initialisms; meaning shifts; the frequent use of formal words in informal contexts; the use of *as compared to*, *actually* and *basically*.

In chapter 5 “History and Current Changes” (pp. 85–92) some of the recent developments in language usage in Singapore are examined and evaluated. The author writes that “a mature variety of the [English] language has been emerging in Singapore” (p. 87). He appears to agree (p. 87) with the classification of Singapore English as having reached the stage of endonormative stabilization, and being likely to move into the next stage, that of differentiation¹⁰. Variation in Singapore English is discussed within the context of the debate between the proponents of the diglossic and those of the continuum approach. The last two sections outline government and respectively popular attitudes

Singapore: Research on Pronunciation, Singapore, Singapore Association for Applied Linguistics; D. Deterding, A. Brown and L. E. Ling (eds.), 2005, *English in Singapore: Phonetic Research on a Corpus*, Singapore, McGraw-Hill Education (Asia).

⁸ See J. C. Wells, 1982, *Accents of English*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

⁹ In the sense of C. N. Li and S. A. Thompson, 1976, “Subject and topic: A new typology of languages”, in: C. N. Li (ed.), 1976, *Subject and Topic*, New York, Academic Press, pp. 457–489.

¹⁰ Deterding refers to E. W. Schneider, 2003, “The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity to construction to dialect birth”, *Language*, 79, pp. 233–281. See also E. W. Schneider, 2007, *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the World*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 160–161.

towards Singapore English, in particular towards Singlish, which the government tries to counter, whereas others value it as a “badge of identity” (p. 91).

Chapter 6 “Annotated Bibliography” (pp. 93–103) consists of five sections which briefly discuss books on Singapore English in general and books and papers on history, sociolinguistics, language policy, phonetics and phonology, morphology and syntax, discourse and lexis (pp. 93–95) as well as a section with the references (pp. 96–103).

Chapter 7 “Texts: Transcripts for the Data of Hui Min” (pp. 104–129) contains the full orthographic transcripts of 12 .WAV files of recorded conversational data, of which illustrative excerpts are included in chapters 2–4 of the book.

The book is a remarkably clear overview of Singapore English. The description and analysis of the linguistic features of Singapore English are placed within the larger context of World Englishes, including natively spoken varieties. The potential influence of the local languages is given careful consideration. The discussion of controversial sociolinguistic issues is both informative and objective. Finally, the volume is beautifully edited and is virtually typo-free. There is precious little one could, perhaps, find fault with. Thus, *that* is discussed in the section on relative pronouns (p. 54), though it is arguably a complementizer. The section on loanwords from the local languages (pp. 74–76) could have contained a more comprehensive sample of such items. The extensive discussion of the discourse particle *lah* appears to have been at the expense of other particles, such as *what*, *ma* and *mei* (just mentioned on p. 76). Since the author focuses on educated Singapore English, the discussion of language variation suffers somewhat from the fact that a prior description of Singlish is not included.

To conclude, this is a comprehensive and insightful book, for which the author should receive ample credit.

Andrei A. Avram

University of Bucharest, Department of English

Edgar W. SCHNEIDER, *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the World*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007, xvi + 367 pp.

Postcolonial English. Varieties around the World attempts to provide a comprehensive account of the spread and diversification of English into a number of varieties: natively spoken ones, the so-called “New Englishes”, English-lexified pidgins and English-lexified creoles.

The aims and the structure of the book are briefly outlined in chapter 1, “Introduction” (pp. 1–7).

Chapter 2, “Charting the territory: Postcolonial Englishes as a field of linguistic investigation” (pp. 8–20), highlights the methodological and conceptual contributions of dialectology, sociolinguistics and pidgin and creole linguistics to the study of Postcolonial Englishes. Two well-known previous approaches are evaluated: the model distinguishing ENL, ESL and EFL countries, and the “Three circles” model, which identifies “Inner Circle”, “Outer Circle” and “Expanding Circle” countries. Also included is a discussion of three key issues: nativeness, norms of correctness and the political and ideological implications of the global spread of English.

In chapter 3, “The evolution of Postcolonial Englishes: the Dynamic Model” (pp. 21–70), the author outlines the theoretical framework of the book. This is his “Dynamic Model”¹¹ of the history of Postcolonial Englishes”. The model basically combines an evolutionary perspective with that of linguistic ecology¹². It integrates insights from theories of language contact in general and from

¹¹ The Dynamic Model was first proposed in E. W. Schneider, 2003, “The dynamics of New Englishes: from identity construction to dialect birth”, *Language*, 79, pp. 233–281.

¹² See S. S. Mufwene, 2001, *The Ecology of Language Evolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

sociolinguistics, e.g. the construction of social identity through linguistic accommodation. On this view, the development of new varieties is a process of competition and selection of features from a feature pool¹³. Selection of features reflects and expresses the sociolinguistic identity of the speakers. Five stages are identified in the emergence and development of Postcolonial Englishes: “Foundation”, “Exonormative stabilization”, “Nativization”, “Endonormative stabilization” and “Differentiation”. In the last stage, “a new national language variety has emerged” (pp. 53–54). Each phase is characterized by a specific configuration of a set of parameters. The parameters at issue are history and politics, identity construction, the sociolinguistics of contact/use/attitude and the linguistic developments/structural effects (a useful summary is provided in Table 3.1 on p. 56). The assumption is that the any postcolonial variety of English can be assigned to one of these possible stages. The model is sufficiently flexible to allow for what the author calls “variations on the basic pattern” (p. 55), such as creolization (discussed on pp. 60–64). Also explored are the possibilities of wider applicability (pp. 68–70), beyond contacts with English, e.g. to the split of Vulgar Latin into the Romance languages, the colonial expansion of Portuguese, Spanish and French, as well as to the recognition as separate languages of Czech and Slovak and of Serbian and Croatian.

Chapter 4, “Linguistic aspects of nativization” (pp. 71–112), examines what the author calls “structural nativization”, defined as “the emergence of locally distinctive linguistic forms and structures” (p. 71). Structural nativization is approached from three complementary perspectives. The author first identifies the diagnostic features of structural nativization in the phonology (see, in particular Table 4.1 on pp. 75–76, and Table 4.2 on p. 77), vocabulary and grammar of Postcolonial Englishes. This is followed by a discussion of the methodological and conceptual issues involved. The chapter ends with an analysis of the linguistic sources and processes of nativization (set out in Figure 4.1 on p. 100). The sources are continuity from Standard and non-Standard English, innovation and language and dialect contact, while the processes identified are simplification, restructuring, exaptation, borrowing, calquing/replication and mixing.

The model and the concepts previously outlined are applied in Chapter 5, “Countries along the cycle: case studies” (pp. 113–250). This chapter examines the emergence and development of 16 varieties of English, both natively spoken ones and New Englishes, spoken in Fiji, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, India, South Africa, Kenya, Tanzania, Nigeria, Cameroon, Barbados, Jamaica and Canada. The discussion also covers sub-varieties, e.g. colloquial Singapore English, Afrikaans English, South African Indian English and Black South African English, as well as English-lexified pidgins and creoles, such as Nigerian Pidgin English, Cameroon Pidgin English and Jamaican Creole. An impressive array of evidence is adduced in order to assess the phase in the evolutionary cycle reached by each variety.

In chapter 6, “The cycle in hindsight: the emergence of American English” (pp. 251–208), the author examines the history of American English. The theoretical framework is shown to be fully compatible with the study of the emergence and development of this variety, although, as pointed out by the author (p. 251), “it is not customary to view American English as one of the “New Englishes”” or Postcolonial Englishes.

Chapter 7, “Conclusions” (pp. 309–317) summarizes the findings and discusses the theoretical and practical implications of the Dynamic Model.

The following are some truly minor observations. Thus, in the list of Singapore English words with “an open /ɛ/ quality” (p. 106), *bed* should read *beg* (cf. p. 159). According to the author, Tok Pisin *-pela* is “a noun classifier and a formative in the pronoun paradigm” (p. 106). In fact, *-pela* is a suffix, used to form adjectives, numerals and plural pronouns¹⁴. *Discuss about* and *request for*, the

¹³ In the sense of S. S. Mufwene, 2001, *The Ecology of Language Evolution*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

¹⁴ J. W. M. Verhaar, 1995, *Toward a Reference Grammar of Tok Pisin. An Experiment in Corpus Linguistics*, Honolulu, University of Hawai‘i Press, p. 12; G. P. Smith, 2002, *Growing up with Tok Pisin. Contact, Creolization, and Change in Papua New Guinea’s National Language*, London, Battlebridge, p. 62; G. Smith, 2008, “Tok Pisin: morphology and syntax”, in: K. Burridge, B. Kortmann (eds.), *Varieties of English*, vol. 3, *The Pacific and Australasia*, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 488–513, see p. 490.

counterparts of *discuss* and *request* which are transitive verbs in natively spoken varieties of English, are included among what the author calls “new phrasal verbs” in Fiji English (p. 118). Since in these examples *about* and *for* are not adverbial particles, but prepositions, *discuss about* and *request for* are not phrasal verbs.

The author mentions among the phonological features of Malaysian English “the omission of single coda-consonants”, in what he renders as *spea* ‘(k), *abou* ‘(t), *loo* ‘(k)” (p. 151). Actually, these illustrate the replacement of word-final stops by glottal stops, as in the following examples: [həuʔ] *hope*; [rʌʔ] *rub*; [kʌʔ] *cut*; [mʌʔ] *mud*; [ʃɔʔ] *shock*; [frɔʔ] *frog*. Further, the examples of final consonant cluster reduction (p. 151) include the form rendered as *affor* ‘(d). However, pronunciations such as [hɛ] *hair*, [wəd] *word*; [gəl] *girl*, [wɔtə] *water*, [kjɔ] *cure*, [bɔn] *born*, and the occurrence of the so-called “linking r”: [fɑ:r æn(d) niə] *far and near*¹⁵ show that Malaysian English is a non-rhotic variety. Consequently, *afford* does not contain a [rd] cluster potentially subject to reduction.

The list of South African English phraseologisms (p. 184) includes *late* ‘has died’. This is a case of extension from the attributive use of *late* to a predicative one¹⁶, and therefore a syntactic feature. In his comments on Nigerian English *enstool/destool* (p. 210), the author quotes approvingly the following: “this exhibits the rich derivational morphology that is so characteristic of African languages”¹⁷. Such examples attest rather to the fact that word-formation processes characteristic of English, such as the use of affixes, frequently result in the derivation of words not found in natively spoken varieties.

In conclusion, Edgar W. Schneider’s impressive scholarship in the field of World Englishes is reflected in the exceptionally extensive scope of *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the World*, the large body of empirical evidence examined, and the important theoretical insights. This outstanding book will undoubtedly remain an unavoidable reference work for further research into the emergence and development of postcolonial varieties of English. Moreover, it is also of considerable interest to specialists in language contacts, dialectology, sociolinguistics or historical linguistics.

Andrei A. Avram
University of Bucharest, Department of English

Gerhard LEITNER, *Weltsprache Englisch. Vom angelsächsischen Dialekt zur globalen Lingua Franca*, Munich, C. H. Beck, 2009, 217 pp.

Gerhard Leitner’s book consists of eight chapters (pp. 7–255), endnotes in “Anmerkungen” (pp. 256–257), the references in “Literaturverzeichnis” (pp. 258–264), an index of terms and names in “Register” (pp. 265–269) and the list of figures in “Abbildungen” (pp. 270–272)

Chapter I, “Englisch – überall und so vielfältig” (pp. 7–42), outlines the national, regional and global dimensions of English and the structural characteristics of the so-called core and the occurrence of widespread variation, typical of pluricentric languages.

¹⁵ All examples in phonetic transcription are from L. Baskaran, 2008, “Malaysian English: phonology”, in: R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English*, vol. 4, Africa, South and Southeast Asia, Berlin · New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 278–291.

¹⁶ Cf. R. Mesthrie and R. M. Bhatt, 2008, *World Englishes. The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 114: “*late* (predicative and attributive adj.) ‘deceased’ (*My aunt is late*)”.

¹⁷ See E. G. Bokamba, 1992, “The Africanization of English”, in: B. B. Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*, 2nd edition, Urbana, Chicago, University of Illinois Press, pp. 125–147. The quote is on pp. 136–137.

In chapter II, “Entstehung und Entwicklung des Englischen” (pp. 43–97), the author summarizes the diachronic evolution of English. The survey covers the West-Germanic and Old English periods, the Middle English period, Early Modern English, developments in English since the end of the 18th century and the issues of standardization and of the Received Pronunciation. In the discussion of the latter, particular attention is paid to two relatively recent developments in British English: the so-called “near Received Pronunciation” and the emergence of the accent known as Estuary English.

Chapter III, “Die keltischen Regionen Großbritanniens” (pp. 99–119), looks at the varieties of English with a Celtic substrate. The varieties discussed include Scots, Standard Scottish English, Northern Irish English and Southern Irish English.

The socio-historical circumstances conducive to the globalization of English are outlined in chapter IV, “Die Expansion nach Übersee” (pp. 121–125).

In chapter V, “Das Englische in Nordamerika” (pp. 127–157), the author first discusses the emergence and the main structural characteristics of American English. Next, he looks into Caribbean English, with a particular emphasis on Jamaican English and Jamaican Creole, as an illustration of the lectal continuum from the basilect through mesolectal varieties to the acrolect. The third North-American variety examined at some length is African American English. The chapter also includes a brief discussion of Cajun English and of Hawaiian Creole.

Chapter VI, “Das Englische in Asien” (pp. 159–184), addresses the issue of the so-called “New Englishes” spoken in Asia. The varieties described are Indian English and Pakistani English in South Asia, Malaysian English and Singapore English in Southeast Asia.

Chapter VII, “Das Englische im Südpazifik” (pp. 185–206) focuses on New Zealand English and Australian English. The author draws on his previous, extensive work on Australian English¹⁸. Also included is a discussion of Pitkern and Norfolk, as well as of Maori English, Aboriginal English and Kriol.

In chapter VIII, “Das Englische in Afrika” (pp. 207–221), the author first briefly discusses the varieties collectively known as West African English and East African English respectively. This is followed by a somewhat lengthier description of the varieties of English spoken in the Republic of South Africa: the so-called “respectable South African English”, South African Indian English and what is currently designated as Black South African English.

Chapter IX, “Das Englische global” (pp. 223–257) starts by examining a number of ideology-laden developments, such as the Plain English Movement, politically correct English, as well as the spread of colloquial and even non-standard English. It then goes on to discuss five highly controversial issues: whether English should be regarded as a “killer language” in the context of the ever-growing concern over language endangerment and language death; the recently proposed English for international business communication known as *Globish*; the current debate centring on English as a *lingua franca*, including its implications for the teaching of English as a foreign language; the co-occurrence of English as a global language with widespread bi- and multilingualism; the problem of standards, either exo- or endonormative, and their implications for the teaching of English.

Written in German, Gerhard Leitner’s book is a contribution to an area of scientific inquiry heavily dominated so far by works published exclusively in English. Unfortunately, however, the book is somewhat marred by a number of shortcomings.

It is maintained that “das sogenannte Danelag (*Danelaw*) [...] als Grenze zwischen dem dänischen und dem englischen Einflussgebiet galt” (p. 50). In reality, *Danelaw* was the name designating the territory under Danish rule. According to the author, “die [...] Siedlungen der Wikinger hinterließen etwa 600 Ortsnamen” (p. 50). In fact, there are over 2,000 Scandinavian

¹⁸ See e.g. G. Leitner, 2004, *Australia’s Many Voices. Australian English – The National Language*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, and G. Leitner, 2004, *Australia’s Many Voices. Ethnic Englishes, Indigenous and Migrant Languages. Policy and Education*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

place-names¹⁹. The statement “*took* kommt von *taka*, im AE [= Altenglischen] war es *tacan*” (p. 51) is in need of reformulation. The Old English for ‘to take’ was (*ge*)*niman*; the form *tacan* is a late borrowing from Old Norse *taka*. The author correctly writes that “oft enstanden Dubletten” (p. 51), i.e. pairs of quasi-synonyms of Old English and respectively Old Norse origin. However, the examples listed (p. 51) include *get* / *take*, both of which are of Old Norse origin. The Middle Scots *quhethir* ‘whether’ is not “das alte Relativpronomen *quhethir*” (p. 66), but a complementizer; moreover, Old English did not have a relative pronoun, but rather a relative particle *þe*. The reader is left in the dark as to the Estuary English counterparts of RP /θ/ and /ð/ respectively in word-initial position: “das <th> am Wortanfang wird als /f/ oder /v/ gesprochen, im EE [= Estuary English] aber als /f, v/” (p. 95).

The author mentions (p. 100) that the Scots had a “Serie von [...] Konflikten mit den Angeln im 11. Jahrhundert”. In the 11th century, some six centuries after the so-called “Anglo-Saxon” invasion, the Angles were no longer a separate ethnic group. With respect to Scottish Standard English the author claims that “Wörter wie *nice*, *pipe* [...] mit /i/ [...] ausgesprochen werden” (p. 106). In fact, Standard Scottish English has [Ai] in such words²⁰. Also, it is not clear why the chapter on the varieties of English with a Celtic substrate does not include a section on Welsh English.

The emergence of the creole continuum in Jamaica is explained as follows: “Als der Zugang zum Englischen im 20. Jahrhundert einfacher wurde, wurde das Jamaikanische in ein breites Spektrum des Englischen eingegliedert” (p. 149). This formulation reflects the original view of the so-called “post-creole continuum”. Most creolists, however, are now of the opinion that a continuum, referred to as “creole continuum”, must have been present from the beginning²¹. *Yam* is not necessarily of Mandingo origin (p. 154)²². *Okra* is said to come from Akan (p. 154), although well-known reference works trace it to Igbo²³. The author further states that (pp. 154-155) “auch *bad-eye* <böser Blick> und *big-eye* <gierig> kommen aus dieser Sprache [= Mandingo]”. In fact, their exact source is rather difficult to establish: likely candidates include Yoruba, Igbo and Kikongo for the former, and Yoruba and Igbo for the latter²⁴. The Hawaiian Creole sentence *he wen send me* is not an example of “<<serielle>> Verbkonstruktionen” (p. 157). Although etymologically derived from English *went*, Hawaiian Creole *wen* is not a verb, but the anterior (or, more rarely, the past) tense marker²⁵. The author erroneously maintains that “Pitkern gilt heute noch als eine Varietät des britischen” (p. 202), although he later correctly refers to it as “eine Kontaktsprache” (p. 203). Also, he mentions twice (p. 203) “a Haitian influence” on Pitkern, instead of the Tahitian one. The transitive suffix *-em* is not “ein Überbleibsel von <them>” (p. 205), but rather a reflex of English *him*, possibly also of *them*, as noted by the author himself in connection with the equivalent Tok Pisin form *-im*

¹⁹ See D. Crystal, 2005, *The Stories of English*, London, Penguin Books, p. 67.

²⁰ J. Stuart-Smith, 2008, “Scottish English: phonology”, in: B. Kortmann, C. Upton (eds.), *Varieties of English*, vol. 1, *The British Isles*, Berlin New York, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 48–70. See Table 1 on p. 55.

²¹ For a discussion, see J. Siegel, 2008, *The Emergence of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 237.

²² R. Allsopp, 1996, *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 616, notes that this is “an item found in a large number of West and Central Afr langs as n (‘meat, food’) or vb (‘eat’)”. M. Parkvall, 2000, *Out of Africa. African Influences in Atlantic Creoles*, London, Battlebridge, p. 99, lists it among “several more-or-less pan-Creole words which also appear to be more-or-less pan-African”.

²³ E.g. R. Allsopp, 1996, *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 414.

²⁴ According to R. Allsopp, 1996, *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 65 and 99.

²⁵ J. Siegel, 2008, *The Emergence of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p. 72.

(p. 30). The author further claims “diese Entwicklung hat nur im australischen Kontext stattgefunden und hat sich von da aus über den gesamten Südpazifik verbreitet”. In reality, there is evidence pointing to independent parallel developments leading to the emergence of a transitive suffix not only in the Pacific, but also in Atlantic English-lexified pidgins and creoles²⁶.

In his description of South African English, the author writes (p. 219) that “bis zu 50 Prozent des Vokabulars stammen aus dem Afrikaans, 30 Prozent aus dem Englischen und 10 Prozent aus afrikanischen Sprachen (Viereck et al. 2002)”. In fact, these percentages hold for the specifically South African English lexicon, not for its entire vocabulary²⁷.

Rather surprisingly, the important, though highly controversial, contributions of Jennifer Jenkins²⁸ are not even mentioned in the discussion of English as a *lingua franca* (pp. 247–248).

There are a number of faulty phonetic transcriptions. The English long, low, back, unrounded vowel /ɑ:/ is transcribed as /a:/ (pp. 81, 93, 194). The affricate /tʃ/ is transcribed /tsh/ (p. 95). The interdental fricatives /θ/ and respectively /ð/ are both transcribed as <<th>> (pp. 79, 95, 149, 157, 170, 181, 205, 212) and as <<th, dh>> (p. 153). Phonetic realizations are indicated between slashes instead of square brackets (pp. 81, 93, 100, 106, 116, 194).

Finally, the correct reference for Crystal is 1995, not 1996, while that for Wells is 1982, not 1992 (p. 81). *Bahasa Malay* (p. 179) should read *Bahasa Malaysia*, and *humkum* (p. 183) should read *hukum*, Malay for ‘law’.

In spite of its shortcomings, Gert Leitner’s *Weltsprache Englisch. Vom angelsächsischen Dialekt zur globalen Lingua Franca* is a highly readable and enjoyable survey of the history of English, from its “modest” Anglo-Saxon beginnings to its current status of world language.

Andrei A. Avram

University of Bucharest, Department of English

²⁶ For an overview, see A. A. Avram, 2000, “A few remarks on the transitive suffix /-Vm/ in the English pidgins and creoles”, *Analele Universității din București. Limbi și literatură străine*, XLIX, pp. 121–131.

²⁷ Cf. the original formulation in W. Viereck, K. Viereck, H. Ramisch (2002) *dtv-Atlas Englische Sprache*, Munich, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, p. 207: “Der Wortschatz des SAE enthält *spezifische Elemente* [emphasis added], die nach Schätzungen zu 50% aus dem Niederländischen/Afrikaans kommen, 30% stammen aus dem Englischen, 10% aus afrik. Sprachen und 10% aus anderen Sprachen”.

²⁸ See, for instance J. Jenkins, 2000, *The Phonology of English as an International Language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, and J. Jenkins, 2007, *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.