ATLANTIS
Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies
39.2 (December 2017): 257-260
ISSN 0210-6124 | e-ISSN 1989-6840
DOI: 10.28914/Atlantis-2017-39.2.20

Elena Seoane and Cristina Suárez-Gómez, eds. 2016. *World Englishes: New Theoretical and Methodological Considerations.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 285 pp. ISBN: 978-90-272-4917-3.

Amanda Roig-Marín
University of Cambridge
adr41@cam.ac.uk

World Englishes: New Theoretical and Methodological Considerations brings together papers presented at the international conference *Englishes Today: Theoretical and Methodological Issues* (University of Vigo, Spain, October 18-19, 2013). This volume manages to achieve an optimum balance between the discussion of theoretical and methodological issues and hands-on approaches to the study of World Englishes (WE). It showcases the type of research that can be conducted thanks to electronic corpus-based developments—like the compilation of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE 2016), a cornerstone in WE research—along with widely used sources of data which remain to be further exploited for linguistic enquiry, such as YouTube or web forums. The papers in this volume also tackle two crucial topics which are still "in need of a firm theoretical basis, methodological approaches and empirical materials" (6), namely the emergence of grammatical changes led by non-native speakers of English and the contextualisation of WE phenomena within a historical framework.

Given the miscellaneous nature of the contributions, they are not formally organised into thematic sections, although most linguistic levels, ranging from phonology (see below Zipp and Staicov) to discourse-pragmatics (see below Davydova), are represented. The book opens with Elena Seoane's panoramic vision of key publications, corpora and atlases in the field and a concise overview of the most influential theoretical models, Edgar Schneider's "Dynamic Model" (2003; 2007) and Christian Mair's "World System of Englishes" (2013). In doing so, Seoane skilfully sets the ground for Christian Mair's contribution: "Beyond and Between the 'Three Circles': World Englishes Research in the Age of Globalisation" (17-35).

Mair stresses the need to "explore uses of English 'between and beyond'" (23) Kachru's "three circles" ([1982] 1992) and concentrates on the rhetorical device of augmentation in the Nigerian diasporic context. He uses evidence from a web-based corpus to underscore how Nigerian Standard English has the weakest status in comparison to the other three varieties spoken in the same milieu. Conversely, Nigerian pidgin is

shown to enjoy a strong covert prestige, a sociolinguistic weighting which encourages further reflection on shifting attitudes towards standard varieties and their motivations.

Marianne Hundt examines in "Error, Feature, (Incipient) Change—or Something Else Altogether?" (37-60) whether the auxiliary-participle combination (*be been*)—and, by extension, any low-frequency phenomena traditionally labelled as errors—might be analysed as developing features in contact varieties. In addition to acceptability judgements among native speakers and synchronic ICE corpora, she innovates by incorporating metalinguistic comments from internet forums into her analysis and by referring to both contemporary and historical corpora produced for both British and American English. Despite judgements about the use of native speakers and internet users, the author finds that *be*-perfects occur not only in ESL corpora but also diachronically in native speakers' corpora. The author, therefore, concludes that "it is too consistently attested to be written off as a mere performance error" (57) and that low frequency should not lead researchers to neglect such linguistic phenomena.

In "'He Don't Like Football, does he?': A Corpus-Based Study of Third Person Singular *don't* in the Language of British Teenagers" (61-84), Ignacio Palacios Martínez draws attention to the use of third-person singular *don't* in British English and examines three corpora of British English representative of the speech of both teenagers and adults. He takes into account possible language-internal motivations as well as extralinguistic factors and performs statistical analyses, which substantiate, among other findings, that *don't* is more prominently used by teenagers than adults, and that the clause subject plays a role in the selection of third-person singular *don't*. Remarkably, his study also reveals that Anglo-origin speakers use this construction more than speakers of other ethnicities, which can reverse popular misconceptions regarding the *properness* of British speakers' language uses.

Stephanie Hackert's "Standards of English in the Caribbean: History, Attitudes, Functions, Features" (85-111) takes us through the linguistic history of the Caribbean to discuss attitudes towards English-lexifier creoles and emergent endonormative standard varieties of English. A diglossic situation—creoles/British English—has given way to the use of creoles as complementary communicative tools, adding "local color" (106) to people's English. In fact, creoles play their parts in the make-up of their own standards, a multifaceted situation which can be extrapolated to other historically relatable backdrops.

Valentin Werner—"Overlap and Divergence: Aspects of the Present Perfect in World Englishes" (113-142)—reconciles allegedly marked differences in the use of the present perfect in WE, by pointing out a "core grammatical area across the varieties considered" (135). He firstly presents a quantitative analysis and subsequently depicts how this overall picture fits into revised models (Modiano 1999; Schneider 2007), by using aggregative approaches—like Neighbor-Net—visual aids which indeed prove helpful.

Lucía Loureiro-Porto examines in "(Semi-)Modals of Necessity in Hong Kong and Indian Englishes" (143-172) the verbs *must*, *need (to)*, *want to* and *have to* in the two varieties of English (ICE-HK and ICE-IND) and juxtaposes them with their uses in

British English (ICE-GB). Not only does she discuss syntactic differences—for instance, in terms of grammaticalisation—but also distinctive semantic behaviours, thus offering a very comprehensive and detailed picture of each of the modals of necessity.

Julia Davydova also adopts a corpus-based approach in "Indian English Quotatives in a Real-Time Perspective" (173-204) and considers a hitherto unexplored area in the context of Indian English: the use of the quotative system. Whereas more traditional quotatives, like *say* and *think*, are losing ground, the copula *be like* and the quotative *go* have been popularised as part of both local and global trends in their uses. However, their functional specialisation in Indian English is vernacular and, according to Davydova, mainly led by private-school female speakers.

Lena Zipp and Adina Staicov's "English in San Francisco Chinatown: Indexing Identity with Speech Rhythm?" (205-227) offers new insights into the negotiation of ethnic identity through speech features, by analysing data collected from ethnicity questionnaires and interviews with second-generation Chinese American living in the San Francisco Chinatown community. This mixed approach enables the researchers to map background information of the participants and their "ethnic identity scores" into the phonetic material elicited through a map task experiment during the interviews. Interestingly, variation in rhythm seems to be used to "negotiate the [speakers'] middle ground" (224), albeit inconsistently. Great prominence is therefore given to individual agency and flexibility, two key aspects sometimes neglected in large corpus-based studies.

Mikko Laitinen and Magnus Levin's contribution—"On the Globalization of English: Observations of Subjective Progressives in Present-Day Englishes" (229-252)—adopts a diachronic perspective on the appropriation of the progressive (in particular, its subjective interpretation with the intervening adverb *always*) in WE. Their starting point is corpus material for American English, which is compared to several corpora of global Englishes in order to inform our understanding of this phenomenon in EFL. This paper clearly posits the existence of an ENL-ESL-ELF/EFL continuum, as the boundaries between these varieties become progressively blurrier.

Finally, Edgar Schneider's "World Englishes and YouTube: Treasure Trove or Nightmare?" (253-281) produces a fully-fledged typology of YouTube videos—according to whether they are "metalinguistic" or "natural" clips (262-275)—and neatly illustrates this with real-life material. He discusses its potential in several spheres of linguistic investigation and language teaching, along with some of the most central concerns in such an enterprise, providing the reader with some provisional suggestions. The colophon of this final chapter invites the reader to further explore this tool, thereby providing a culmination of the inquisitive spirit promoted throughout the book.

At this stage, a few general observations should be made. Although in the book the term "L2 varieties of English" usually refers to those speakers who have an L1 different from English (for instance, Hindi or Chinese), it becomes problematic to imply that this label applies uniformly to all speakers of English in countries such as India, Singapore, Hong Kong, and other areas which have traditionally fallen within the "English as

an L2" category. This geographically-based and historically-motivated classification is misleading and has been much contested, particularly by those coming from Kachru's "outer circle" ([1982] 1992) but for whom English is their first language. This present-day reality should perhaps have been pointed out—albeit succinctly—at some point in the monograph. Awareness of these complex scenarios should avoid perpetuating linguistic stereotypes associated with Asians.

Likewise, it would have been interesting to mention contact-induced phenomena across Kachru's three circle-model ([1982] 1992)—as in Colloquial Singaporean English (CSE) and Multicultural London English (MLE). This begs the question of acceptability: is, for instance, British speakers' use of third-person singular *don't* more acceptable than uses developed by L1 English speakers beyond the "inner circle"? Are these *non-standard* forms equally stigmatised by their respective speech communities? What role does the basilectal-acrolectal continuum play in this? These are just a few questions that may arise—and could perhaps be addressed in follow-up contributions—after having read the thought-provoking material covered in this highly valuable contribution to the study of World Englishes.

Works Cited

ICE. 2016. *International Corpus of English*. [Accessed online on October 31, 2017]

Kachru, Braj Bihari, ed. (1982) 1992. *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P.

Mair, Christian. 2013. "The World System of Englishes: Accounting for the Transnational Importance of Mobile and Mediated Vernaculars." *English World-Wide* 24 (3): 253-278.

Modiano, Marko. 1999. "Standard English(es) and Educational Practices for the World's Lingua Franca." *English Today* 15 (4): 3-13.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2003. "The Dynamics of New Englishes: From Identity Construction to Dialect Birth." *Language* 79 (2): 233-281.

—. 2007. *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Received 27 February 2017 Revised version accepted 17 July 2017

Amanda Roig-Marín, BA (Universitat d'Alacant), MPhil (University of Cambridge), is a PhD student at the Faculty of English, University of Cambridge, where she is currently working on the multilingual make-up of late medieval texts produced in England. She has also conducted research into present-day English and contact linguistics—particularly, into the influence of English on Spanish—, and published articles in journals such as *English Today* and *Spanish in Context.*

Address: Selwyn College. Grange Rd. CB3 9DQ, Cambridge, United Kingdom. Tel.: +44 7716027246.