

## CHAPTER 1 – ENGLISH LANGUAGE

### 1. General

In this section, I cover a number of studies of general interest in areas of or related to English language and linguistics. I begin with an introductory textbook on general linguistics, titled *Introducing Linguistics: Theoretical and Applied Approaches*, and edited by Joyce Bruhn de Garavito and John W. Schwieter. The textbook introduces various linguistic subfields through eighteen chapters, organized into seven parts, and written by a group of authors. The introductory chapter, written by the editors of the volume, introduces the study of language from a number of more general perspectives, including the connection between language and communication, the history of modern linguistics, and the most prominent theoretical approaches to the study of language. The next part of the textbook comprises two chapters on the topic of ‘Sound’. The first of these chapters, written by Christine Shea and Sarah Ollivia O’Neill, covers ‘Phonetics (pp. 25–66); it deals with a number of fundamental topics in phonetics, from the way sounds are produced and classified, to phonetic transcription, as well as processes of sound change. The second chapter by Joyce Bruhn de Garavito, covers ‘Phonology’ (pp. 67–113); it deals with the concepts of phonemes and allophones, distinctive features, as well as the nature and structure of the syllable. The three chapters in the next part of the textbook are all on topics of ‘Structure and Meaning’. ‘Morphology: Word Structure’ (pp. 117–64) by Joyce Bruhn de Garavito first covers the definition of basic concepts such as morphemes, lexemes, allomorphs, and then looks at the morphological structure of words, i.e. inflectional and derivational morphology, as well as word-formation processes. The chapter ends with an appendix with practical guidelines about identifying morphological units in other languages and conducting a tree-based morphological analysis. The same author also covers ‘Syntax: Phrase and Sentence Structure’ (pp. 165–18) in the next chapter; she introduces word classes and categories and syntactic notions such as constituents and arguments, and then moves to phrases and sentences. The chapter also covers movement, and includes an appendix on syntactic tree analysis. In the final chapter in this part, Roumyana Slabakova deals with ‘Semantics: Language and Meaning’ (pp. 219–50), with a good overview of notions in semantics, from basic definitions and distinctions in the meaning of words, to the meaning of phrases and sentences, to different approaches to the study of meaning. Linguistic typology and language change are covered in Part 4, with two chapters on these two topics. The chapter on ‘The Classification of Languages’ by Asya Pereltsvaig (pp. 253–288) covers language families, the comparative reconstruction methods, and basic topics in linguistic typology studies. Next, Laura Grestenberger covers ‘Historical Linguistics’ (pp. 289–323), looking at language stages in the past, different types of language changes in relation to linguistic level, and it also covers reasons for language change. The last points covered in this chapter complement the previous one by expanding on linguistic and comparative reconstruction. The next part of the textbook covers social aspects of language, with chapters on sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse analysis, and writing systems. Terry Nadasdi introduces concepts relevant to the study of ‘Sociolinguistics: Language in Society’ (pp. 327–355) through a useful organization of the discussion into three topics:

social variation, covering linguistic variation across social groups; stylistic variation, referring mainly to aspects of style and register variation; and variation in bilingual communities, covering topics in language planning, code-switching, and pidgins and creoles. Next, Maite Taboada covers ‘Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis’ (pp. 356–75), introducing, in the area of pragmatics, speech acts, implicatures, Conversation Analysis, the Cooperative Principle, and politeness theory, and, in the area of Discourse Analysis, genre and register, coherence and cohesion, and stylistics. This part is rounded off with a chapter on ‘Writing Systems’ (pp. 376–414) by Peter T. Daniels and John W. Schwieter, covering the typical characteristics, as well as the history, of a range of writing scripts and systems. Part 6 is devoted to ‘Language Acquisition’, with two chapters by John W. Schwieter, one covering ‘First Language Acquisition’ (pp. 417–59), and the other ‘Second Language Acquisition’ (pp. 460–97). The final part covers ‘Language, Cognition, and the Brain’, with another two chapters by John W. Schwieter. The first one is ‘Psycholinguistics: Language Processing’ (pp. 501–34), while the second covers ‘Neurolinguistics: Language and the Brain’ (pp. 535–70). The textbook is a clear, well-written introduction to the study of language, and it does a great job of striking a good balance between a simple introduction of basic concepts and a sufficient level of detail for a more advanced study. It abounds in examples, practical exercises, effective communication of important concepts and it covers a good range of languages, while also containing a lot of English examples. In that sense, it can be used not only as a general textbook for the introduction of linguistics, but also in courses specifically focusing on English linguistics.

Of general interest to English linguistics is the book *Doing English Grammar: Theory, Description and Practice* by Roger Berry. While the book covers a commonly treated subject, it does so by taking a strongly pedagogical perspective. This is not a textbook for students, though perhaps parts of it could be used as such. It is primarily intended to be used in the context of language pedagogy. It is aimed at course designers, educators, teachers, writers of instructional materials, or others involved in the teaching of grammar. The book opens with an explanation about ‘The Place of Grammar’, specifically in the teaching of English as a Foreign Language. It covers different methods and approaches within which grammar can be taught, thus providing different perspectives on how grammar can be approached in class or integrated within a specific educational context. The second chapter goes into answering the question ‘What is Grammar?’, doing so by first defining grammar as ‘the system of rules that enables users of a language to relate linguistic form to meaning’ (p. 19), and then describing the many ways in which languages can vary in terms of grammatical structure, or, as explained in the book, the way in which different languages ‘do grammar’ differently. The chapter further addresses a number of distinctions in terms of how grammar can be approached from the perspective of speakers – such as primary vs secondary grammar, or prescriptive vs descriptive grammar – all distinctions useful and relevant to the teaching of English grammar. In chapter 3, the author addresses ‘The Need for New Descriptions’ in the area of grammar teaching, providing five reasons supporting this need: language changes, correcting current accounts where necessary, the incorporation of newly discovered grammatical phenomena, the extension of the scope of grammar, and, lastly, the addition of alternative approaches to existing problems. The next chapter addresses a number of aspects and issues related to grammatical terminology, dealing with topics such as terminological

variability. In chapter 5, Berry looks at issues in describing grammar, such as the level of detail and nuance exercised, the approach to issues of formality or acceptability, or the use of examples in grammatical description. Chapter 6, then, turns to the practical aspects of teaching grammar in the classroom, by looking at the incorporation of grammar teaching into the syllabus, as well as classroom activities and testing. The last four chapters of the book zoom in on a specific grammatical area in English, each aiming to examine the state of affairs in grammar teaching and offering suggestions for improvement. Chapter 7 deals with articles. The author argues that, unlike the indefinite article, the definite article is subject to creativity, and that this idiosyncrasy is usually overlooked in the classroom where teachers wrongly suggest that the use of the definite article is determined by a set of rules. Throughout the chapter, practical suggestions are proposed to address this misconception; among them is treating article-only gap-fill exercises with caution and using alternative meaning-dependent formats. The second case study is discussed in Chapter 8. It focuses on the comparison of adjectives, and the use of corpus-based methods to discover the factors at play in the sub-regularities in this area. Frequency is treated here as crucial as it ‘de-emphasises an obsession with so-called correctness, which leads to the learning of rules, followed by extensions of the rules and then of exceptions to these rules’ (pp. 177–78). Chapter 9 revolves around the personal pronoun paradigm as another case of ‘messy reality’ (p. 190). Finally, the last case study (chapter 10) is on reported speech. As in previous chapters, Berry is critical about inflicting rules on learners and suggests presenting direct and reported speech as two independent phenomena. All of the case-studies address issues and difficulties in the teaching of the respective grammatical area, and they offer practical approaches to teaching these grammatical aspects. The book thus represents an important contribution to the arsenal of teaching preparation materials in the area of English grammar. See also section 5 (pp. 27) for additional information on this work.

Two contributions to English historical linguistics covering topics of general interest are covered next. The first one is *Studies in the History of the English Language VIII: Boundaries and Boundary-Crossings in the History of English*, a volume edited by Peter J. Grund and Megan E. Hartman. The volume contains ten contributions on the topic of boundaries and boundary-crossing in the history of English, each addressing this topic from a particular perspective. The ten chapters are organized into three thematic sections. In the first section, devoted to ‘Conceptual and Methodological Boundaries’, Michael Adams first addresses the question of ‘Scale and Mode in Histories of English’ (pp. 23–43), challenging the current models and conventions in telling language history, and proposing alternative ways in which the history of English can be studied and described. These alternative models – such as describing the history of English through the scale of a human lifetime – aim to account for history beyond the scope of disciplinary boundaries, engaging a broader audience. Adams then discusses these models by addressing microhistories, the narrative mode, and multimodal histories. Next, Amy J. Devitt looks at ‘The Blurred Boundaries of Genres-in-Use: Principles and Implications from Rhetorical Genre Studies for English Historical Linguistics’ (pp. 45–72). The author first provides an informative, detailed, and comprehensive discussion of the contributions of the rhetorical linguistic approach to genres-in-use, and subsequently turns to an illustration of how historical studies of English can be enriched by incorporating this approach. Chapter 3 is Edgar W. Schneider’s contribution

entitled ‘Meanderings from Early English to World Englishes: A Complex Systems Perspective on Morphosyntactic Changes in *Wh*-Pronouns’ (pp. 73–105), in which the author presents the concept of Complex Adaptive Systems as a conceptual innovation in approaching and explaining the characteristics of and changes in the linguistic system, and illustrates this with respect to varieties of English. The author first introduces Complex Adaptive Systems, and addresses a range of properties of such systems, illustrating them with linguistic processes. Using the metaphor of ‘meanderings’, he then applies this theoretical concept to the case of *wh*-pronouns in English, which shows how seeing processes of change as Complex Adaptive Systems allows for the combination of a number of processes usually studied in isolation in linguistics. The next section comprises four contributions on the topic of linguistic boundaries. In the first of these, ‘First or Best, Last not Least: Domain Edges in the History of English’ (pp. 109–34), Donka Minkova explores the extent to which evidence from prosodic or segmental boundaries in OE verse can be used as evidence in the study of phonology, on the basis of applying PDE knowledge about such boundaries. Next, Edgar W. Schneider and Sarah Buschfeld look at ‘Expanding Boundaries of a Function Word: Uses of *One* in Early Modern and Modern English’ (pp. 135–66), presenting a detailed, informative, and illuminating analysis of the developmental trajectory of *one* throughout a period of four centuries. Based on various corpus sources, the analysis provides a detailed and comprehensive picture of the changes in usage and function of this form, allowing the authors to show its importance from a linguistic change perspective. This paper is followed by Erik Smitterberg’s analysis of ‘Non-correlative Commas between Subjects and Verbs in Early and Late Modern English Sermons and Scientific Texts’ (pp. 167–186), which provides a corpus-based variationist investigation throughout the history of English. The final chapter in this section is Raquel Vea Escarza’s contribution on ‘Old English Verbs of Envy: Class Membership and Grammatical Behaviour’ (pp. 187–207), aiming to investigate and revisit previously established class boundaries by crucially including a syntactic analysis alongside the semantic analysis of verbs. The final section consists of three contributions on questions relating to ‘Language and Language Variety Boundaries’. In the first of these, Anatoly Liberman looks at ‘Germanic /r/ as an Isogloss, Rhotacism, and the West Germanic Geminatio’ (pp. 211–23); he discusses the history of the phoneme in Germanic and the processes through which it arrived at the present-day realization. Next, Angela Hoffman and Merja Kytö explore ‘Migration, Localities, and Discourse: Shifting Linguistic Boundaries in Swedish-American Cookbooks’ (pp. 225–248), looking specifically at language mixing in the context of these cookbooks, which allows for the investigation of the boundaries between Swedish and English. In the final chapter of the volume, Don Chapman turns his attention to ‘Specimen Texts and Boundaries in the History of the English Language’ (pp. 249–70), analysing how History of English textbooks select, discuss, and present historical periods in the development of the English language.

Another original contribution to language history is Lynda Mugglestone’s *Writing a War of Words: Andrew Clark and the Search for Meaning in World War One*. The study presents a rich, insightful, and expert analysis of a collection of notebooks on language written by Andrew Clark, a scholar, historian, and rector of Great Leighs in Essex, in which he aimed to record the use of the English language during WWI. The collection is referred to as ‘English Words in War-Time’, as many of the notebooks were titled, and they contain

records of language use gathered by Clark from newspapers and other publications. In almost a hundred notebooks, '[w]ords, meanings, language attitudes, alongside other changes in form and use, were all assiduously preserved' (p. 2). Similarly to lexicographical projects, Clark collected words and phrases mainly from newspapers, but also from other written material – leaflets, posters, advertisements, etc. – thus providing insights into the everyday language use of the time. As such, as Mugglestone shows, Clark's collection provides a unique dataset for investigating language history. Importantly, Clark's collection of records shows that contrary to the view that the war years had a negative impact on the development of the language, this period of upheaval and change brought about rich developments. In the first chapter, Mugglestone goes into detail on the work that went into 'Words in War-Time', showing how Clark's work managed to record contemporaneous language usage in an original and relevant way. The chapter that follows explores the ways in which Clark approached his sources and how he made use of a range of materials from the newspapers he relied on. Chapter 3 turns towards an analysis of a specific phrase, *do one's bit*, looking at Clark's analysis of the use of the phrase, and its meaning in relation to war discourse. In the next chapter, the author expands the discussion of the linguistic material, by looking at the range of expressions used to describe or refer to war itself, and the ways in which the unprecedented nature of warfare shaped the language at the time. Chapter 5 is concerned with 'Border Crossings', expanding on war's influence on language by looking specifically at attitudes, proscriptions, and linguistic influences from other languages. In chapter 6, Mugglestone analyses Clark's records from the perspective of the influence of military language on everyday language. Women's place and history in wartime is explored in the next chapter, with an analysis of Clark's observations of linguistic forms related to gender. The language of illness and death is explored in chapter 8, showing the emergence and use of a range of body-related expressions. The book closes with a chapter exploring Clark's records of expressions of peace, as well as his own perspective on the project itself, as changes took a new turn with the end of the war. The book offers an illuminating, original contribution to historical linguistic, sociolinguistics, and the history of lexicography as well as a beautifully written, enjoyable, and detailed analysis of a unique collection of language data. A short mention of this work is also made in section 7 (pp. 46).

Finally, I cover contributions to the area of corpus linguistics that go beyond a specific linguistic area. The first of these focuses specifically on the creation of The London-Lund Corpus 2. Written by Nele Põlvedere, Victoria Johansson, and Carita Paradis, the article 'On *The London-Lund Corpus 2: Design, Challenges and Innovations*' (*ELL* 25[2021] 459–83) outlines the creation of a new corpus of spoken English matching the design of the original *London-Lund Corpus*. The corpus comprises half a million words of spoken British English from 2014 and 2019; it supplies novel spoken language data, but it is organized in such a way that principled investigations and comparisons can be conducted in relation to the first instantiation of the corpus. The article covers details relevant to the corpus design, as well as the procedure of corpus creation and the challenges thereof. In a similar vein, Vaclav Brezina, Abi Hawtin, and Tony McEnery's article present the 'The Written British National Corpus 2014 – Design and Comparability' (*T&T* 41[2021] 595–615), a new corpus of written British English, similar to the 1994 version of the BNC. The article details the approach to creating this corpus, changes in the process in light of corpus creation developments, and the

make-up of the new corpus. Finally, with respect to corpus-based contributions, Christian Mair reviews ‘Recent Advances in the Corpus-Based Study of Ongoing Grammatical Change in English’ (*T&T* 41[2021] 763–785), pointing out that these advances are evident predominantly in the increasingly sophisticated technical or statistical tools used for the analysis of established cases of change, rather than in the discovery of new grammatical changes or language change phenomena. Exploring two cases studies, semi-modals and the progressive, the author makes a number of relevant points with respect to recent developments in the area of corpus-based studies of grammatical change in English, mainly to do with the complex interrelation of linguistic and social factors in the study of change.

## 2. History of English Linguistics

I begin this section with a number of articles published in the three issues of the sixty-fourth volume of the journal *Language & History*. Frederick Newmeyer's contribution to the history of American linguistics, 'A Post-Bloomfieldian's Last Stand', looks at 'Charles Hockett's Attempt to Resign from the LSA in 1982' (*Lang&H* 64[2021] 44–61). The article is an illuminating discussion of a series of letters between leading linguists in the field, instigated by Hockett's decision to resign from the LSA, and more specifically, of the reasons he provided for the decision. Hockett's reasoning had to do with his deep dissatisfaction with the influence of generative linguistics and the developments in linguistics stemming from that. Using previously unpublished letters, Newmeyer shows the tension between linguistic scholars' personal positions about the state of the discipline on the one hand and actual reality on the other; in this case, in reality, Newmeyer argues, linguistics was varied and diverse, rather than strongly dominated by generativist influence. Blanco Pena's contribution, 'On Ancient vs. Modern, Eastern vs. Western, Contributions to Text Coherence Theory' (*Lang&H* 64 [2021] 27–63), looks at the history of the study of the concept of coherence, going back to ancient philosophical sources in both Eastern and Western philosophy. Examining the place of coherence in the work of Aristotle and in the hermeneutic tradition, the author shows how these ancient philosophical thinkers were concerned with coherence in the context of works of art or literary works as a relation between the whole and its parts. Parallel developments are identified and discussed in ancient Chinese philosophy, on the basis of two works which deal with textual coherence in detail in the third and sixth centuries CE. In examining these works, the author shows the similarities between the two traditions in their focus on textual aspects of coherence, while also pointing to the lack of 'conceptual continuity' between these ancient traditions and the modern linguistic perspective on coherence, which is seen as external to the text. In the area of the history of English language teaching, Greg Brooks' article, 'Joseph Neef (1770–1854): A Forgotten Pioneer of Applying Phonetics and Regularised Phonic Materials to the Initial Teaching of Literacy in English' (*Lang&H* 64 [2021] 1–26), discusses the work and legacy of Joseph Neef, a teacher who introduced Pestalozzi's principles in the US and was one of the first to apply phonetics and use phonic materials in the teaching of English in the US. The study covers in detail Neef's biography, as well as his approach to the teaching of English in the US, which was based solely on pronunciation and speaking rather than on grammar and learning the linguistic code. Also devoted to the history of language teaching and learning is a special issue of *Language & History* (*Lang&H* 164:iii[2021]), edited by Friederike Klimmel and Rolf Kemmler, which deals with the Reform Movement and Grammar Translation Method. In their own contribution, 'Oral Skills Versus Structural Knowledge: The Reform Movement and the Grammar-Translation Method' (*Lang&H* 64 [2021] 137–150), the editors provide a brief sketch of the history of language teaching and learning. The second article, written by Michael Ashby and Patricia Ashby, examines 'Phonetic Teachers and the Reform Movement', and provides 'Evidence from Records of the IPA' in the context of Australiasia (*Lang&H* 64 [2021] 151–167). In 'Patriotism and patriarchy as obstacles to the adoption of reform methods in the English school system' (*Lang&H* 64[2021] 168–186), Simon Coffey examines the history of the Reform Movement in England, the place of significant resistance

to the movement. Tim Geisler looks at the influence of the Reform Movement in ‘Start Afresh or Return? The Impact of the Reform Movement on Northern German English Language Teaching’ (*Lang&H* 64 [2021] 187–203), while María José Corvo Sánchez examines the situation with the Grammar-Translation Method and its use in teaching, in ‘Grammar–Translation method? Why a History of Methods? Considerations from a Spanish Perspective’ (*Lang&H* 64 [2021] 204–220).

The second group of studies traditionally covered in this section are studies of prescriptivism and standardization, both areas with important contributions in 2021. It is fitting to start with the publication of *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization*, edited by Wendy Ayres-Benett and John Bellamy. As the editors state in the introductory chapter, the handbook offers a wide-ranging coverage of topics and case studies in the area of language standardization, across different socio-historical contexts, thus contributing to the area of comparative standardology research. Chapters are organized into five parts, covering ‘models and theories of standardization (Part I), questions of authority and legitimacy (Part II), literacy and education (Part III), borders and boundaries (Part IV) and standardization in Late Modernity (Part V)’ (p. 1). Though the volume has a general orientation, a number of chapters are of specific interest to topics of processes of standardization of English varieties, which I cover in what follows. (The chapters that focus on languages other than English are not covered here.)

The first part is entitled ‘Revisiting Models and Theories of Language Standardization’, and comprises six chapters covering various issues in theoretical approaches to standardization. The first chapter, ‘Modelling Language Standardization’ (pp. 27–64), is of interest to us from the perspectives of both standardization studies and history of linguistics. In particular, Ayres-Bennett charts the historical development of models of language standardization, starting from the early models by Einar Haugen, through subsequent developments proposed by the Milroys, John Earl Joseph, and Robert Cooper. In the context of the 1990s, Ayres-Bennett reviews Hornberger’s integrative framework of language planning as well as work examining purism and prescriptivism. The author then turns to current trends, covering work on processes of standardization in comparative perspectives, moving beyond the national and the European focus, as well as mentioning work on destandardization and restandardization. The next two chapters address the process of standardization ‘from above’ and ‘from below’. Gijsbert Rutten and Rik Vosters look at the former (pp. 65–92) in a sociohistorical perspective, examining a range of issues related to the implementation of standards in Early and Late Modern times, and describing how they were implemented at various stages in history. Stephan Elspaß considers standardization processes ‘from below’, looking at aspects of conventionalization and acceptance, again in a sociohistorical perspective. In Part II, ‘Legitimacy, Authority and the Written Form’, Douglas A. Kibbee’s chapter on ‘Standard Languages in the Context of Language Policy and Planning and Language Rights’ discusses two contexts: France and the USA. With reference to the US, and specifically the American English Standard, Kibbee goes into the development of standardization processes from the time of the American Revolution to the present, examining various agents in standardization in the realms of spelling, the lexicon, and morphosyntax. Not directly addressing English, but relevant for standardization processes in European languages, Nicola McLelland analyses ‘Grammars, Dictionaries and Other

Metalinguistic Texts in the Context of Language Standardization’ (pp. 263–93). Next, Ian Brookes, Mary O’Neill, and Meryn Davies-Deacon provide ‘An Industry Perspective’ in ‘Dealing with Language Variation in Collins Dictionaries’ (pp. 294–312), addressing the issue of how commercial language products such as dictionaries deal with issues of language variation. They do so by considering three different questions: the first is related to contexts in which there are multiple language norms, the second is related to cases where a monolingual dictionary has to come to grips with language variation, and the third one looks at dictionary-making with English learners as the target audience. In Part III of the volume, entitled ‘Norms, Literacy and Education’, there is one chapter addressing aspects of the standardization of English varieties. ‘Standard Languages and Standardization in the Context of Bilingual Education’ (pp. 470–95), by Robert Train and Claire Kramsch, looks at bilingual education in the USA, with a special focus on California, providing a historical perspective of the development of the place of English and Spanish in the context of the educational system of the state. In Part IV, ‘Beyond the National’, in a chapter on ‘Transnational Standards of Languages: The Rise and Codification of National Varieties’ (pp. 519–45), Raymond Hickey examines the process of emergence of transnational standards of two global languages, English and Spanish, thus offering a comparative perspective on this process. The rest of the handbook covers many different contexts and language varieties, and can therefore be seen as the definitive state-of-the-art coverage of a wide range of topics and issues in the area of language standardization. See also section 7 (pp. 9) for a short reference to this work.

In the area of language prescriptivism, we can note Yáñez-Bouza’s ‘Methodological Approaches to the Study of Codification, Prescription, and Prescriptivism’ (*SN* 93[2021] 334–64). The article provides a comprehensive, informative, clear, and detailed overview of the methodological approaches to the study of the stages of the standardization process, focusing explicitly on primary sources. Yáñez-Bouza examines existing research in terms of seven thematic areas based on types of primary sources: a) studies of individual authors and individual sources, b) studies of groups of individuals connected through discourse communities or communities of practice; this theme also covers studies of the metalanguage of normative grammars and usage guides; c) studies of the characteristics of the genre, or the ‘art and craft’ of normative writing; d) precept corpora, i.e. collections of normative or prescriptive sources such as grammars and usage guides; e) studies using bibliographies as primary source data; f) studies based on (digital) collections of texts; and, finally, g) studies of historical databases. Yáñez-Bouza thus shows how the field has developed over time, and provides an up-to-date detailed overview of the variety of sources and methodological approaches used in the area. Another contribution related to prescriptivism is Oaks’s article ‘Linguistic Encounters in Real World Prescriptivism: Acknowledging its Place and Role’ (*Lingua* 264[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103159](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103159)); it discusses the role of prescriptivism in applied linguistics, revisiting the complex relationship between descriptivism and prescriptivism in professional linguists’ scholarly practice. Oaks builds on recent work exploring the tension between the descriptive-prescriptive dichotomy in theory and in practice, and argues that a strong avoidance or denial of prescriptivism in linguistic practice is untenable and unrealistic. The author introduces a useful distinction between ‘dutiful prescriptivism’ and ‘informed prescriptivism’, aligning the latter with what would be appropriate and, in some cases, expected from linguistic scholars in specific professional

settings. Finally, Tieken-Boon van Ostade's article 'Of greengrocers, Sports Commentators, Estate Agents and Television Presenters: Who's in a Usage Guide and Why' (*JMMD* 42 [2021] 783–91) provide a linguist's perspective on the usage guide by focusing on Caroline Taggart's usage guide *Her Ladyship's Guide to the Queen's English* (2010). Specifically, the article looks at whose usage is proscribed, thus showing what kinds of speakers, or groups of speakers are used as models, and how this relates to the British class system.

The edited volume on *Language Use, Usage Guides and Linguistic Norms* devoted to the work of Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, edited by Luisella Caon, Marion Elenbaas, and Janet Grijzenhout, also contains a number of studies relevant in the field of English prescriptivism, as well as other aspects of standardization of varieties of English. A selection of chapters relevant for English language studies is covered here. In the first section of the volume, three chapters look at language use in English in different contexts. Marina Dossena's analysis of 'Student Evaluations in Late Modern Times: Testimonials in Favour of James Y. Simpson, M.D' (pp. 3–16) provides an important and original contribution to the study of evaluative discourse in Late Modern Times, through the study of new data gleaned from nineteenth century University of Edinburgh student evaluations. Next, Raymond Hickey investigates 'Elocution and its Legacy in Modern Ireland' (pp. 17–30), looking at the history of elocution in Ireland, and the attitudes associated with it. Finally, in 'An Old Friend Revisited: The Case of *But...Neither*' (pp. 31–51), Wim van der Wurff revisits Tieken-Boon van Ostade's earlier analysis of the construction. In the second part, Terttu Nevalainen's contribution, 'Between English and Dutch: The Case of a 16th-Century Merchant Shipmaster' (pp. 65–77), investigates the letters of Francis Johnson, a sixteenth-century merchant and shipmaster who was active both in the Low Countries and in East Anglia. The analysis looks at a range of linguistic features, and provides evidence of the influence that Dutch had on Johnson's language use, leading the author to conclude that the way Johnson used specific linguistic features was indicative of his use of strategies for communication in multilingual contexts. Next, Carol Percy discusses 'The Fall and Rise of Lord Chesterfield? Aristocratic Values in the Age of Prescriptivism in the "Age of Johnson"' (pp. 79–92) by analysing Lord Chesterfield's posthumously published letters to his illegitimate son, specifically focusing on observations made about the use of language and specific linguistic features. In the final chapter of this section, Thijs Porck provides an insightful look into the history of the *OED* by discussing 'The Correspondence between James Murray (1837–1915) and Pieter Jacob Cosijn (1840–1899)' (pp. 107–129), which shows that *OED*'s editor James Murray asked the Dutch philologist Pieter Jacob Cosijn to help him with his work for the *OED*. In the third and final part, another three contributions address topics related to usage guides and linguistic norms in English. First, Wim Tigges (pp. 145–54) discusses 'Have Went and Flat Adverbs Once Again – "Irish Style"?' looks at two linguistic items considered to be usage problems, extending the discussion with data from an Irish English usage guide. This is followed by Joan C. Beal's contribution 'Write Back in Anger: Storming the "Accent Bar" in 20th-Century British Writing' (pp. 155–66), which looks at how non-standard British accents were represented and used in mid-twentieth-century literary works, against the backdrop of the attitudes associated with RP at the time. Beal concludes that despite the critical awareness of the attitudes towards RP, the use of non-standard English in literature remains marked. The volume closes with David Crystal's entertaining and personal

suggestion about ‘The Next Step: Cultural Usage Guides’ (pp. 167–75), in which Crystal points out a need for a specific type of usage guides – cultural usage guides – in the context of language contact situations. Overall, the volume represents a good overview of Tiekens-Boon van Ostade’s research interests, while at the same time contributing original research to the domain of English language prescriptivism, standardization, and the history of English linguistics.

### 3. Phonetics and Phonology

This year's Phonetics and Phonology section starts with three introductory books, two of which treat the transcription of General American (GA) and General British English (GB). The third book concerns the use of Praat for analysing spoken English. I then discuss selected journal articles ordered by the regional variety they focus on. The final two articles concern voice qualities of American cartoon characters and Pokémonastics.

The first two books to be discussed here are *American English Phonetic Transcription* and *British English Phonetic Transcription*, both written by Paul Carley and Inger M. Mees. Both books essentially follow the same structure and diverge only in the phoneme inventory sections of American English and British English. I will therefore first outline the general structure of the two books before going into the differences. While the titles suggest that the main concern will be phonetic transcription, both books in fact target phonemic transcription in the majority of the chapters. The authors have opted for the use of 'phonetic' in the titles as this is a term non-linguists frequently use and because they want to make it easier for a broader audience to find the book when they search for works on transcription (*American English Phonetic Transcription*, p. xix). In the preface to each book, Carley and Mees briefly discuss the aims of transcription, and they provide a short comparison of GA and GB. Each book is divided into three parts: Transcribing Words (Part A), Transcribing Connected Speech (Part B), and Transcribing Intonation (Part C). Additionally, there are two appendices, namely a 'Summary of Consonant and Vowel Theory' (Appendix A) and 'Phonetic Transcription' (Appendix B). Part A (Chapters 1-11) discusses all consonants and vowel phonemes (the latter using Wells' Lexical Sets), primary and secondary stress, syllabic consonants, inflections, and epenthesis. In part B (Chapters 12-16), Carley and Mees walk their readers through connected speech and liaison, stress and weak forms, elision, and assimilation. Part C (Chapters 17-20) features an introduction to intonation, with chapters on nucleus and tail, head and pre-head. Parts B and C furthermore include extended sets of practice exercises.

The main differences between the two books are situated in Part A and reflect the structural differences between the GA and GB phoneme inventories. Thus, *American English Phonetic Transcription* distinguishes between stressed schwa (in STRUT words and before /r/ in words like *burn*) and unstressed schwa (as in *pivot* or before /r/ in words like *winner*) (sections 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, and 5.3). Moreover, it features the SPORT set (sections 5.4 and 5.5) and the FLEECE and GOOSE sets before /r/ (chapter 8). *British English Phonetic Transcription*, in contrast, discusses the STRUT vowel /ʌ/ (section 1.6), the NURSE and SQUARE sets (sections 5.3 and 5.4), and the centring diphthongs in the NEAR and CURE sets (chapter 8). In addition, it features a section on the LOT vowel, which is absent in GA (section 1.5). BATH words, which are distinct from TRAP words in GB, are discussed under PALM (section 5.1). The structure of the majority of chapters in Part A of the two books is as follows: a discussion of the phoneme, its lexical set and potential spellings, a list of homophones, transcription exercises, and finally a chapter revision. Part B shows a number of differences across the two books. In particular, *British English Phonetic Transcription* features sections on analogical /r/-liaison (section 12.3) and coalescent assimilation of /t/ and /j/ to /tʃ/, and /d/ and /j/ to /dʒ/ (section 15.10); these sections are missing in *American English Phonetic Transcription* for

the simple reason that GA is rhotic and does not have /j/ after /t/ and /d/. With the exception of some items for transcription, Part C is identical in both textbooks.

It is especially due to the concise explanations and overviews that these textbooks are very good introductions to the phonemic transcription of English. They are reduced to the essentials and will be handy for any student, non-linguist and linguist alike, that is interested in English phonology. Moreover, as a lecturer of English phonetics, I think it provides a good alternative at BA level to the more technical literature.

The third introductory book that will be treated in this section is Štefan Beňuš's *Investigating Spoken English: A Practical Guide to Phonetics and Phonology Using Praat*. This book contains 14 chapters and, as its title suggests, is designed as a practical introduction for students to analyse spoken English using Praat. To my knowledge, it is the first book of this kind, with its specific focus on English and its activity-based, practical approach. The first chapter 'Introduction' addresses the questions 'What to expect from this book?', 'Who is this book for?', and 'How is this book structured?'. In answer to these questions, Beňuš states that the book provides a learning-by-doing, hands-on approach for native and non-native speakers of English and that it aims to bring their unconscious knowledge underlying spoken English into their conscious awareness, providing them with skills to explain phonetics to non-linguists. As for the structure, chapter 2 introduces 'Fundamental Concepts' including the 'Transcription of Speech' and concepts such as 'Context and Variability'. In chapter 3, Beňuš turns to the 'Articulatory Mechanisms in Speech Production', e.g., 'Breathing and Airstream Mechanisms' and 'Voicing'. Chapter 4 is devoted to acoustics and an introduction to Praat. The following three chapters (chapters 5-7) discuss English vowels and consonants as well as allophonic variation. The next three chapters (chapters 8-10) treat syllables, words stress, and connected speech, respectively, and as such touch on concepts such as sonority, syllable weight, assimilation, and elision. Chapters 11-13 are devoted to prosody and discuss its basics (chapter 11), Intonation (chapter 12), and concepts that go 'Beyond Intonational Phrase' such as discourse markers and turn-taking (chapter 13). The final chapter concerns 'Exemplifying the Book Material in Real Interviews' (chapter 14). Every chapter has an accompanying website with sound material, annotation files, and scripts for Praat. The book also comprises a 'Further Reading' section (pp.265-6) for those students who look for a fuller treatment of specific issues.

Since the book came out, it has been used in acoustic phonetics courses for second year Bachelor students at our department. It has proven to be a useful and handy resource primarily thanks to its hands-on approach. Other positive features are that it contains helpful practical exercises, that it calls for reflection, and that it raises students' awareness of their own speech. However, Beňuš sometimes uses expressions like 'a-like sound' (p. 59) or 'oh-like sound' (p. 52) to describe the sounds in the second syllable of *discovering* and the first of *spoken*, respectively. These descriptions could be misleading because 'a-like' and 'oh-like' might be interpreted differently, depending on the variety of English one speaks or on whether one is an L1 or L2 speaker. That said, this book is highly recommendable to any student and teacher who wants to explore Praat for analysing English speech – be it on their own or in a classroom setting.

I now turn to journal articles published on English Phonetics and Phonology, sorted by region. We will start with NZE for which James Brand, Jen Hay, Lynn Clark, Kevin

Watson, and Márton Sóskuthy investigate ‘Systematic Co-Variation of Monophthongs across Speakers of New Zealand English’ (*JPhon* 88[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2021.101096](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2021.101096)). On the basis of F1 and F2 frequencies for ten NZE monophthongs obtained from the Origins of New Zealand English (ONZE) corpus, the authors analyse ‘the degree to which a given speaker’s location in a single vowel is predictive of their location for other vowels’ (p. 2). Their main goal was to come up with a methodology to investigate co-variation within the same speaker. Their NZE data show that there is indeed evidence of co-variation and they conclude that their novel methodology (see p. 6) in fact enables such an analysis.

Moving to AusE, Joshua Penney, Felicity Cox, and Anita Szakay investigate ‘Glottalisation of Word-Final Stops in Australian English Unstressed Syllables’ (*JIPA* 51[2021] 229-60), based on data obtained from female undergraduates from Macquarie University in Sydney and from the AusTalk corpus. In the authors’ use of the term, ‘glottalization’ does not refer to the glottal replacement of stops but to what is sometimes termed glottal enforcement, e.g. [ʔt]. Their study shows that glottalization of word-final stops, as in *parrot*, occurs more frequently among younger speakers than older speakers and thus supports the suggestion of a change in progress made in previous research. Furthermore, gender is reported to play a role as female speakers glottalize stops more frequently than males. In another study, Penney, Cox, and Szakay look at ‘Effects of Glottalisation, Preceding Vowel Duration, and Coda Closure Duration on the Perception of Coda Stop Voicing’ (*Phonetica* 78[2021] 29-63). The study conducted with seventy-seven participants, divided into two age groups, uses the words *bard, bart, bead, beat, bud, but, bid, bit* as stimuli. The results indicate that vowel duration provides cues for voicing while glottalization leads to the perception of voicelessness in coda stops. In contrast to findings of previous studies, Penney, Cox, and Szakay find that age does not play a role in the perception of coda stop voicing.

In another perceptual study on AusE, Tünde Szalay, Titia Benders, Felicity Cox, and Michael Proctor are interested in ‘Perceptual Vowel Contrast Reduction in Australian English /l/-Final Rimes’ (*LabPhon* 12:i:9[2021] [doi.org/10.5334/labphon.185](https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.185)). The article presents results from two experiments: a disambiguation and a word-recognition task. In the former, thirty participants were asked to categorize vowels in /hVd/ and /hVl/ contexts. In the latter, forty-six participants had to key in which words they heard after having been played /CVl/ and /CVd/ words. The experiments reveal that ‘vowel-lateral coarticulation reduces perceptual vowel contrast both in vowel disambiguation and in word recognition’ (p. 19).

We will now turn to AmE phonology. All articles from the journal *American Speech* that treat phonological variation are discussed in this chapter’s Section 9 on Dialectology and Sociolinguistics. These are the following: David Ellingson Eddington and Earl Kjar Brown’s ‘A Production and Perception Study of /t/-Glottalization and Oral Release following Glottals in the United States’ (*AS* 96[2021] 78-104), Michael Friesner, Laura Kastronic, and Jeffrey Lamontagne’s ‘Dynamics of Short-a in Montreal and Quebec City English’ (*AS* 96[2021] 450-480), Monica Nesbitt’s ‘The Rise and Fall of the Northern Cities Shift: Social and Linguistic Reorganization of *Trap* in Twentieth-Century Lansing, Michigan’ (*AS* 96[2021] 332-70), Pocholo Umbal’s ‘Filipinos Front *Too!* A Sociophonetic Analysis of Toronto English /u/-Fronting’ (*AS* 96[2021] 397-423), and Dan Villarreal and Mary Kohn’s ‘Local

Meanings for Supralocal Change: Perceptions of TRAP Backing in Kansas’ (AS 96[2021] 45-77).

In an article on AmE nasals, Lisa Davidson, Shmico Orosco, and Sheng-Fu Wang investigate ‘The Link between Syllabic Nasals and Glottal Stops in American English’ (*LabPhon* 12:i:4[2021] [doi.org/10.5334/labphon.224](https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.224)). In two studies, one conducted in a laboratory setting and one based on the University of Washington/Northwestern University (UW/NU) corpus, the authors examine the role of dialect and speech style in the distribution of word final [ŋ] and [ən] in words like *deepen*, *worsen*, *sullen*, *beaten*, and *wooden*, and moreover whether this distribution is affected by the phonetic contexts. They find that ‘syllabic nasals in American English only occur reliably after a glottal stop, a period of glottalization, or glottally reinforced [tʔ], and to a lesser extent, following /d/’ (p. 19). Furthermore, speakers from New York are shown to more likely use [ən] than speakers from other regions.

Maria Lialiou, Stavroula Sotiropoulou, and Adamantios I. Gafos look at ‘Spatiotemporal Coordination in Word-Medial Stop-Lateral and S-Stop Clusters of American English’ (*Phonetica* 78[2021] 385-433). Using articulatory data from seven AmE speakers, they investigate /pl, kl, sp, sk/-clusters paired with their corresponding single lateral/stop–vowel sequence, as in *append* ~ *suspend*, *delight* ~ *decline*. Their main finding is ‘that adding a consonant to the left of a CV to obtain a CCV results in readjustments of the spatiotemporal structure of the inner CV subsequence in the word-medial clusters investigated’ (p. 426-7).

In ‘Phonetic Imitation of Multidimensional Acoustic Variation of the Nasal Split Short-a System’ (*SpeechComm* 135[2021] 54-65), Georgia Zellou and Chloe Brotherton investigate an innovative phenomenon in California English, namely the nasal split of short-a, which describes that the vowel /æ/ is raised before nasals and backed and lowered before all other consonants. In their study, they have thirty-two female UC Davis undergraduates repeat words first shown on a computer and then uttered by three model speakers. The first model speaker does not have the split, nor do they produce enhanced nasal coarticulation or show diphthongization. The second model speaker’s speech has the nasal-split, but similarly to the first model speaker does not show nasal coarticulation or diphthongization. The third speaker has a raised, nasalized, and diphthongized /æ/ before nasals. The authors find ‘that imitators who were more advanced in the sound change were more likely to imitate both vowel positioning and nasalization patterns of the conservative model talkers’ (p. 54).

For the next article we look at BrE speakers. In ‘The Duration of Word-Final /s/ Differs across Morphological Categories in English: Evidence from Pseudowords’ (*Phonetica* 78[2021] 571-616) Dominic Schmitz, Dinah Baer-Henney, and Ingo Plag conduct an analysis on potential length differences between non-morphemic, plural, and *is-* and *has-*clitic /s/ in English. An example of a pseudoword eliciting non-morphemic /s/ is *glips* as in *Every day, the glips plays with the cloops* (p. 584). In this study, forty native speakers of Southern British English were tasked to produce pseudowords with word-final /s/. They find that ‘non-morphemic /s/ is significantly longer than plural /s/, which in turn is longer than clitic /s/, while there is no durational difference between the two clitics’ (p. 571). This study thus confirms results from previous corpus studies on the subject, while it differs from earlier experimental studies.

To finish this year's section, we will look at two more studies that allow our inner child to come out. The first discusses voice qualities of cartoon characters, while the second concerns sound symbolism in Pokémon names. In 'Detecting Protagonists and Antagonists in the Voice Quality of American Cartoon Characters: A Quantitative LTAS-Based Analysis' (*Phonetica* 78[2021] 345-84), Ke Hui Tong and Scott Reid Moisik analyse the cartoon series *Avatar*, *Korra*, *Dragon Prince*, and *Huntik*. Their findings reveal that voice qualities 'can be used in a quantitative way to very accurately distinguish between the categories of "protagonist" and "antagonist"' (p. 376). Based on their results, however, they admit that 'we cannot state with absolute confidence that protagonists exhibit high frequency and antagonists exhibit low frequency dominance in their spectral profiles, respectively' (p. 376). As for sound symbolism of Pokémon names, Shigeto Kawahara and Canaan Breiss present 'Exploring the Nature of Cumulativity in Sound Symbolism: Experimental Studies of Pokémonastics with English Speakers' (*LabPhon* 12:i:3[2021] [doi.org/10.5334/labphon.280](https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.280)). To give an example from previous studies, Pokémon names with [a] rather than [i] 'tend to be judged to be more suitable for post-evolution Pokémon' (p. 7). The same applies to names that include voiced obstruents rather than voiceless ones. In two experiments with native speakers of English, the authors examine 'when there are two or more sounds with the same sound symbolic meaning, whether these effects yield a greater combined effect than each of their own effects when they appear in isolation' (p. 3). Kawahara and Breiss's findings indeed show cumulative effects of sound symbolism: in other words, rather than just taking into account one factor, speakers in the experiments 'probabilistically took all factors (vowel quality, consonant voicing, and different degrees of length) into consideration when they decided whether each name belonged to a pre-evolution character or a post-evolution character' (p. 18).

## 4. Morphology

In this section we review the publications within the area of English morphology. We start with verbal morphology, move on to the nominal domain, and conclude with textbooks.

In the area of verbal morphology, ‘The Semantics of English *out*-Prefixation: A Corpus-Based Investigation’ (*ELL* 25[2021] 61–89) by Sven Kotowski analyses the verbal prefix *out*- in its scalar-comparative sense (e.g. *to outrun / out-marry / outstubborn someone*) with data from COCA and iWeb. The article manages to debunk previous misconceptions about the construction’s semantics as well as its productivity, in particular about the possible bases it can attach to.

On nominal morphology, there are three articles we wish to discuss. For OE, Elżbieta Adamczyk presents ‘A Multifactorial Account of Analogical Developments in Old English Nominal Paradigms’ (*NOWELE* 74[2021] 4–26). The author examines the factors conditioning the restructuring of nominal inflection, using a regression analysis. The most important factors that lead to retaining archaic forms are frequency of use and phonological and morphological salience, while neutral forms (i.e. ‘inflectional forms which overlap with the forms of the productive declensions’ (p. 12)) are likely to lead to further analogy. For IModE and PDE, Kun Sun and R. Harald Baayen argue in ‘Hyphenation as a Compounding Technique in English’ (*LangS* 83[2021] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2020.101326>) that the hyphen in compounds has evolved into a compounding technique used when two or more words form a cognitive unit, violating the general compounding principles of right-headedness and syntactic order (e.g. *prime-time*). Based on diachronic corpus data from COHA and the Google N-gram corpus, the study shows that idiosyncratically hyphenated compounds of this kind (e.g. *fifty-fifty*, *avant-garde*) have considerably increased in frequency, following the S-curve model of language change. Hyphenation is claimed to function as a discriminative cue that helps readers to unconsciously process words hyphenated like this as a new type of compound. A third paper on nominal morphology is Salvador Valera and Alba E. Ruz’s ‘Conversion in English: Homonymy, Polysemy and Paronymy’ (*ELL* 25[2021] 181–204), approaching in a systematic way the relation between base and derivative in conversion-related pairs. It is argued that earlier proposals are not sufficient to provide a full-fledged account of the phenomenon of conversion in English, and that a distinction between paradigmatic and paronymic relations may contribute to a (partial) solution of the problem.

Two papers address shortened words. Manfred Markus investigates ‘Aphesis and Aphaeresis in Late Modern English Dialects (Based on *EDD Online*)’ (*ES* 102[2021] 124–41), two terms which relate to word-initial erosion of a vowel or syllable, respectively. His analysis of examples from around 1900, taken from the digitized *EDD* shows that while some erosions clearly represent a phonological process, others seem morphologically motivated, for instance deletion of prefixes or simplification and reanalysis of Latinate words. On PDE shortened forms, Martin Hilpert, David Correia Saavedra, and Jennifer Rains present ‘A Multivariate Approach to English Clippings’ (*Glossa* 6[2021] [doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5771](https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5771)), i.e. shortened forms of the type *lab* < *laboratory*. They aim to find systematicity in the process of clipping, especially because it has often been described as unpredictable. Their statistical method finds structured patterns in the dataset, which was annotated for cognitive

(e.g. least effort), discourse-pragmatic (e.g. recoverability), and phonological (e.g. syllable structure) factors. They conclude that clipping as a phenomenon can best be seen as a collection of lower-level patterns (in CxG terms) rather than one generalized process; in their paper, they describe fourteen such common lower-level patterns (which still only account for 33.9% of the examples in the database).

Several contributions address pronouns. On OE pronouns, Marcelle Cole presents evidence of ‘An Old English Progenitor for Middle English Accusative *his*’ (*N&Q* 68[2021] 18–24), *in the form of* examples from psalter glosses from the DOE (Cole discusses the problems with taking psalter glosses as evidence), suggesting that there is in fact an Old English progenitor for accusative *his*, which has not been attested in earlier work; this has previously led scholars to analyse ME *his* as a borrowing or ME innovation. On PDE pronouns, Jeffrey Keith Parrott, in ‘Post-Syntactic Mechanisms of Pronominal Case Variation in Germanic’ (*ALH* 53[2021] 132–59), compares case forms of pronouns in English, Danish, and Swedish, languages where case has been retained as grammatically marked by pronouns only. He presents a typology where English and Danish are analysed as Oblique-Form Default languages, with a pronoun taking oblique case, unless it is a subject (compare Swedish, which is analysed as a Subject-Form Default language). There are also some contexts where non-subjects take a subject form (*e.g. between you and I*), mostly sociolinguistically determined; Parrott calls these forms ‘exceptional’ subject forms. Parrott then proposes a formal analysis within the domain of Distributed Morphology. We think that it is problematic that he does not include Dutch as another West Germanic language that has lost case on nouns but not on pronouns.

Helene Seltzer Krauthamer’s book *The Great Pronoun Shift: The Big Impact of Little Parts of Speech* addresses personal pronouns in the recent history of English, with special reference to the pronoun problem that has emerged because of ‘our ability to perceive gender no longer as a binary male or female but as a range’ (p. 3). The hypothesis that is put forward is that the pronoun *they* ‘will (someday) replace *he* and *she*, making them as archaic as *thee* and *thou*’ (p. ix). The book consists of nine chapters. The first four tackle the pronoun problem in print, on Broadway, in style guides, and in relation to non-binary individuals, pets, planets, and other bodies. The book continues in chapters 5 and 6 with the history of pronouns and their use in religious contexts. Finally, chapters 7 and 8 discuss the many forms of neopronouns, the use of *they* for everyone, and the consideration of pronouns as a third word category that shares features with both function and content words: they fill a grammatical slot, pronouns are subject to change, and ‘they do convey meaning’ (p. 111). The last chapter offers some suggestions as to what language users should do regarding the pronoun problem. The overall conclusion is that there is clear evidence for the Great Pronoun Shift. It is argued that this will happen without further notice and for reasons of simplicity, politeness, and/or because of social forces like the ones that ‘wiped out class distinctions in language’ (p. ix). The book targets both an academic and a non-academic audience, it is written in a rather informal style, and contains an informative list of annotated references at the end of each chapter.

Let us turn to textbooks. This year saw the third edition of Rochelle Lieber’s *Introducing Morphology*. This edition does not differ extensively from previous ones, the most significant change being the addition of a final chapter on six current theories of

morphology. The textbook consists of eleven chapters. The first five concentrate on English and other languages that are likely to be familiar to the linguistics student. Chapter 3 is particularly interesting because it introduces students to corpus-based methods, and many of the exercises contained throughout the book indeed refer to corpus data. Also interesting for this review is chapter 4 ('Productivity and Creativity') as it is the only chapter that focuses exclusively on English. The fact that the author frequently draws on examples from other languages makes this textbook an excellent resource for lecturers who wish to look at the bigger picture and set English in a cross-linguistic context.

It is not often that we see new textbooks on English morphology, but Don Ringe's *A Historical Morphology of English* is exactly that. Rather than providing historical explanations of PDE phenomena, as plenty of textbooks do, this book starts by describing OE and then moves towards PDE, in a journey through all stages of English morphology. The first part of the book (chapters 1 and 2) briefly reviews general concepts in morphology and historical linguistics. The second part addresses inflectional morphology, starting with an overview of the OE verbal and nominal systems (chapter 3). Chapter 4 discusses late OE changes, most notably the loss of gender and the introduction of the pronoun *she*, and chapter 5 shifts the focus on ME, with the loss of case marking and the development of the possessive 's. Chapter 6 works as an aside and dives into a discussion surrounding language contact and how language change takes place. Chapter 7 discusses further changes in the verbal system in eModE, while chapter 8 discusses some final developments that mark the final transition to PDE, such as changes in pronouns and the rise of modals. The third part of the book addresses derivational morphology. Chapter 9 outlines derivational patterns in OE and their subsequent development in terms of productivity; it also addresses compounds. Chapter 10 discusses prefixes and suffixes borrowed from French, and chapter 11 those with a Latinate source. The final chapter discusses some final miscellaneous issues, such as zero derivation and resegmentation. Each chapter ends with a set of exercises that are a bit like extensive puzzles (and no key is given). The book is aimed at advanced students and includes reflections on morphological theory and ample references for further reading – but even advanced students may need some guidance in working with the material. Due to the nature of the topic, syntactic and phonological aspects are frequently included and the descriptions are sometimes more characteristic of a reference work than a textbook. With its wealth of data and clear presentation of the main issues, it will no doubt prove to be a useful resource for students and researchers alike.

## 5. Syntax

### (a) Modern English

In this section we review publications dealing with IModE and PDE syntax. We start with papers on the intersection between grammar and discourse. Then we move on to studies addressing clauses of various kinds, followed by papers about the verbal domain, including modality and negation, and finally to publications in the nominal domain. The subsection ends with a review of two monographs and concludes with textbooks.

Two papers address the relation between grammar and discourse, from different theoretical perspectives. Rebecca Woods, in ‘Towards a Model of the Syntax–Discourse Interface: A Syntactic Analysis of *Please*’ (*ELL* 25[2021] 121–53) describes the distribution of *please* in the British component of the ICE and argues that *please* should be considered part of narrow syntax; specifically, a discourse marker expressing the illocutionary act of requesting. She then provides a generative analysis, which mostly builds on the cartographic approach for functional heads in the left periphery. In ‘Managing Information Flow Through Prosody in *It*-Clefts’ (*ELL* 25[2021] 485–511), Charlotte Bourgoin, Gerard O’Grady, and Kristin Davidse analyse the information status and prosody of specificational *it*-clefts in the LLC, as in *It’s their credibility that’s in question*. They show that under the same syntactic configuration, different prosodic patterns, i.e. foci, are possible, and all discourse-familiarity statuses occur. Ultimately, they conclude that there is no direct mapping of the grammatical form with one type of focus. They further argue that reduced clefts are not just reduced but that they constitute a separate construction with its own characteristics and rhetorical effect.

Articles dealing with clauses in IModE and PDE have proliferated this year. On the basis of data from previous studies, Bernd Heine and Gunther Kaltenböck’s ‘From Clause to Discourse Marker: On the Development of Comment Clauses’ (*LangS* 87[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101400](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101400)) argue that the development of comment clauses (e.g. *I think, I mean, I admit*) is a case of cooptation rather than of grammaticalization. Kasper Boye and Peter Harder’s ‘Complement-Taking Predicates, Parentheticals and Grammaticalization’ (*LangS* 88[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101416](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101416)) is mostly theoretical in nature. The authors distinguish between constructional slots for discursively secondary material on the one hand, and parenthetical Complement-Taking Predicate (CTP) clauses (e.g. *Cassio’s an honest man, I think*) as potential fillers of such slots on the other. This distinction allows them to broaden the range of types of CTP clauses that fit in those slots, and ultimately to argue that not all CTP clauses ‘can be claimed to be grammatical(ized)’ (p. 16). For instance, the parenthetical involved in *She is nuts, he actually had the temerity to say* is ‘too idiosyncratic to be part of the grammar’ (p. 16). On the basis of insights like these, the authors offer an improved account of the grammaticalization of parenthetical CTP clauses and claim to set the ground for future crosslinguistic research in this area.

Charlotte Maekelberghe’s ‘Assessing the Impact of Syntactic Complement Type on the Modifying Status of Complement-Taking Predicates: The Case of *Imagine*’ (*LangS* 86[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101390](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101390)) explores whether the parenthetical uses of *imagine* CTP clauses ‘have led to a reconfiguration in the broader *imagine* network’ (p. 5); more specifically, the author examines whether there is a division of labour between the

different complementation patterns of *imagine*, and the extent to which other complementation patterns of this verb have acquired similar conventionalized (modal) meanings. Idan Landau's 'Duality of Control in Gerundive Complements of P' (*JL* 57[2021] 783–813) presents a generative analysis of ditransitive verbs that take as their second complement a PP in the form of a gerund (*They talked Bill into committing a crime*). He distinguishes between two types: verbs with an implicative meaning (occurring with *to*, *into*, *out of*, and *from*) and a smaller, less semantically coherent group with non-implicative meaning (with *of*, *with*, and *against*). He claims that previous work has focused too much on the surface level (e.g. only sentences with *into*) and not enough on the underlying abstract system, as represented by the syntactic differences between the two groups. In 'Category-Free Complement Selection in Causal Adjunct Phrases' (*ELL* 25[2021] 719–41), Sadayuki Okada explores the phenomenon of *because X* (*because homework*) and analyses it as a blending of the subordinator *because* and the phrasal adjunct *because of NP*. Based on data from the *OED*, *COHA*, and *GloWbE*, he proposes that this new structure occurred with NPs for several centuries and only recently extended to adjectives, adverbs, and verbs. He also examines whether other causal adjuncts with truncated prepositions show similar developments, but this is not convincingly the case.

Maïte Dupont's monograph *Conjunctive Markers of Contrast in English and French: From Syntax to Lexis and Discourse* is a thorough contrastive corpus study of English and French, providing plenty of material for researchers working just on English. The introduction outlines the purposes: to carry out a detailed corpus-based analysis of conjunctive markers denoting 'contrast', thus allowing a detailed comparison of frequencies, syntactic types (coordinators, subordinators, and adjuncts), and positions of syntactically flexible conjunctive adjuncts. Chapters 2-4 provide an overview of previous research and definitions and outlines the theoretical framework, a combination of corpus linguistics and Systemic Functional Linguistics. Chapters 5 and 6 outline the data – two corpora of editorials and research articles in both languages – and provide details on the selection and handling of relevant examples. The results in chapter 7 provide evidence against earlier proposals: for instance, English in fact uses more conjunctive markers of all three syntactic types than French does. The chapter also includes detailed information on differences in frequencies of specific lexical options, as well as discourse effects of the syntactic options and absence or presence of conjunctive markers. A register analysis sheds light on cohesive strategies in the editorials and research articles; for instance, more sentence-initial coordinators can be observed in editorials than in research articles. Chapter 8 focuses on conjunctive adjuncts only, identifying two thematic and three rhematic positions. All positions are available in English as well as in French, but the frequencies differ, especially for the rhematic positions. In English, the first rhematic position, on the boundary of theme and rheme, is noticeably more frequent in editorials than in academic prose. The author identifies conjunctive adjuncts, especially when they do not occur sentence-initially, as not only having a linking function but also a rhetorical function, such as emphasizing a different part of the sentence. Chapter 9 concludes. The book is rich in detail (perhaps this is also the greatest drawback: it is over 400 pages long). Its main contribution is in providing data to test earlier claims about differences between the two languages, and a further understanding especially of the internal structure of the rheme, which has received far less attention in the literature than the theme.

While it only considers one semantic category (i.e. ‘contrast’), it also manages to address many larger issues.

*From Subordination to Insubordination* by Cristina Lastres-López presents *A Functional-Pragmatic Approach to If/Si-Constructions in English, French and Spanish Spoken Discourse*. Chapter 1 introduces the hypothesis and the research questions. Chapter 2 offers a clear overview of the literature on conditionals and insubordination from a functional-pragmatic, corpus-based, and contrastive perspective. Chapter 3 deals with the corpora and the methodology adopted in the case studies presented in chapter 4 (for English, the corpora selected are the British Parliament Hansard Corpus and ICE-GB). The first two case studies have the same structure, thus facilitating comparison: they approach conditional subordination (e.g. *If it converted to a horse business, no business rate would still be charged*) in parliamentary discourse and in informal conversations. The third and last case study is based on previous work by the author (see *YWES* 99[2020] 34). It focuses on cases of *if/si*-insubordination (e.g. *If you could get that across to her*). The 3,558 tokens analysed in this chapter confirm the author’s hypothesis; *if/si*-constructions are quite rich with regard to the discourse-pragmatic functions they can fulfil, in that they convey ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions in the three languages investigated. The results also show some interesting cross-linguistic and cross-register differences; for instance, interpersonal conditionals are much more frequent in informal conversations, and modal verbs are clearly a distinctive feature of English ideational conditionals. Furthermore, *if/si*-insubordinated clauses are attested in the three languages examined, but they occur sparingly in English where they are typically used to encode requests. Chapter 5 nicely combines the many different functions of *if/si*-constructions discussed in chapter 4 with a proposal for their path of development. The monograph ends with a concise chapter on suggestions for further research, followed by an appendix that includes the metadata and contextual information of the conversations analysed in the first two case studies. On the whole, Cristina Lastres-López’s study is a welcome read that fills a gap in the literature on conditionals from a cross-linguistic perspective. It is interesting that in her concluding chapter, the author mentions the pedagogical application of her investigation, an aspect that is discussed in *Doing English Grammar: Theory, Description and Practice* by Roger Berry, which is reviewed below.

Moving to the verbal domain, Peter Hallman’s paper discusses ‘On Passive and Perfect Participles’ (in Kleantes K. Grohmann, Akemi Matsuya, and Eva-Maria Remberger, eds., *Passives Cross-Linguistically: Theoretical and Experimental Approaches*, pp. 64–97). The author reviews the properties of verbal passives, adjectival passives, and perfects, and provides a generative analysis. He claims that the abstract morpheme ‘-EN’ is the default verb form when no other verb form is selected; and that the passive is not marked by the participle but by the type of *to be*, either a copular *to be* resulting in an adjectival passive or passive *to be*, which does not assign accusative case. In the same volume, Caterina L. Paolazzi, Nino Grillo, and Andrea Santi examine ‘The Source of Passive Sentence Difficulty: Task Effects and Predicate Semantics, Not Argument Order’ (pp. 359–93). The authors carry out experiments consisting of acceptability judgements and comprehension tests with British English native speakers to investigate whether passive sentences are more difficult to parse than active sentences, as often claimed in earlier work. The authors conclude that passives are

not more complex to parse than actives, but that there is some evidence of statives being more difficult than eventives.

In the verbal domain, there is also Signe Oksefjell Ebeling's 'Score or to Score a Goal: Transitivity in Football Match Reports' (*ES* 102[2021] 243–66), which explores how often prototypically transitive verbs are used intransitively. In broad terms, 'football verbs' such as *net*, *save*, and *play* are shown to manifest a greater tendency towards object omission than more general verbs such as *feed*, *create*, and *take*. In a data-rich paper by Matt Hunt Gardner, Derek Denis, Marisa Brook, and Sali A. Tagliamonte, entitled 'Be like and the Constant Rate Effect: From the Bottom to the Top of the S-Curve' (*ELL* 25[2021] 281–324), over 15,000 tokens are analysed of *be like* quotatives in sociolinguistic interviews from Toronto, Canada and York, England. The authors conclude that *be like* originates around the same time in the two places, seemingly independently, and argue that the development follows the Constant Rate Effect: all contexts (e.g. person, tense) show the development in a parallel fashion, rather than the innovation spreading from one context to another – but they modify the Constant Rate Effect to account for a saturation point of less than 1.

A number of papers deal with modality in PDE. Robbie Love and Nial Curry's 'Recent Change in Modality in Informal Spoken British English: 1990s–2010s' (*ELL* 25[2021] 537–62) focuses on changes in the frequency of core modal auxiliaries (e.g. *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *shall*, *should*, *will*, and *would*), semi-modals (e.g. *ought to* and *need*), and a selection of lexical modality changing devices (e.g. *possible*); these frequency data are accompanied by a description of the changing functions (e.g. epistemic, deontic, dynamic) of the core modal auxiliaries between the 1990s and 2010s in spoken BrE. Although no significant trends in functional change are attested, the authors encourage researchers to consider form-function relationships to gain a more nuanced perspective on modality in English. Susanne Flach's 'Beyond Modal Idioms and Modal Harmony' (*ELL* 25[2021] 743–65) contributes to the validity of focusing on both form and function in the realm of modality, making use of collocation analysis to measure the degree of idiomaticity of a number of modal + adverb collocations (e.g. *would rather*, *may well*, *would well*, *will really*), with data from COCA. Another study published this year that focuses on modality is Sali Tagliamonte and Jennifer Smith's 'Obviously Undergoing Change: Adverbs of Evidentiality Across Time and space' (*LVC* 33[2021] 81–105). The article deals with the adverb of evidentiality *obviously* across over thirty communities in the UK and Canada, showing that its development does not follow a sequential order but rather takes place 'near simultaneously in both the UK and Canada' (p. 99). The authors suggest that this could be explained by the increasingly globalized communication networks of the modern world. Last, Laura Kastronic and Shana Poplack's 'Be that as it may: The Unremarkable Trajectory of the English Subjunctive in North American Speech' (*LVC* 33[2021] 107–34) examines the diachronic trajectory of the subjunctive in North AmE speech. Their results for Present Day North AmE, based on the *Quebec English Corpus* (2002–2005), reveal that mandatory and adverbial subjunctives are extremely rare and heavily lexically constrained.

In the area of negation, Gunnell Tottie's 'Not-Negation Revisited' discusses the 'Variation Between *A* and *Any* in Verb Complements in Contemporary Spoken American English' (*ELL* 25[2021] 513–35). The analysis of 21,084 *not*-negated sentences from the spoken component of COCA reveals that variation is rare with copular *be*, but common with

existential *be* and *have*, and also with abstract nouns such as *problem*, as in *There wasn't a/any problem*, and *I don't have a/any problem*. Bert Capelle's article 'not-Fragments and Negative Expansion' (*C&F* 13[2021] 55–81) provides the first constructionist analysis of a discourse-level construction that he terms 'negative expansion construction' (p. 71). Being a characteristic of spoken (informal / spontaneous) discourse, the pattern is formed by a negated clause, followed by a series of negative clause fragments that repeat the negation from the preceding clause, as in the illustrative example *It will never happen. Not today. Not tomorrow. Not ever*. Diego Krivochen's 'NEG Lowering into Quantifiers' (*ALH* 53[2021] 91–125) provides a theoretical analysis working within generative grammar of sentences where the negation that applies to the subordinate clauses surfaces in the main clause, as in *I don't think that he will come*, which actually means *I think that he will not come*. We should also mention Claire Childs's 'The Grammaticalisation of *Never* in British English Dialects: Quantifying Syntactic and Functional Change' (*JL* 57[2021] 531–68). This paper sets out to explore the extent to which the variation in the use of *never* in PDE reflects its historical development: from expressing (i) universal quantification over time (e.g. *He's never been to Paris*), and (ii) non-quantification meanings equivalent to *didn't* (e.g. *She waited but he never arrived*), to the development of a third use where *never* is used with other predicates (e.g. *I never won that competition yesterday*). Finally, there is 'Mechanisms of Grammaticalization in the Variation of Negative Question Tags' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 419–58) by Claire Childs. Using conversational data from Glasgow, Tyneside, and Salford, she compares full forms (*isn't it*), reduced forms (*int it*), and coalesced forms (*innit*) for aspects of grammaticalization. All varieties show erosion of forms and an effect of age, but there is little evidence of decategorization, and desemanticization and extension are not straightforward, suggesting a complex picture of the interaction between these aspects of grammaticalization. The author suggests that the change in Tyneside is ongoing, i.e. least progressed, and led by younger men; see also section 9 (p. 75) for additional information on Childs's studies.

In the nominal domain, Lotte Sommerer and Andreas Baumann's 'Of Absent Mothers, Strong Sisters and Peculiar Daughters: The Constructional Network of English NPN Constructions' (*CogLing* 32[2021] 97–131) focuses on the constructional network of patterns consisting of singular count nouns conjoined by a preposition such as *day to day* and *step by step*. The article addresses their frequency, productivity, their semantics, and extension potential. With usage-based data from COCA, subjected to a number of collostructional analyses, it is argued that speakers may find it difficult to abstract a 'mother node' (that is, a general schema) in a bottom-up fashion. Finally, Susan Reichelt's 'Recent Developments of the Pragmatic Markers *Kind of* and *Sort of* in Spoken British English' (*ELL* 25[2021] 563–80) reports on the dramatic increase in frequency of *kind of* from 1994 to 2014 and the continued prevalence of *sort of* as the preferred option in British English varieties. Zhen Wu considers 'Compound Pronouns in English' (*ELL* 25[2021] 825–49), for example *someone* and *nothing*, a combination of a determinative and a nominal morpheme. The author reviews their properties, focusing on coordination and modification, and argues that they are best analysed as compound phrases, behaving syntactically as NPs but morphologically as compounds. The paper also discusses compound pronouns that are truly lexical, for instance because they have a plural (*somebodies*) or allow premodification (*a political nobody*). Muteb Alqarni's 'The Syntax of PP-Adverbs within English Determiner Phrases'

(*ELL* 25[2021] 325–45) considers adverbials of the type *this month*, which he analyses as adverbs containing a null preposition *of* and a noun phrase, and which can occur between a head noun and its PP-complement, as in *the election this month of the first female president*. He presents a generative analysis, which builds on extraposition of the PP-complement.

In the following, we will discuss contributions about patterns involving adjectives and adverbs. Claudia Lehmann's 'About as Boring as Flossing Sharks' (*CogLing* 32[2021] 133–58) discusses the constructional family of approximate comparison constructions using data from COCA. This family consists of three constructions following the pattern *about as X as Y*, but differing in terms of their function; that is, they may express literal comparison (*about as high as a tall pine*), simile (*about as American as Apple Pie*), and irony (*about as interesting as iceberg lettuce*). Collostructional analysis is used to identify the collexemes (adjectives) most attracted to the X slot of each construction. The author argues that these adjectives serve as cues for the correct interpretation of the construction before speakers complete their utterance. Timothy Osborne analyses 'Adjectives as Roots of Nominal Groups: The Big Mess Construction in Dependency Grammar', (*FoLi* 55[2021] 231–63). Osborne proposes a Dependency Grammar analysis of the so-called Big Mess Construction (e.g. *so big a scandal* or *so good of a bargain*). He regards the adjective as the head of the phrase (rather than the noun, the article, or the preposition *of*, as in earlier proposals), with the presence of a degree adverb forcing a category shift to explain the construction's NP behaviour (much like *the wealthy*). The analysis is based on a review of several properties, such as the optional appearance of *of*, as well as on a comparison to similar structures, such as binominal noun phrases. Martin Schäfer's 'From *Quick* to *Quick-To-Infinitival*: On What is Lexeme Specific Across Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic Distributions' (*ELL* 25[2021] 347–77) approaches the versatility of the adjective *quick* and its semantic neighbours. Ulrike Stange's contribution "'He Should So Be in Jail": An Empirical Study on Preverbal *So* in American English' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 114–36) discusses a recent addition to the English intensifier system, namely the so-called GenX *so*, as in the title of her article. Data are taken from the SOAP corpus, consisting of transcripts of American soap operas (2001–12). Preverbal *so* is very flexible as it has a wide collocational range in affirmative uses (e.g. *want, get, deserve, appreciate, hope, regret, wish*, etc.), it occurs before or after auxiliaries, and it has been attested after the negator *not* (e.g. *He so does not deserve her*) and even in questions (*How can you so revel in your own sister's pain?*). The author also analyses speaker age and gender, but while we agree this corpus provides useful new data, its scripted language can hardly be used to study sociolinguistic factors. Karin Aijmer in 'That's Well Good' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 18–38) approaches the re-emergent intensifier *well* in current British English on the basis of the old BNC (1994) and the new Spoken BNC (2014). It is shown that *well* has increased in frequency and that this intensifying adverb is used in the place of others (e.g. *very*) that are considered to be more familiar and less expressive; for an additional mention of Aijmer study, see section 9 (p. 90).

In 'Ongoing Change in the Australian English Amplifier System' (*AJL* 41[2021] 166–94), Martin Schweinberger studies amplifying degree adverbs (e.g. *really*) in spoken private conversations in the Australian part of the ICE. The author shows that *really* has replaced *very* as the dominant amplifier (in apparent time data) and that this has happened mostly due to *really* collocating with several high-frequency adjectives, a process which he views as a

case of entrenchment. On the same phenomenon but in a different variety, the same author reports ‘On the Waning of Forms – A Corpus-Based Analysis of Decline and Loss in Adjective Amplification’ (In Svenja Kranich and Tine Breban, eds. *Lost in Change: Causes and Processes in the Loss of Grammatical Elements and Constructions*, pp. 235–60) using Wellington Corpus of Spoken New Zealand English. A regression analysis shows that age is the single most important factor in the apparent-time decline of *very* and the rise of *really*. Schweinberger concludes that the trajectory of decline is different from the trajectory of innovation: the trajectory of decline is uniform and its spread is not determined by social or syntactic factors, as many innovations are.

We will now discuss two monographs. Robert Malcolm Ward Dixon is the author of *English Prepositions: Their Meanings and Uses*, a fully comprehensive account of fifty main prepositions in English. Apart from insights on their origin and development, interesting comparisons are drawn between alternating prepositions (e.g. *to* and *at* in *Mike threw the ball to Ian* and *Mike threw the ball at Ian*). The wealth of examples given throughout the book have been retrieved from various standard corpora and sources, which clearly give a sense of the uses of these prepositions, their structural possibilities, and their semantic scope. After some preliminaries, where the author highlights the aim of the book (i.e. ‘to provide an integrated account of the main prepositions of English’ p. ix), the chapter ‘A Story to Tell’ prepares the ground for the two main parts that make up the book. Part I delves into the forms of prepositions in English. It deals with inner and outer prepositional phrases, depending on whether the PP provides spatial or temporal modification to a verb (*She sat below the window*) or to a complete sentence (*Jack broke the plate [in the garden] [at the pub] [at noon] [on Monday]*). It also discusses prepositional stranding (*Who is Sylvia living with?*), complex prepositions (or sequences of two prepositions, as in *out on* in *Marcia took her anger out on Henry*), and constructions where prepositions are modified by adverbs (*Jerry put the canister [just inside the room]*) or follow their noun phrase (*She slept the night through*). This part ends with two chapters devoted to the special properties of phrasal (e.g. *bring about*) and prepositional verbs (e.g. *rely on*). Part II, which is much longer than Part I, comprises ten chapters, each of them dealing with a set of semantically related prepositions. Chapters 5-6 concern relational prepositions with minor reference to space or time (e.g. *of, for, by, and with*, among others). Chapters 7-13 are concerned with prepositions with a basic spatial meaning and several extended abstract senses (e.g. *at, to, towards, from*, etc.). Finally, chapter 14 discusses temporal prepositions (e.g. *since, until/till, during, after, before*, etc.) following the same procedure as in the preceding chapters. The last chapter of the book, ‘Do It Your Way’, contains a discussion on prescriptivism, criticism on the treatment of prepositions in dictionaries, and reflections on cases of variation between speakers (L1 vs L2) and regions (AmE vs BrE / AusE). The chapter closes with ‘Moving Forward’, where the author speculates about the future of prepositions. All in all, this is a book wide in scope but very simple to read; a must-have for those looking for a bird’s eye view of the syntax and semantics of the main English prepositions.

Roger Berry’s book seeks to build a bridge between the theory and practice of grammar teaching. It is divided into two parts. The first part is mostly theoretical in nature. Chapters 1 to 3 introduce key theories of grammar teaching and highlight the need for new descriptions, mostly for such reasons as the prevalence of misconceptions, language change ,

or the discovery of new grammatical phenomena that have been around for some time without being noticed. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss terminological aspects, and how to deal with formality and acceptability. Chapter 6, entitled ‘Grammar in Operation’, serves as a transition between the theoretical aspects discussed, and the case studies presented in Chapters 7-10. For a detailed discussion of these case studies, we refer to the review of Berry’s book in section 1 (pp. 3). All in all, the book aims to foster communication between different communities involved in the teaching of English grammar.

Also on English grammar is Michael McCarthy’s textbook, *English Grammar: The Basics*. The book mostly takes a UK perspective and is aimed at a general audience of native speakers. The first part is what one would expect from a grammar book, with chapter 1 explaining what grammar is, chapter 2 introducing morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, and sentences, and chapters 3 and 4 diving deeper into lexical and grammatical word classes. Then the book changes perspective a little, turning into a book *about* grammar rather than just explaining grammar itself. Chapter 5 discusses major grammatical theories and their history, while chapter 6 addresses the grammatical features characteristic of spoken language (such as pragmatic markers, non-standard agreement, and ellipsis), as well as looking at some aspects of varieties of English. The aim here, too, is not to give a complete overview but give the reader a sense of how (descriptive) linguists view and analyse these features. Chapter 7 reviews discussions about, and historical developments in, grammar teaching in schools in various English-speaking countries. The book ends with a chapter on some well-known and well-debated issues (singular *they*, apostrophes, *like*, semicolons). Throughout the book, McCarthy manages to balance a precise and accessible description of each phenomenon, a fair account of the different opinions, and clear explanation of how each feature has its place in language – as a social phenomenon and one that is constantly changing. This is a fun and easy-to-read book, which, while it may not be a typical textbook, can certainly be used as such in a first-year course; it will also be useful for students who are not doing a degree in linguistics but would benefit from both technical knowledge and an insight into how language works, especially in society.

Finally, several textbooks and reference works were republished this year, with some necessary updates and changes in layout, but largely offering the same content: the excellent introduction to syntax *Analysing Sentences: An Introduction to English Syntax* by Noel Burton-Roberts, now in its fifth edition; the indispensable reference grammar the *Grammar of Spoken and Written English* by Douglas Biber, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey N. Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan; and the student version of that other major reference grammar, *A Student’s Introduction to English Grammar* by Rodney Huddleston, Geoffrey K. Pullum, and Brett Reynolds.

### (b) *Earlier syntax*

In this section, we discuss publications dealing with the earlier stages of English and those that show a diachronic approach to the study of English syntax. We follow the same thematic structure as in previous section: we start with papers at the intersection between grammar and discourse, then move on to papers dealing with the verbal domain, starting with those contributions that adopt a particular theoretical framework and following with those that adopt a more eclectic approach. The remaining papers reviewed in this section concern the

nominal domain, and in particular this year expressions conveying intensification. We wrap up the section by discussing a textbook.

A number of contributions focus on the use of specific patterns in discourse. Diane M. Lewis's 'Pragmatic Markers at the Periphery and Discourse Prominence' (in Daniël Van Olmen and Jolanta Šinkuniene, eds., *Pragmatic Markers and Peripheries*, pp. 351-82) deals with the diachronic distribution of *of course* in British English since the 1700s. Though no major differences are attested in its distribution, *of course* has developed certain discourse-structuring functions, with the left periphery being used to introduce prominent information units, and the right periphery to comment on a previous idea. What remains to be explored is the degree of grammaticalization of *of course* at both peripheries and how *of course* may evolve in the future. For a more detailed discussion of Van Olmen and Šinkuniene's volume, see section 13 (p. 134-135). Rafał Molencki's 'The Grammaticalization of the Epistemic Adverb *Perhaps* in Late Middle and Early Modern English' (*SAP* 56[2021] 411–24) supplements previous diachronic studies on the process of grammaticalization of *perhaps* with late ME data from the *MED* and the analysis of other synonymous modal adverbials based on the Old Norse root *happ* 'good luck, good fortune, chance', such as *haply/hapliche* and *happily/happiliche*. María José López-Couso and Belén Méndez-Naya's 'From Complementizing to Modifying Status' explores the grammaticalization of the clauses *chances are* and *odds are* (*LangS* 88[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101422](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2021.101422)). With AmE data from COHA and COCA, the authors subtly demonstrate how constructions of the type NP<sub>PL</sub> + BE + complement clause develop into parentheticals in PDE, with the earliest examples dating back to the first quarter of the twentieth century (e.g. *You do not need the money involved. You never will need it, the chances are*).

On OE clauses, Gerardo Sánchez Argüelles reviews 'The Status of Compound Relatives in the Northumbrian Old English Gloss to the Rushworth Gospels', (*ES* 102[2021] 511–32). Sánchez argues that compound *seþe*-relatives should be recognized as a relativization strategy independent from *se* and *þe*-relatives. He shows that these *seþe*-relatives are particularly frequent in the Rushworth Gospels and that they have distinct morphological and syntactic characteristics, as well as unique discourse properties in conveying foregrounded information and marking topic-shifts. Elly van Gelderen's 'Variations on *what for* in the History of English' (*JCGL* 24[2021] 245–67) examines kind-questioning constructions in the history of English. She identifies an OE 'What Partitive Construction' (*what* plus a partitive genitive noun), which she analyses as having a null head noun, and which later develops into '*what* plus a light head noun and *of*', as in *what kind of man*. Another kind-questioning option arises in eModE, the *what for* construction, similar to Dutch and German; however, this construction occurs too late and is too different to be a successor of the *What Partitive Construction*, and it dies out in the nineteenth century. The article concludes with a generative analysis of all constructions.

Anna Cichosz considers word order in 'Verb-Final Conjunct Clauses in Old English Prose', examining in particular 'The Role of Latin in Translated Texts' (*NOWELE* 74[2021] 172–98) with data from the YCOE. Her data show that there is substantial intertextual variation. She then analyses Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* in more detail and concludes that its high percentage of verb-final order is due to a translation effect of Latin. Also on OE word order, Ans van Kemenade and Christine Meklenborg analyse 'Issues in the Left Periphery of

Old French and Old English: Topic Types and the V2 Constraint' (in Sam Wolfe and Christine Meklenborg, eds., *Continuity and Variation in Germanic and Romance*, pp. 248–74). Working within a generative framework, they examine two types of topicalization in OE and Old French – left-dislocation and hanging topics – to gain further insight into the left periphery in the two languages. The main conclusion is that in both languages, hanging topics are in a higher topic position in the left periphery and left-dislocated topics in a lower position; but the position of the verb differs between the two languages. On eModE word order, Javier Pérez-Guerra, in 'Object-Verb in Early Modern English: Modelling Markedness' (*SAP* 56[2021] 85–119), carries out a multivariate statistical analysis of OV and VO order in PPCEME and PCEEC, the period when OV had already become marked but not completely disappeared. The model includes a range of variables based on form (length, genre, auxiliary, type of clause). It appears that OV is favoured in speech-like genres, with shorter and pronominal objects, and in certain types of clauses. Unfortunately, the numbers that are used as input for the statistical analysis are not included.

Erik Smitterberg's *Syntactic Change in Late Modern English: Studies on Colloquialization and Densification* aims to merge insights gained from social-network theory with the view that language change in lModE is more limited than in other periods. This goal is achieved with the help of four corpus-based studies that focus on colloquialization and densification, as represented by the following four linguistic features: *not*-contraction (e.g. *wont* vs *will not*), co-ordination by *and* in linguistic units above the phrase level (e.g. *I [went to the theatre] and [saw a comedy]*), nominal premodifiers in noun phrases (e.g. *a book room*), and participle clauses as postmodifiers in noun phrases (e.g. *the lady crossing the street*). The book revolves around what the author refers to as the 'stability paradox', which involves three apparently contradictory assumptions in the literature concerning language change during lModE, namely 'that the lModE period featured weakened social-network ties, that weakened ties facilitate language change, and that little structural change took place in lModE' (p. 2). The author's proposal is that even though plenty of language change occurred, this did not affect the overall structure of lModE, and that 'change on the idiolectal level' can be regarded as 'the actual correlate of weak network ties' (p. 3). Chapters 2, 3, and 4 provide the theoretical and methodological background to the study. Chapter 2 delves into the mediating role of social networks between sociocultural changes on the one hand, and linguistic changes on the other. Chapter 3 deals with three different types of language change (independent innovation, propagation, and propagation-dependent innovation, that is, imperfect replication during propagation), and how loose networks promote the last two. Chapter 4 addresses historical corpus linguistics, the notions of densification and colloquialization, the variationist and text-linguistic approach to frequency, and the corpora used in the different case studies outlined in Chapters 5–8 (CONCE and CNNE). Results show that the four features under investigation (see above) are well established in the English syntax of the nineteenth century; however, important changes in their distribution can be observed, probably 'mediated through specific linguistic and extralinguistic contexts' (p. 90). The results confirm the hypothesis that colloquialization (as represented by *not*-contraction and co-ordination by *and*) and densification (as represented by nominal premodifiers and participle postmodifiers in noun phrases) 'were underway in nineteenth-century English' (p. 266). Some language users reacted to this development by

adjusting their idiolects, propagating densification and colloquialization further. All in all, with his focus on idiolect, and with his careful use of IModE corpora, the author has provided a solution to the ‘stability paradox’. This insightful and well-written book is a must-read for researchers interested in sociolinguistics as well as corpus and historical linguistics.

Several papers and one book address various types of clauses within the framework of Construction Grammar. Lobke Ghesquière and Faye Troughton’s ‘*What a Change! A Diachronic Study of Exclamative What Constructions*’ (*JEngL* 49[2021] 139–58) explores the origins and the development of exclamative *What* constructions from OE up until PDE to test whether verbless clauses such as *What a pity!* have undergone either a process of reduction via ellipsis or, by contrast, a process of syntactic expansion, with the full, verbal exclamative constructions (e.g. *What a pity it is*) being syntactic expansions of these verbless clauses (e.g. *What a pity!*). William Standing and Peter Petré’s ‘Exploiting Convention: Lifespan Change and Generational Incrementation in the Development of Cleft Constructions’ (in Karen V. Beaman and Isabelle Buchstaller, eds. *Language Variation and Language Change across the Lifespan: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives from Panel Studies*, pp. 141–63) targets cleft constructions (e.g. *It was your Heart that contriv’d it*) and their use in the seventeenth century at the aggregate and the individual level. Using data from the 90-million-word corpus EMMA, the authors argue that the construction, despite being a low-frequent phenomenon, increased in schematicity over this period. Also, individual differences are attested as for the cognitive and social dimension of the construction. The degree of entrenchment of the construction depends on individual language users, and changes across the lifespan are attested in a small but coherent group of individuals, born in later generations, lacking university education, and showing certain social mobility.

In *Changes in Argument Structure: The Transitivity Reaction Object Construction*, Tamara Bouso deals with the characterization and historical development of the Reaction Object Construction (ROC), an English construction where an otherwise intransitive verb is used with an object that expresses an attitude or a reaction of some kind, as in the prototypical example *She mumbled her adoration*. The monograph is divided into two parts. Part I outlines the research questions and hypothesis (when, how, and why the ROC has developed), addresses the process of transitivization that has affected English since OE times (chapter 2), and offers a review of the literature on the reaction object (chapter 3) as well as on the framework of DCxG (chapter 4). Part II consists of three chapters. Chapter 5 characterizes the ROC as a form-meaning pairing (section 5.1), tracks the accumulation of new verbal types in the construction between the fourteenth century up to the twentieth century (section 5.2), and compares the results for the ROC, from the *OED* and other historical reference grammars, with those given in the literature for similar constructions. Chapter 6 zooms in on the development of the ROC over the course of IModE (1710–1920); based on the analysed data from the CLMET3.0, the author proposes a link between the ROC and the British sentimental novel. Also in this chapter, simple collexeme analysis is used to identify the prototypical verbs of the construction. Chapter 7 confirms with data from COHA that the ROC is a BrE innovation that later spread to AmE. It also describes the striking similarities between the American ROC and the *way*-construction (e.g. *He whistled his way across the room*) in terms of theoretical work on constructionalization and constructional changes. In the concluding chapter, the author interprets the historical parallels between the

ROC and other related constructions as being part of the broader, long-term trend of English towards transitivization.

In ‘Another Turn of the Screw on the History of the Reaction Object Construction’ (*FuL* 28[2021] 208–31), Tamara Bouso and Pablo Ruano San Segundo confirm the strong ties between the ROC and the British Sentimental novel but reject the idea that the Direct Discourse Construction (DDC), as in *She smiled, ‘I don’t believe you’*, could have served as a template for the configuration of the ROC. The same authors, in ‘The British Sentimental Novel Corpus (BSNC) and the ROC-DDC Alternation at the Level of the Individual’ (*NJES* 20[2021] 215–57), test the validity of the corpus used in the aforementioned study to carry out quantitative and qualitative analyses at the level of individuals; more specifically, they show that the ROC-DDC alternation, as manifested in *She smiled disbelief vs She smiled, ‘I don’t believe you’*, is a common feature of the narrative style of the eleven canonical British authors represented in the corpus.

Moving now to the area of modality, in ‘Contractions, Constructions and Constructional Change: Investigating Constructionhood of English Modal Contractions from a Diachronic Perspective’ (in Martin Hilpert, Bert Cappelle, and Ilse Depraetere, eds., *Modality and Diachronic Construction Grammar*, pp. 13–52), Robert Daug demonstrates with data from COHA and sophisticated quantitative methods that the underexplored contracted modals *can’t*, *won’t* and *’d* differ from their full counterparts (*cannot*, *will not*, and *would*) in distribution, relative frequency, and collocational preferences. The take-home message is that the analyst should investigate separately the different forms of a given auxiliary, treating them as independent yet related phenomena. Also on modal verbs, Christine Elsweler addresses ‘Convergence and Divergence in Two Historical Varieties of English: Pragmalinguistic Strategies in Commissive and Directive Speech Acts in Scottish and English Letters (1500–1700)’ (*Anglistik* 32[2021] 115–38), based on letters from the Helsinki corpus and PCEEC. She shows that both Scots and English letter writers in the sixteenth century use *may* to mitigate direct requests and *shall* to express commitments, but that in the seventeenth century – when Scottish converges towards a Southern English standard in morphology and spelling – these uses drop out in English letters while they are still used in Scottish letters. She explains this with reference to a different community of practice in the seventeenth century, and also by arguing that this change, unlike spelling and morphology, takes place below the level of consciousness. Finally, Svenja Kranich discusses ‘Decline and Loss in the Modal Domain in Recent English’ (in Kranich and Breban, eds., pp. 261–89). She investigates loss in the modal domain in COHA in the second half of the twentieth century, against the backdrop of similar, previous studies (core modals decline, while semi-modals increase); in the present study, she zooms in on *must* and *may*, and in particular the *we may say* construction. Her findings are twofold: different modals and modal constructions decline at different rates (i.e. there is a complex picture behind a general development) and genre plays an important role.

Next, we review other contributions to the verbal domain that do not necessarily comply with one particular theoretical framework. Carla Bouzada-Jabois’s *Nonfinite Supplements in the Recent History of English* provides a full-fledged account of nonfinite supplements based on corpus data from IModE and PDE texts. The monograph consists of six chapters. Chapters 1 and 2 serve as an introduction to the object of study. The author

mentions that she uses the label ‘supplement’ quite restrictively. In Huddleston and Pullum’s *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (2002), supplements are defined as ‘elements which occupy a position in linear sequence without being integrated into the syntactic structure of the sentence’ (p. 1350); in Carla Bouzada-Jabois’ definition, by contrast, the head of these elements is always a nonfinite *ing-* or *ed-* form that lacks an explicit subject (e.g. *Having read the report, Max was sure he had nothing to worry about*) and is sometimes introduced by a conjunction or a preposition, as in *Any soldier (...), may, if approved by competent Military Authority (...), be reengaged to serve (...)*. Other formal and semantic properties of supplements are outlined in chapter 2; among them, the types of control relations between the supplement and the main clause, and the different semantic classifications of supplements, including the one proposed by the author. Chapter 3 describes the corpora used (PPCMBE and ICE-GB) alongside the fine-grained process of searching and retrieving the data from each corpus. This chapter also reports on precision and recall, the configuration of the database, and the variables that form the basis for the analysis in the two subsequent chapters. Chapter 4 focuses on IModE nonfinite supplements involving (simple and more complex) *-ed* and *-ing* forms (e.g. *having considered*, or *having been cooked*). The results presented here are quite extensive. In brief, there is an overall preference for *ing-* supplements; still the use of *ed-* supplements increases over time. There is also an increase in the use of connectors, especially with *ing-* supplements. As for their semantics and textual distribution, supplements usually convey informative meanings, and are found to be more frequent in formal and narrative text types. Chapter 5 blends these IModE results with PDE data. As in older stages of the language, simple *ing-* supplements are the preferred constructional option, and connectors are still more frequent with *ed-* supplements. The main differences with the IModE data lie in the lack of increase in *ed-* supplements, and in the disassociation between augmentation on the one hand, and unrelated and short supplements on the other. The chapter also proposes a ‘non-periphery’ construction, generalizing from the similarities between supplements and absolutes in terms of frequency, form, and function.

*Verb-Governed Infinitival Complementation in the Recent History of English* by Sofia Bemposta-Rivas delves into the factors that condition the variation between *to* and bare infinitives with the pre-modal verb *dare* and the lexical verbs *need* and *help*. The author adopts an eclectic and corpus-based/driven approach, relying on data from six different historical corpora (PPCME2, PCEEC, PPCEME, PPCMBE, BNC Baby, and COHA). The research questions addressed in the two core chapters of the book (chapter 3 and 4) concern the nature of the variation (categorical vs probabilistic) as well as the intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors that are suspected to influence the choice between *to-* and bare-infinitival complementation with the verbs selected: frequency, diachrony, the variety of English in question (AmE vs BrE), and the meaning of the main-clause verb, among others. Fine-grained details on the coding of these variables and the statistical multivariate analyses performed are provided in chapter 2. The book concludes in chapter 5 with a summary of the findings, and a note on future research. The results show that changes in the complementation patterns of the verbs *dare*, *need*, and *help* can be observed in the transition between ME to eModE and also from IModE to PDE. In very broad terms, all verbs have alternated since ME. In eModE *dare* and *need* reflect opposing trends; in IModE *dare* and *need* opt for the bare-infinitive alternative whereas *help* displays a statistically significant preference for *to-*

infinitival clauses. Finally, in PDE, *need* shows more instances of the *to*-alternative as opposed to *help* and *dare*, which typically govern bare infinitives. It is revealing that, for *help*, the two most relevant factors affecting the alternation across periods and varieties are shown to be passivization and the *horror aequi* effect. Two additional interesting results are that in PDE there has been an overall increase in frequency of *to*-infinitives, and that bare-infinitives are more frequent in AmE than in BrE.

On impersonal constructions, there is one paper and a monograph. On OE and ME, ‘The impersonal construction in the texts of Updated Old English’ by Jan Čermák (in Kranich and Breban, eds., pp. 75–100) aims to illustrate the relevance of what he calls Updated Old English: OE texts edited in early ME, updated by scribes and providing data from a period where not many new texts are produced. He uses the impersonal construction, i.e. non-nominative experiencer subjects, as a case study. His analysis shows a solid continuation of the patterns found in OE, i.e. there are no scribal edits to suggest changes in the syntax at this point. The monograph by Noelia Castro-Chao, entitled *Argument Structure in Flux: The Development of Impersonal Constructions in Middle and Early Modern English, with Special Reference to Verbs of Desire*, fills a gap in the field of impersonal constructions by focusing on corpus data from the eModE period (1500-1700). The author examines the development of the verbs *lust*, *thirst*, and *long*; their common point is that all of them are used in the *OED* and/or the *MED* with the sense ‘to desire’ when involved in grammatical constructions ‘lacking a grammatical subject controlling verbal agreement’ (p. 63). The book is divided into 9 chapters. Chapters 1-3 introduce the research questions, review previous studies, and present theoretical notions such as State of Affairs (SoA) and semantic frame. Chapter 4 applies these semantic notions to the class of verbs of desire, concluding that these verbs are semantically low in transitivity. Also described here is the PDE syntactic patterning of these verbs. Chapter 5 provides details on the corpus used (EEBOCorp 1.0), the texts selected, and the ten main variables that guide the author’s analysis of the data in the individual case studies discussed in chapters 6-8. Chapter 6 focuses on *lust*. This verb decreases in frequency over the course of the eModE period, undergoes semantic specialization, and its impersonal uses can be recorded up to the first half of the sixteenth century; yet all instances attested are fossilized and show ‘a low degree of subject variation’ (p. 130). Its personal uses, by contrast, reveal a great deal of variation, being particularly frequent with clausal complements and pronominal desirers. Chapters 7 and 8 revolve around *thirst* and *long*. These verbs, similarly to *lust*, also decrease in frequency and are mostly restricted to the domain of religion. Impersonal uses are not attested in EEBOCorp 1.0 for either *thirst* or *long*; personal uses once again favour pronominal desirers and prepositional complements. All these preferences are explained by the end-weight principle, and the existence of what the author calls the Move-Attention construction, a metaphorical extension of the intransitive motion construction. With regards to the syntax of *long*, Castro-Chao interestingly observes that some of its clausal complements involve finite clauses introduced by *till/until* (*Thou long’st till thy corn be in the barn* = ‘You long that thy corn be in the barn’). In such contexts, the function of the adverbial subordinator *till/until* is equivalent to that of the major declarative complementizers *that* and *zero*. The monograph concludes in chapter 9, where it becomes clear that, despite the vast literature on the topic, the author has successfully achieved to widen the research area of impersonal constructions.

Also on loss, specialization, and earlier argument structures of English verbs is Ulrike Schneider's 'Loss of Intersective Gradience as the Lifeboat of a Dying Construction' (*FoLi* 55:s42[2021] 429-59), where the author offers 'An Analysis of the Diachronic Change of Causative *Bring*'. Despite being rare, the causative verb *bring* increasingly attracts reflexive objects combined with a modal or negation, as in *She couldn't bring herself to believe what she had overheard*. On OE valency, there is Luisa García-García and Esaúl Ruiz Narbona's 'Lability in Old English Verbs: Chronological and Textual Distribution' (*Anglia* 139[2021] 283-326), which traces the distribution between the seventh and the eleventh centuries CE of a set of OE labile verbs coming from Germanic causative oppositions, e.g. Gem. *\*melta-* 'melt' (intrans.) and *\*maltija-* 'melt' (sth., trans.). The corpus-based results (1,621 tokens for forty-two verbs) confirm a tendency towards lability across text types, already in OE before French influence. Also on OE verbs, 'Old English *Try* Verbs: Grammatical Behaviour and Class Membership' (*SN* 93[2021] 314–32) by Ana Elvira Ojanguren López explores six verbs of trying, such as *onginnan* and *hīgian*. Working within a Role and Reference Grammar framework, she concludes that these verbs form a consistent class based on their syntactic and semantic properties.

The monograph by Lynn Anthonissen, *Individuality in Language Change*, based on the author's PhD dissertation, investigates the development of two special passives in the seventeenth century: the prepositional passive (*They were laughed at*) and the Nominative-cum-Infinitivo (NCI) or ECM passive (*He is said to be a thief*). The author aims to investigate how variation and language change at the community level relate to the individual level, and whether morphosyntactic change is possible in an individual's lifespan. After a short introductory chapter, the theoretical approach, Cognitive CxG, is described (chapter 2), as well as previous work on the English passive in general (Chapter 3) and the two special passives in particular (chapter 4). Chapter 5 describes the EMMA corpus used for the case studies, which contains texts from fifty authors born in the seventeenth century, divided into five generations. The data on the prepositional passive (chapter 6) confirm the previously described increase at the aggregate level, locating the main increase between generations 3 (born between 1635 and 1644) and 4 (born between 1653 and 1667). However, there are considerable differences between individuals, which translates into variation at the community level. Chapter 7 shows that the NCI first increases in frequency, after which the picture becomes less clear. Anthonissen distinguishes between an evidential type (*Of this numerous army, thirty six are said to be hang'd and burnt*) and a modalized type (*Every Man may justly be said to have so much need of such a Motive*); the proportion of evidential examples increases over time, but the modalized type seems to have found a functional niche as it remains in use as a minority pattern. The chapter shows a great many differences between authors as well as lifespan change within individual authors. In chapter 8, Anthonissen argues that the two passives are connected in speakers' cognition, but that it is not evident from the data that they influence each other, especially because they diverge: the prepositional passive continues to expand its range of increase in types, leading to schematization, while the NCI specializes. The book represents an interesting exploration of theoretical questions through two specific case studies (although it is not clear to us why the third special English passive, the recipient passive, is not included); it also provides valuable insights into the 'messiness' underneath straightforward community-level changes and the

role of social networks. At the same time, the aim is mostly theoretical and methodological; the book uses a wide range of statistical methods, while it does not always provide the relevant raw data, making it less widely accessible.

Finally, there are several papers targeting the aspectual system of English. Leszek Szymański's 'A Corpus-Based Analysis of the Modal *Can* with the Perfect in American English from a Synchronic and Diachronic perspective' (*SN* 93[2021] 287–313) examines the meaning(s) expressed by *can* with the perfect, and reports on the gradual obsolescence of this syntactic combination in contemporary American English, based on corpus data from COHA and COCA. Paula Rautioaho and Robert Fuchs's 'Recent Change in Stative Progressives: A Collostructional Investigation of British English in 1994 and 2014' (*ELL* 25[2021] 35–60) builds on previous investigations on the historical development of the progressive to argue against the general impression that stative progressives (e.g. *I am wondering*) have increased in frequency beyond the 1990s; conversational data from the BNC (1990s–2010s) reveals that stative verbs form a rather heterogeneous group and that this alleged increase in frequency only turns out to be statistically significant for eight of the 100 stative verbs analysed, namely for the verbs *hope*, *expect*, *wonder*, *hold*, *think*, *hear*, *belong*, and *love*. Last, 'From *Have*-Omission to Supercompounds: A Wealth of English Perfects' by Marc Fryd (in Kristin Melum Eide and Marc Fryd, eds., *The Perfect Volume: Papers on the Perfect*, pp. 397–438) delves into largely unreported English syntactic patterns involving *have*-omission (e.g. *for those of us who would hated to have seen ...*) and *have*-doubling (e.g. *A better opening act could've not have been chosen for this tour*). Based on a variety of sources, and spanning the whole history of English, this piece of research discusses the many different sources of constructions involving *have*-omission, encourages research on *have*-doubling to test – among other aspects – its productivity, and sets the ground for future investigations on an interesting novel supercompound. Finally, Marianne Hundt's '“The Next Morning I Got a Warrant for the Man and His Wife, but He Was Fled”: Did Sociolinguistic Factors Play a Role in the Loss of the BE-Perfect?' (in Kranich and Breban, eds., pp. 199–233) analyses the loss of the *be*-perfect in the OBC with intransitive verbs indicating a change of state or place. She first traces the loss in frequency, using Variability-based Neighbour Clustering, which shows the most significant change to have occurred between the 1820s and 1830s. She then includes both language-internal (most notably the verb) and social factors (sex, role in court, socio-economic status) in further statistical analyses; the results show that the verb is by far the most important determinant and social factors play a more minor role, although in later stages higher class males seem to lead the change.

In the nominal domain, Louise Mycock and James Misson analyse 'Lone Pronoun Tags in Early Modern English: ProTag Constructions in the Dramas of Jonson, Marlowe and Shakespeare' (*ELL* 25[2021] 379–407). They provide a description of the frequency, forms, and functions of so-called ProTags – a rare phenomenon where a single referential pronoun following a clause or phrase, as in *I'm a floating voter, me* – in eModE, based on the complete works of Jonson, Marlowe, and Shakespeare. They find that personal pronouns are far more common than demonstratives in eModE, while the situation in PDE is the reverse. While the core functions are similar, a further function is found in eModE: questioning.

On articles, there is Lotte Sommerer and Klaus Hofmann's 'Constructional Competition and Network Reconfiguration: Investigating *Sum(e)* in Old, Middle and Early Modern English' (*ELL* 25 [2021] 1–33). With data from the PPCME and the PPCEME alongside the implementation of a number of sophisticated statistical analyses, the authors convincingly show how the determinative *sum(e)* moved from occurring with singular nouns (e.g. & *sum wif hatte Uenus* 'and there was a woman called Venus') to being prototypically used as an indefinite near-article with plural and mass nouns (e.g. *þat he schuld sende summe prestes to þis lond* 'that he should send some priests to this land'). This constructional change is explained in terms of competition with the numeral *ān*, which was the default marker of indefiniteness before singular nouns in OE.

Several papers discuss adjectives. Janusz Malak, in 'Strength and Weakness of the Old English Adjective' (*SAP* 56[2021] 333–59) attempts to account for the difference between weak and strong adjectives in OE, working within a generative framework. The difference, he claims, is not lexically consistent as it is for nouns and verbs, but rather, is based on two different syntactic derivations. Willem B. Hollmann considers 'The "Nouniness" of Attributive Adjectives and "Verbiness" of Predicative Adjectives: Evidence from Phonology' (*ELL* 25[2021] 257–79). Although the evidence is phonological, the implications may be relevant for syntacticians: the most frequent adjectives in the COCA pattern with nouns when used attributively but pattern with verbs when used predicatively. Hollmann takes this as evidence for cross-level harmony of word classes between different levels of linguistic analysis and argues for a usage-based approach to word classes instead of one based on preconceived ideas. Karolina Rudnicka, in 'So-adj-a Construction as a Case of Obsolescence in Progress' (in Kranich and Breban, eds., pp. 51–73) examines the *so*-adj-a construction (*so black a shadow*) in COHA and COCA. She analyses five aspects of what she calls grammatical obsolescence (i.e. loss), such as frequency and a restriction to specific genres, and concludes that this is a case of obsolescence in progress, in that not all requirements for loss are met, and she hypothesizes about further trajectories.

A double special issue of *JEngL* was devoted to on expressions conveying intensification. The first part comprises five articles, two of which were already discussed in the section on Modern syntax. Turo Hiltunen's 'Intensification in Eighteenth Century Medical Writing' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 90–113) explores the function, meaning, frequencies, and co-occurrence patterns of the high-frequency amplifiers *so*, *very*, and *too* in the Corpus of Late Modern English Medical Texts. Claudia Claridge, Ewa Jonsson, and Merja Kytö contribute to the rather neglected area of downtoners in 'A Little Something Goes a Long Way' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 61–89) by focusing on the degree and non-degree uses of 'Little in the Old Bailey Corpus' (e.g. *I waited a little*). Similarly, Laurel Brinton's "'He Loved His Father but Next to Adored His Mother": *Nigh(ly)*, *Near*, and *Next (To)* as Downtoners' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 39–60) narrates the history of the approximator downtoner *nearly* 'almost, all but, virtually', and its earlier variants *nigh(ly)*, *near*, and *next (to)*. The proposed pathway for downtoners is different from the one followed by intensifiers (from degree adjuncts to degree modifiers), and only *nigh* and *nearly* can be conceived as fully realized cases of grammaticalization.

The second part of this special issue comprises five additional papers (one also reviewed earlier in this chapter). Lobke Ghesquière's 'A Good Deal of Intensity: On the

Development of Degree and Quantity Modifier *Good*' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 159–81) relies on the *OED* quotation database to analyse the non-descriptive uses of prenominal *good* from OE to PDE. The study is innovative in that it provides evidence of the intensification potential of unbounded adjectives (*good* follows the same historical pathway as *very*). Victorina González-Díaz's 'Intensificatory Tautology in the History of English' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 182–207) traces the historical development of size-adjective clusters such as *little tiny room*. Turo Vartiainen's 'Trends and Recent Change in the Syntactic Distribution of Degree Modifiers: Implications for a Usage-Based Theory of Word Classes' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 228–51) shows that most modified adjective phrases in the sample data appear in predicative rather than in attributive position, which leads the author to contend that frequency information 'should in some way be incorporated as part of word class theory' (p. 20) and, most particularly, in constructionist approaches to language. Last, Belén Méndez-Naya's 'Synthetic Intensification Devices in Old English' (*JEngL* 49[2021] 208–27) deals with degree modification of adjectives and adverbs by means of spatial formatives such as *þurh-* in *þurhbitter* 'very bitter', and *for-* in *foreape* 'very easily'. With data from standard OE dictionaries and the DOEC, it is argued that the collocational preferences attested for these intensifying morphological devices are influenced by their original space meaning. Out of the three productive formatives identified, *for-* stands out as the most grammaticalized element.

Also on intensification, Martin Schweinberger writes on 'Analyzing Historical Changes in the Irish English Amplifier System' (*Anglistik* 32[2021] 139–58). He investigates amplifiers and adjectives in a corpus of Irish private letters written between 1675 and 1931. The results for lexical diversity, collocational strength, and semantic similarities shows that the amplifiers in attributive position are stable, while there is more variation in predicative position. *Very* is by far (75%) the most frequent amplifier in the dataset, but is overtaken by *so* in the most recent period, which Schweinberger suggests may be due to the close association with predicative *good*.

We finally turn now to textbooks. Martin Hilpert's *Ten Lectures on Diachronic Construction Grammar* offers a general overview of how CxG as a theory of linguistic knowledge can be applied to the study of language variation and change. It starts off with a summary of the theoretical foundations of the framework in the form of ten basic ideas, and five major controversies. Chapter 2 explains the allure of DCxG, how it differs from grammaticalization theory, and how the latter has recently been navigating towards a constructionist perspective. Chapter 3 recasts some of the ideas presented in chapter 1 to delve deeper into three open questions in the field: (i) the cognitive dimension of DCxG, (ii) the point at which constructions emerge as new form-meaning pairings, and (iii) what Hilpert calls the 'fat node problem' (p. 72), that is, the idea that much constructionist work focuses on the constructions themselves rather than on the relations between and among constructions. To highlight the relevance of these relations, or associative links, Hilpert relies on historical data from COHA for nine English auxiliaries (*would, might, could, must, shall, should, can, may, and will*) followed by a verb in the infinitive. Using multidimensional scaling and distinctive collexeme analysis, he shows how modals have been undergoing semantic changes ; *may*, for instance, has developed towards a more epistemic meaning in the 2000s (e.g. *I may have told you*), and the modal *would*, as opposed to *might*, has developed towards politeness-oriented formulas (*If you would permit me to advise*). Shifts in

collocational preferences are the focus of chapter 4, which analyses Germanic future constructions in Danish, English, and Dutch. Chapters 5 and 6 focus on nominal morphology, whereas chapter 7 revolves around differentiation and attraction within the paradigm of concessive parentheticals (e.g. *Although painful, the step was necessary*). Finally, chapter 10 showcases the usefulness of motion charts and distributional semantic methods in tracing the development of the *many a NOUN* construction (e.g. *I've thought that many a time myself*) and of the permissive *get* construction (e.g. *In the movies prisoners always get to make one phone call*). All in all, even those who are unfamiliar with Hilpert's work will find this new contribution readily accessible. The collection of chapters is the result of a series of lectures Hilpert delivered at the China International Forum on Cognitive Linguistics (Beijing 2019) and which student volunteers transcribed very accurately for the purposes of publishing the book. The readers may miss the presence of in-text references throughout; however, in keeping with the author's usual careful style, the contents are presented in a very clear, reader-friendly, and enlightening manner. The e-book version is open-access, and it serves as a bonus to the audio recordings, and other extra materials of the lectures available from the publisher's website.

## 6. Semantics

This year's Semantics section will present a selection of relevant works (books and articles) dealing with negation, the mass-count distinction, quantification, modality, distributivity, discourse-bound uses of the adverb *now*, language and cognition, and sentence type and mood. Two of these works were published in 2020, but are included in the present section, as they could not be discussed in *YWES* 101[2020].

*The Oxford Handbook of Negation* (2020), edited by Viviane Déprez and M.Teresa Espinal, is a well-structured and accessible overview of the state of the art in the study of negation, a fundamental category in the cognition of humans, which relates to notions like 'opposition, falsity, absence, non-existence, denial, rejection, refusal, correction, avoidance, disappearance, prohibition, and the like' (p. 1). Part I, 'Fundamentals' is concerned with underlying philosophical questions such as 'Negation and Opposition: Contradiction and Contrariety in Logic and Language' (pp. 7-33), by Laurence R. Horn, 'Negative Predicates: Incorporated Negation' (pp. 26-46), by Jacques Moeschler, 'Denial' (pp. 47-57), by David Ripley, 'Types of Negation' (pp. 58-74), by Karen de Clercq, and 'Affixal Negation' (pp. 75-88), by Shrikant Joshi. Part II, 'Questions in the Syntax of Negation', addresses structural issues such as 'The Typology of Negation', by Johan van de Auwera and Olga Krasnoukhova (pp. 91-116), 'The Morpho-Syntactic Nature of the Negative Marker' (pp. 117-34), by Chiara Gianollo, 'The Possible Positioning of Negation' (pp. 135-51), by Cecilia Poletto, 'Negation and Constituent Ordering' (pp. 152-76), by Elizabeth Pearce, and 'The Expression of Negation in Sign Languages' (pp. 177-96), by Josep Quer. Part III, 'Negation at the Syntax-Semantics Interface', discusses topics including 'Neg-Raising' (pp. 199-215), by Laurence R. Horn, 'Intervention Effects with Negation' (pp. 216-34), by Clemens Mayr, 'Form and Function of Negative, Tag, and Rhetorical Questions' (pp. 235-54), by Maribel Romero, 'Expletive Negation' (pp. 255-68), by Denis Delfitto, and 'Calculating the Scope of Negation: Interaction of Negation with Quantifiers' (pp. 269-81), by Nicholas Fleischer. Part IV surveys the landscape of 'Semantics and Pragmatics of Negation', including chapters on 'Modals and Negation' (pp. 285-300), by Naomi Francis and Sabine Iatridou, 'Negation in Event Semantics' (pp. 301-32), by Barry Schein, 'Negation and Alternatives: Interaction with Focus Constituents' (pp. 333-48), by Anamaria Fălăuș, 'Metalinguistic Negation' (pp. 349-68), by Ana Maria Martins, and 'Negation and Presupposition' (pp. 369-88) by David Beaver and Kristin Denlinger. Part V, 'Negative Dependencies', focuses on 'what it means to be negative or to be sensitive to negation' (p. 3), discussing 'Negative Polarity Items' (pp. 391-406), by Lucia M. Tovená, 'Minimizers and Maximizers as Different Types of Polarity Items' (pp. 407-25), by Susagna Tubau, 'Negative Quantifiers' (pp. 426-40), by Hedde Zeijlstra, 'Negative Fragment Answers' (pp. 441-57), by Andrew Weir, 'Negative Concord and the Nature of Negative Concord Items' (pp. 458-78), by Anastasia Giannakidou, and 'Double Negation Readings' (pp. 479-96), by Henriëtte de Swart. Part VI surveys topics related to 'Synchronic and Diachronic Variation in Negation', including 'Quantitative Studies of the Use of Negative (Dependent) Expressions' (pp. 499-514) by Phillip Wallage, 'Negation in Non-Standard Varieties' (pp. 515-29) by Christina Tortora and Frances Blanchette, 'The Negative Cycle and Beyond' (pp. 530-45), by Anne Breitbarth, 'Evolution of Negative Dependencies' (pp. 546-62), by Chiara Gianollo, and 'The Role of Pragmatics in

Negation Change’ (pp. 563-73), by Pierre Larrivé. Part VII, ‘Emergence and Acquisition of Negation’, includes chapters on ‘Evolutionary Precursors of Negation in Non-Human Reasoning’ (pp. 577-88), by Manuel Bohn, Josep Call, and Christopher J. Völter, on ‘Cognitive Precursors of Negation in Preverbal Infants’ (pp. 589-98), by Jean-Rémy Hochmann, on ‘Negation and First Language Acquisition’ (pp. 599-614), by Rosalind Thornton, and on ‘Negation in L2 Acquisition and Beyond’ (pp. 615-31), by Liliana Sánchez and Jennifer Austin. The volume closes in Part VIII with studies presenting ‘Experimental Investigations of Negation’, including ‘Understanding Negation: Issues in the Processing of Negation’ (pp. 635-55), by Barbara Kaup and Carolin Dudschig, ‘Negative Polarity Illusions’ (pp. 656-76), by Hanna Muller and Colin Phillips, ‘Negation, Prosody, and Gesture’ (pp. 677-93), by Pilar Prieto and M.Teresa Espinal, ‘Negation and the Brain: Experiments in Health and Focal Brain Disease, and their Theoretical Implications’ (pp. 694-712), by Yosef Grodzinsky, Virginia Jaichenco, Isabelle Deschamps, María Elina Sánchez, Martín Fuchs, Peter Pieperhoff, Yonatan Loewenstein, and Katrin Amunts, ‘Individual Differences in Processing of Negative Operators: Implications for Bilinguals’ (pp. 713-24), by Veena D. Dwivedi, ‘The Neurology of Negation: fMRI, ERP, and Aphasia’ (pp. 725-39), by Ken Ramshøj Christensen, and ‘The Neurobiology of Lexical and Sentential Negation’ (pp. 740-55), by Liuba Papeo and Manuel de Vega.

Still within the domain of negation, ‘Explaining Gaps in the Logical Lexicon of Natural Languages: A Decision-Theoretic Perspective on the Square of Aristotle’ by Émile Enguehard and Benjamin Spector (*S&Prag* 14[2021] [doi.org/10.3765/sp.14.5](https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.14.5)) takes a fresh look at the question why the quantifier *not all* is not lexicalized in natural languages, an issue which is also addressed in the contributions of Laurence R. Horn and Hedde Zeijlstra in the handbook above. The proposed account is based on independently motivated assumptions about the meanings of lexical predicates, as well as general principles of language, such as frequency of lexicalization and the expected utility that speakers can receive from using the language. In ‘Domains of Polarity Items’ (*JSem* 38[2021] 1-48), Vincent Homer treats the licensing conditions of negative as well as positive polarity items in an ‘environment-based’ unified syntactic-semantic theory.

*Mass and Count in Linguistics, Philosophy, and Cognitive Science* (2020) by Friederike Moltmann, presents new work on the syntax and semantics of the mass-count distinction, including treatments of syntactic and semantic shifts between the two categories, and the way the distinction relates to cognition. The editor’s lucid ‘Introduction’ (pp. 1-12) reviews the essence of the count-mass distinction, including better- and less-known distinctive features, as well as the two classical theoretical approaches to it, referred to as the ‘extensional mereological approach’ and the ‘integrity-based approach’. ‘Activewear and other Vagueness: A Morphological Perspective on Aggregate-Mass’ (pp. 37-59) by Dana Cohen considers mass nouns denoting groupings of objects, such as *furniture*, *police force*, *footwear*, or *hardware*, which have a morphology indicating systematic and productive derivation processes, and a syntax akin to non-count nominals. Regarding their semantics, they are suggested to refer to a multiplicity of objects with common functionality, with backgrounding of the individual members. Stefan Hinterwimmer puts forward ‘A Comparison of Abstract and Concrete Mass Nouns in Terms of Their Interaction with Quantificational Determiners’ (pp. 62-82), showing that in constructions with vague

quantifiers such as *a lot* and *little*, and specificity markers such as *a certain*, abstract mass nouns derived from gradable adjectives (*beauty*, *generosity*, or *intelligence*) have an extra reading compared to concrete mass nouns (*water*). Whereas the latter only introduce a quantity/cardinality related scale for measurement and identification, the former also have a second reading made available by a scale that ‘orders the states denoted by the respective noun according to the degree with which they instantiate the corresponding property’ (p. 61). Mahesh Srinivasan and David Barner argue in ‘Lexical, Syntactic, and Pragmatic Sources of Countability: An Experimental Exploration of the Mass-Count Distinction’ (pp. 159-90) that the mass-count distinction is asymmetric: whereas count nouns only denote individuals, mass nouns can denote objects, substances, and actions (whether individuated or not). Their model assumes that count syntax takes individuated semantic representations as input, and specifies quantification over countable individuals, while mass syntax allows nouns to quantify according to mass/volume and according to number as well, depending on the nouns’ lexical specifications. Roberto Zamparelli observes in ‘Countability Shifts and Abstract Nouns’ (pp. 191-224) that ‘most of the nouns that can be used in count or mass syntactic contexts (“elastic nouns”) are (arguably abstract)’ (p. 191), proposes meaning shifts between mass and count interpretations, and comments on the relation between abstract nouns and kinds.

Still on the semantics of noun phrases, ‘The Many Readings of *Many*: POS in the Reverse Proportional Reading’ (*Ling&P* 44[2021] 281-321) by Maribel Romero proposes a unified analysis of non-reverse and reverse, cardinal, and proportional readings of *many* and *few*. ‘An Alternatives Account of “Most” and “More than Half”’ (*Glossa* 6[2021] [doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5764](https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5764)) by Fausto Carcassi and Jakub Szymanik explains why, in spite of the assumed truth conditional equivalence between ‘most’ and ‘more than half’, the former is usually interpreted as conveying greater proportions than the latter. The account relies on the assumption that the two expressions introduce different sets of pragmatic alternatives and that listeners tend to minimize the expected distance between their representation of the world and the speaker’s observation. The authors’ explanation is supported by computational modelling and results of a production experiment.

*Concepts, Frames and Cascades in Semantics, Cognition and Ontology*, edited by Sebastian Löbner, Thomas Gamerschlag, Tobias Kalenscher, Markus Schrenk and Henk Zeevat, collects contributions from linguistics, philosophy, and psychology addressing language and cognition. The papers study the nature of mental representations underlying natural language production and understanding, other manifestations of cognition, and general reasoning about the world, based on theoretical, empirical, and experimental research. ‘Counting Possible Configurations’ (pp. 43-63) by Manfred Krifka deals with nouns like *outfit*, which denote ‘entities that consist of well-individuated parts that come together at certain worlds and times to form a certain configuration or to serve a purpose, but may be taken apart and be reconfigured at other indices’ (p. 46). The proposed analysis treats these entities as individual concepts instead of simple entities, makes a proposal for how such concepts can be counted, and explores the consequences of representing more regular entities as individual concepts as well, which have more stable temporal properties. Marcin Morzycki, ‘Structure and Ontology in Nonlocal Readings of Adjectives’ (pp. 65-99), takes a fresh look at adjectives that appear to make the semantic contribution normally associated with adverbs, such as *average* and *occasional*. The author suggests that two possible

approaches to the analysis of these adjectives, which either work with a richer ontology or with more involved composition rules, should be merged, in order to account for the fact that although their lexical semantics appears to be about kinds, they actually have the semantic type of quantificational determiners like *every*.

Sebastian Löbner also provides an overview of research results obtained from applying Lawrence W. Barsalou's theory of frames to semantics ('Frames at the Interface of Language and Cognition', *ARL* 7[2021] 261-84). This research has been carried out by the Düsseldorf frame group (a research team comprising the research unit 'FOR 600 Functional concepts and frames' (2005–2011) and the Collaborative Research Centre SFB 991 'The structure of representations in language, cognition, and science' (2011–2020)), whose approach 'grounds the analysis of composition in deep decomposition of lexical meanings with frames' (p. 261), the basic mechanism of composition being unification.

*Truth and Veridicality in Grammar and Thought: Mood, Modality, and Propositional Attitudes* by Anastasia Giannakidou and Alda Mari studies how the concepts of truth, knowledge, and veridicality are reflected and encoded in the grammar of natural languages, particularly with regard to the choice between subjunctive and indicative mood in the complements of modal expressions and propositional attitude verbs. The authors argue in favour of a correlation between indicative mood and veridicality and subjunctive mood and nonveridicality, assuming that the latter concept not only covers objective truth but also commitment to the truth of the propositional content by the speaker (subjective veridicality). Although the discussion focuses on Standard Modern Greek and Romance, the study offers ample implications for languages lacking a systematic mood distinction such as English, including the distinction between non-finite (-ing, bare or to-infinitive) vs finite (*that*-clause) complements of verbs of perception (*see*) or volition (*want*).

Still on the semantics of sentence types and mood, 'The Structure of Communicative Acts' (*Ling&P* 44[2021] 425-74) by Sarah E. Murray and William B. Starr argues that sentence forces, the conversational effects associated with the sentence types, should be treated within compositional dynamic semantics, and should be distinguished from utterance (illocutionary) force, to be analysed within compositional pragmatics. 'Evidentiality, Modality, and Speech Acts' (*ARL* 7[2021] 213-33) by Sarah E. Murray reviews the semantic effects of evidential constructions, which consist in contributing information about an individual's source of evidence and about the evidence holder on the one hand, and potentially modifying the force of a sentence, on the other. Wataru Uegaki defends the claim that 'The Existential/Uniqueness Presupposition of *Wh*-Complements Projects from the Answers' (*Ling&P* 44[2021] 911–51), to account for why interrogatives like *Who smokes?* introduce an existential presupposition (*Someone smokes*), as opposed to interrogatives like *Which semanticist danced?*, which give rise to a uniqueness presupposition (*Exactly one semanticist danced*). Yimei Xiang offers 'A Hybrid Categorical Approach to Question Composition' (*Ling&P* 44[2021] 587-647), arguing that questions should be defined as 'topic properties'. Jessica Rett investigates 'The Semantics of Emotive Markers and Other Illocutionary Content' (*JSem* 38[2021] 305-40), including lexical markers like *alas* and *fortunately*, as well as prosodic ones. She argues that the contribution of these emotive markers is semantically encoded and not-at-issue. They relate to how the speaker is using the

utterance in context; therefore their content is added to the speaker's Discourse Commitments rather than to the Common Ground.

Further journal articles of particular relevance to the semantics of English include 'Two Puzzles about Ability *Can*' (*Ling&P* 44[2021] 551-86) by Malte Willer, which explains the differences between ability vs epistemic and deontic readings of *can* by combining tools from dynamic and inquisitive semantics with ideas on the role of agency in deontic logic: the ability reading requires the possibility of a certain action, while the epistemic/deontic reading requires the possibility of a certain state of affairs. 'Anyone Might but Everyone Won't' (*S&Prag* 14[2021] [doi.org/10.3765/sp.14.10](https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.14.10)) by Ana Arregui accounts for interactions between quantifiers and epistemic modals, according to which, in a sentence with *everyone* and *might*, *everyone* won't take inverse scope over *might*, making *Everyone might be infected* # *but not everyone is* infelicitous, but *anyone* does, as in *Anyone might be infected but not everyone is*. 'The Lexical and Formal Semantics of Distributivity' (*Glossa* 6[2021] [doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1137](https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1137)) by Lelia Glass takes up the general question of how distributivity should be represented compositionally, and argues that certain features of the event described by the predicate determine whether it is distributive or nondistributive: causative predicates (*open a door*) as well as predicates built from transitive verbs favour a nondistributive interpretation, but experiencer-subject predicates (*love a movie*) and those built from intransitive verbs (*smile*) are mostly interpreted in a distributive fashion. Finally, 'Formal Properties of "Now" Revisited' (*S&Prag* 14[2021] [doi.org/10.3765/sp.14.3](https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.14.3)) by Una Stojnić Daniel Altshuler accounts for the discourse-bound (i.e. anaphoric) uses of the adverb *now*, and for the fact that it can occur felicitously with the past tense by claiming that on any of its occurrences it does not refer to a time but a state, namely, the consequent state of the most prominent event.

## 7. Lexicography, Lexicology, and Lexical Semantics

This section begins with a discussion of publications in the field of lexicography, and goes on to look at work in lexicology and lexical semantics. In each part, the more general publications related to each sub-field will be discussed first, followed by more specialized publications. Research on current synchronic topics will precede historical studies.

The year 2021 saw the publication of the fourth and final instalment of Michael Adams's 'The Dictionary Society of North America: A History of the Early Years (Part IV)' (*DJDSNA* 42:i[2021] 1–94). Part IV focuses on DSNA's conferences and publications, which are still thriving today. This year, the society's journal *Dictionaries* also benefits greatly from the biennial meeting of DSNA – unusually held online – with several papers on the topic of 'Fitness of Our Dictionaries and Lexicography to 21st-Century Realities'. The keynote session 'Dictionaries as Authorities: Can They and Should They?' (*DJDSNA* 42:i[2021] 183–209) is presented by Kory Stamper, Bryan A. Garner, and Lane Greene, discussing the changing relationships between authority and expertise and between dictionary editors and readers. Three themed forums that follow provide fresh perspectives to the field.

With a brief discussion of dictionaries' remarkable shift from page to pixel, Ben Zimmer introduces the first forum on 'How Global Events and Social Change Affect Modern Lexicography' (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 41–4), which brings in-house insights from three dictionary programs. In 'Thirty-Four Days: Inside Merriam-Webster's Emergency Coronavirus Update' (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 45–56), Stefan Fatsis demonstrates how Merriam-Webster's editors reacted to the unprecedented disease and added *COVID-19* to the dictionary just thirty-four days after the word's coinage. Wendalyn Nichols and Lewis C. Lawyer showcase Cambridge Dictionary's rationale for 'Identifying Emergent Meanings via the Word of the Year Process: A Case Study' (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 57–69). The case study reveals that the selection of the Cambridge Dictionary Word of the Year 2020 helped editors to timely update 'emergent' new senses of *quarantine* and *lockdown*. The third article in this forum is 'Two-Tongued Lexical Trends: Updating Inclusive Language in a Bilingual Dictionary' (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 71–89) by Rachel Victoria Stone. She examines the contrasts between inclusive language norms of English and French and illustrates some editorial decisions about including new words in bilingual lexicography.

The three papers in the second forum 'Dictionaries in the Public Eye' (*DJDSNA* 42:i[2021] 211–3), introduced by Anne Curzan, concern dictionaries' authority and responsibility at a time when '[d]ictionaries are more part of the public discourse than they have ever been' (p. 211). In order to investigate 'The Decontextualized Dictionary in the Public Eye' (*DJDSNA* 42:i[2021] 215–34), Katherine Connor Martin presents a typology of scenarios in which dictionary content is used in today's market, and then conducts a qualitative review of various dictionary-related news stories since 2019. Lindsay Rose Russell traces a half-century history of 'Dictionary Boycotts and the Power of Popular (Re)Definition' (*DJDSNA* 42:i[2021] 235–47). She also suggests that dictionary bias is 'not just a byproduct of individual lexicographers' choices; rather, it is a matter of lexicographical policies, practices, cultures, and norms' (p. 244). In 'Scouring Dictionaries: Their Overuse and Misuse in the Courts' (*DJDSNA* 42:i[2021] 249–57), Joseph Kimble provides three examples in court settings where dictionaries play an 'outsized' role. Kimble criticizes this

kind of dictionary habit and also gives some pithy suggestions to lexicographers at the end of the paper.

The final forum looks at ‘The Future of Dictionaries and Lexicography’ (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 91–4), and is introduced by Sarah Ogilvie. The two papers in the forum prove that the prediction of dictionary’s death, made ten years ago, is wrong. Timothee Mickus, Mathieu Constant, and Denis Paperno review the literature on dictionaries in NLP and go into details ‘About Neural Networks and Writing Definitions’ (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 95–117). According to the authors, Definition Modelling is a ‘promising’ field of study, though much remains to be done. Orin Hargraves explores ‘Lexicography in the Post-Dictionary World’ (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 119–29) by analogy with painting in the development of photography. Though some traditional dictionary publishers disappeared as a result of the development of internet technology, ‘the overall effect has been a great improvement in the quality and quantity of language reference information available to the public’ (p. 125).

Two chapters from *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Standardization*, edited by Wendy Ayres-Bennett and John Bellamy, are relevant for this review. Both chapters can be found in Part II, entitled ‘Legitimacy, Authority and the Written Form’ (see also section 2, History of English Linguistics, p. 9). Nicola McLelland discusses the role of ‘Grammars, Dictionaries and Other Metalinguistic Texts in the Context of Language Standardization’ (pp. 263–93), with examples taken from various languages. Although metalinguistic texts including grammars and dictionaries did not emerge for the sake of standardization, they truly ‘serve to illuminate past, present and future practices and ideologies of language standardization’ (p. 286). ‘Dealing with Language Variation in Collins Dictionaries’ from ‘An Industry Perspective’ (pp. 294–312), Ian Brookes, Mary O’Neill, and Merryn Davies-Deacon explore three Collins-branded dictionaries, namely *CED*, *COBUILD*, and the *Collins English School Dictionary*. The examples illustrate how varieties of English are treated in the three dictionaries with regard to lexis, phonology, and orthography, and also reflect that the Collins dictionary team is moving their main focus from print dictionaries to online ones. This chapter also mentions the effect of technological innovations on the process of producing and publishing dictionaries, such as the CollinsDictionary.com website, which provides fuller lexicographic materials and can better detect users’ preferences.

A heated topic in the field of lexicography this year is the transition from printed pages to the cloud, with a number of researchers arguing whether the future of dictionaries is digital. Several studies discussed above fall into this category, and here are a few more. Ana Frankenberg-Garcia, Geraint Paul Rees, and Robert Lew notice an ‘over-reliance’ on e-lexicography. The authors exemplify a range of authentic problems – concerning wordlists, collocation research, and example selection – that arose during the compilation of the ColloCaid lexical database, and which are easily ‘Slipping Through the Cracks in e-Lexicography’ (*IJL* 34[2021] 206–34). In an era of big data, Xiqin Liu, Jing Lyu, and Dongping Zheng look ‘For a Better Dictionary’ by redefining and ‘Revisiting Ecolxicography as a New Paradigm’ (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 283–321). In this study, a tentative framework of ecolxicography is proposed. Emma Ferrett and Stefan Dollinger attempt to answer the question ‘Is Digital Always Better?’ by ‘Comparing Two English Print Dictionaries with Their Digital Counterparts’ (*IJL* 34[2021] 66–91), namely the *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, the *AHD*, and their open access online counterparts *Merriam-*

*Webster.com* and the *Oxford Living Dictionary*. The results suggest that lexical information is lost in the transition from print to digital. Besides the contents and layouts, the authors also compare dictionaries' social media presences and partnerships with tech giants. Dilin Liu, Yaochen Deng, and Shiyang Yang examine the quality of online bilingual dictionaries, thereby 'Evaluating Popular Online English-Chinese Dictionaries in China by Applying Lew and Szarowska's (2017) Evaluation Framework' (*IJL* 34[2021] 157–82). Based on the evaluation results, the authors also provide specific lexicographic recommendations to each evaluated dictionary.

In a series of three articles, Rufus H. Gouws and D.J. Prinsloo explore various aspects of lexicographic data boxes. The first in the trio, 'Lexicographic Data Boxes Part 1. Lexicographic Data Boxes as Text Constituents in Dictionaries' (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 330–73), starts with what data boxes are and then discusses where they are positioned in dictionaries, and in printed dictionaries in particular. In 'Lexicographic Data Boxes. Part 2: Types and Contents of Data Boxes with Particular Focus on Dictionaries for English and African Languages' (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 374–401), the authors propose a hierarchy of data boxes based on type and content. Regarding the transition from paper to electronic dictionaries, Gouws and Prinsloo explore new approaches in which current online dictionaries use data boxes in 'Lexicographic Data Boxes Part 3: Aspects of Data Boxes in Bilingual Dictionaries and a Perspective on Current and Future Data Boxes' (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 402–33). Part 3 also suggests that, whereas a better layout and presentation of data boxes can be found in future dictionaries, '[a]ccommodating salient data should remain a significant assignment to data boxes' (p. 431).

At the interface of lexicography and dialectology, several publications record the recent projects and innovations of the *EDD Online*. To begin with, Manfred Markus provides a book-length user guide to the *English Dialect Dictionary Online: A New Departure in English Dialectology*. Besides various aspects of the structure of the *EDD Online 3.0*, the book also mentions details of programming, in an attempt to 'address IT-specialists and laypeople working in philological projects of computerisation, in particular, in the digitisation of dictionaries' (p. 4). Also based on the data from the *EDD Online 3.0* is Markus' assessment of 'Joseph Wright's Sources in the English Dialect Dictionary: Evidence of Spoken English from EDD Online' (*DetG* 29[2021] 77–96). Markus uses Northamptonshire dialect words as a test case, in response to the widespread scepticism towards the *EDD* sources. In another study 'Wright's Sources: Compatibility with Other Filters and Parameters in *EDD Online 4.0*' (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 169–90), Manfred Markus introduces the most recent digitized version *EDD Online 4.0*, planned for publication in 2022. The study focuses on some major challenges and limitations during the revision work, which will be repaired in the forthcoming 4.0 version.

The year 2021 only saw a few publications on historical lexicography. The first is Lynda Mugglestone's monograph *Writing a War of Words: Andrew Clark and the Search for Meaning in World War One*. By examining Andrew Clark's valuable notebooks, this monograph reveals Clark's careful documentation of wartime language and of his significant contribution to the *OED*, which, in Mugglestone's words, offers 'memorialization of the fleeting diction and vernacular creativities of the past' (p. 257). A more detailed discussion of this work can be found in section 1 (pp. 5).

In a short note ‘Sir Archibald Alison and *The New English Dictionary*’ (*N&Q* 68[2021] 445–6), John Considine uncovers why Sir Archibald Alison’s works had been excluded from the *NED* (which later became the *OED*), proposed by the Philological Society’s Committee in 1857. Due to Alison’s ‘inadequately acknowledged sources’ (p. 446), the *OED* only contains six citations of his works, which also reflects the early lexicographical policy of this Philological Society’s dictionary. Laura García Fernández yields new ‘Insights into Old English Lexicography: Lemmatisation of *Gān* and Its Prefix-Formations Using a Corpus-Based Database’ (*IJL* 34[2021] 493–508). Based on the data from dictionaries, corpora, and databases, the author verifies a range of inflectional forms of the OE verb *gān* ‘to go’ and thus contributes to OE lexicography.

Looking specifically at Australian lexicography and its iconic dictionary, Pat Manser’s *More Than Words: The Making of the Macquarie Dictionary* consists of sixteen short chapters, plus an introduction, concluding sections, and a ‘content warning’ about this ‘warts-and-all dictionary’. Manser’s book is full of amusing anecdotes about the dictionary’s history, its evolution and revolution, its practicalities and policies, and most importantly, its people.

Moving the focus to work with a pedagogical perspective, Songshan Zhang, Hai Xu, and Xian Zhang investigate ‘The Effects of Dictionary Use on Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Meta-Analysis’ (*IJL* 34[2021] 1–38) and show that dictionary use is a very effective vocabulary learning strategy. In a similar vein, Mari Carmen Campoy-Cubillo aims to increase the awareness of the value of training in dictionary use and explores new methods for ‘Fostering Learners’ Online Dictionary Skills through Active Dictionary Rubrics’ (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 487–510). As shown in the pre- and post-training questionnaire results, dictionary skills training progressively improves learners’ linguistic competence. In a short essay, Jack Lynch introduces some approaches to ‘Teaching Literary History with the *Oxford English Dictionary*’ (*DJDSNA* 42:ii[2021] 191–99) and the *HTOED*, which helps students better understand language and literature in historical contexts. In ‘Construal of Mental Health Problems in English Learners’ Dictionaries’ (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 1–19), Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak looks up twelve terms from the field of mental ill health in six monolingual English learners’ dictionaries (MELDs) – five British (*CALD*, *COBUILD*, *LDOCE*, *MED*, *OALD*) and one American (*Merriam Webster*) – in order to find out how well MELDs cope with sensitive lexicographic material. Bartosz Ptasznik tests the effectiveness of ‘Single-Clause *When*-Defining Models in English Monolingual Pedagogical Dictionaries’ (*IJL* 34[2021] 112–34), in particular for abstract noun headwords. A significant difference is found between different *when*-defining models. For a challenging branch of ESP, Zorica Đurović applies ‘Corpus Linguistics Methods for Building ESP Word Lists, Glossaries and Dictionaries on the Example of a Marine Engineering Word List’ (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 259–82), aiming to meet the vocabulary needs of the target English learners, that is, university students and trainees undertaking Marine Engineering courses.

Looking specifically at Chinese learners of English, Fang Huang and Sven Tarp analyse two ‘Dictionaries Integrated into English Learning Apps’ and make ‘Critical Comments and Suggestions for Improvement’ (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 68–92). The authors detect several deficiencies and problems in the *Kaiyan OpenLanguage* app, which may have

negative effects on learners' motivation and their learning process. Atipat Boonmoh investigates the 'Use of Dictionaries and Online Tools for Reading by Thai EFL Learners in a Naturalistic Setting' (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 239–58). Although the sample size is fairly small (only fourteen participants), the study reveals the students' look-up behaviour and their preference of dictionaries and online tools, such as Google Translate, *LDOCE*, and bilingual dictionaries. French-speaking learners of English as a foreign language are the subject of Gaëtanelle Gilquin and Samantha Laporte's study on 'The Use of Online Writing Tools by Learners of English: Evidence from a Process Corpus' (*IJL* 34[2021] 472–92). The results show that learners' use of online resources vary considerably between individuals and more training sessions are needed for more efficient use of different tools.

Among the studies where lexicography and WE converge, David-Antoine Williams explores the changing ways in which different editions of the *OED* have documented the English words outside the British Isles in "'Alien" vs. Editor: World English in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, Policies, Practices, and Outcomes 1884–2020' (*IJL* 34[2021] 39–65). The editorial history of the *OED*, according to Williams, is not only 'a matter of the development of lexicographical theory and practice', but also 'part-and-parcel of the cultural context from which it draws and to which it contributes' (p. 21). Danica Salazar's chapter records the changes in 'Documenting World Englishes in the *Oxford English Dictionary*: Past Perspectives, Present Developments, and Future Directions' (in Alexander Onysko, ed., *Research Developments in World Englishes*, pp. 271–94). She first gives a chronological overview of the *OED*'s coverage of WE, then moves on to the dictionary's current policies on including lexical items from varieties of English, and ends with some remarks on the future of WE in the *OED*. The addition of WE words, as stated by Salazar, makes the *OED* 'an even bigger, more balanced, more representative, and more reliable dataset' (p. 292) for researchers in the field. Also on the subject of the *OED* and WE, Hyejeong Ahn, Danica Salazar, and Sophia Khan showcase six teaching activities that aim at 'Enhancing Teachers' Awareness of Global Englishes Using the *Oxford English Dictionary*' (in Ali Fuad Selvi and Bedrettin Yazan, eds., *Language Teacher Education for Global Englishes: A Practical Resource Book*, pp. 100–7).

The influence of *Hallyu*, aka *Korean wave*, on the English lexicon is well represented in two articles. First, Hyejeong Ahn explores 'Spelling Variations of Translingual Korean English Words', aiming to answer the question 'What Have K-Pop and K-Wave to do with English Today?' (*EnT* 37[2021] 42–9). Data are taken from the *OED*, CNN, Google Search, Google Trends. The results show that several words of Korean origin and their variants are popular round the globe. In another study, Hyejeong Ahn co-authors with Jieun Kiaer, investigating five 'Pop Culture Words' of Korean origin in order to see 'How Can K-Wave Turn Korean Words into Global, Translingual Words?' (*EnT* 37[2021] 178–87). The authors also touch on the effect of social media, which makes Korean words more recognizable and promotes the ongoing expansion of today's English.

Limiting the investigation to specific semantic fields are two contributions. Dragica Žugić and Milica Vuković-Stamatović describe the 'Problems in Defining Ethnicity Terms in Dictionaries' (*Lexikos* 31[2021] 177–94). The authors find that most of the ethnic definitions are quite simple and rudimentary; they therefore call for a standardized model for lexicographers to define the ethnicity terms. Viewing the *OED*'s inclusion of lexis of

sexuality and gender as ‘an excellent example of how dictionaries reflect the time and culture they belong to’ (p. 95), Nicholas Lo Vecchio aims at providing additional information to the *OED* and ‘Updating the *OED* on the Historical LGBTQ Lexicon’ (*DJDSNA* 42:i[2021] 95–164).

This year as well, there are a number of contributions that are concerned with etymology and word history. Keith Briggs finds new evidence for ‘The Etymology of “Girl” with ‘Two More Ideas’ (*N&Q* 68[2021] 1–4): one is from OE forms, and the other is from a Germanic postulated stem. In another note, Keith Briggs adds one more instance to the early spelling of the name of Sherborne Lane, confirming the conjectured etymology of this street name, namely ‘Middle English *Shiteburgh* “A Privy”’ (*N&Q* 68[2021] 261–2). Also focusing on the usage and development of a toponym, Richard Coates presents ‘An Antedating of *Bluestone*’ (*N&Q* 68[2021] 413–7). In terms of attesting OE names, Leonard Neidorf carries out a theophoric analysis to trace ‘The Etymology of Freawaru’s Name’ (*N&Q* 68[2021] 379–83). Jonathan McGovern traces ‘The Origin of the Phrase “Will no one rid me of this turbulent priest?”’ (*N&Q* 68[2021] 266) and finds that Robert Dodsley’s version of the phrase is now the most popular one.

William Sayers presents several short papers in *ANQ* on the etymologies of the dated word ‘*Curmudgeon*, an Etymology’ (*ANQ* 34[2021] 1–2), of the reduplicative compounds ‘*Fiddle-faddle* and *Flibbertigibbet*: Etymologies’ (*ANQ* 34[2021] 93–6) and ‘Exotic, Erotic: The Etymology of *Hootchy-kootchy*’ (*ANQ* 34[2021] 177–9), and of the Americanized terms ‘*Skulduggery*: Etymology’ (*ANQ* 34[2021] 93–6, wrongly attributed to 2019) and ‘The Etymology of *Jazz* – One More Time’ (*ANQ* 34[2021] 267–70). These papers share a common purpose: to call for an update or reproduction in the *OED*’s etymological commentary. Studies on the etymology of words are still of interest to readers, just as Sayers wishes: ‘the popular speech of past times will escape both the earlier whiff of class prejudice and hint of editorial proscriptiveness, and receive its due share of scholarly attention in the republic of words’ (p. 96).

Several studies shift the etymological focus to specific domains. In ‘From Zero to Zillion: Etymological Notes on Some Number Terms’ (*N&Q* 68[2021] 383–7), Joachim Grzega makes a few etymological observations on words representing numbers. In ‘Etymologies of Well-Being: Exploring the Non-English Roots of English Words Used in Positive Psychology’ (*JPosP* 15[2020] 373–89, a 2020 publication that was not reviewed last year), Tim Lomas explores the origin of 1333 lexemes (160 of which are related to psychological concepts). The results show that over 60% (and 62% of the psychological words) are loanwords, mainly borrowed from Latin, French, and Greek. Whereas the statement that the field of psychology is ‘relatively Western-centric’ (p. 373) may still be true, the complexity of the English language itself also demonstrates the influences from various cultures. Arpan R. Mehta, Pujar R. Mehta, Stephen P. Anderson, Barbara L.H. MacKinnon, and Alastair Compston trace the history of two spellings, namely ‘neuron’ and ‘neurone’, in ‘Etymology and the Neuron(e)’ (*Brain* 143[2020] 374–9). The authors conclude that ‘neuron’ is the correct spelling while ‘neurone’, ‘in any medical or cultural context, should no longer be used’ (p. 378). Within the same domain, Diederik F. Janssen finds evidence for ‘The Etymology of “Neurology”’, *Redux: Early Use of the Term by Jean Riolan*

the Younger (1610)' (*Brain* 144[2021] 1–2). Janssen attributes the first use of the term 'neurology' to Riolan the Younger, not the widely-accepted Thomas Willis.

Among the works on words published in 2021, a notable one is Ralph Keyes's monograph *The Hidden History of Coined Words*, which presents an impressive collection of colourful and playful coinages. The book is organized into three sections. The first section, 'How Words Are Coined', looks at a multitude of ways in which words can be created: by accident, by mistake, by contempt, as insults, for fun, or for a joke. Section II explores various 'Sources of Coined Words', ranging from comic strips, newspaper columns, children's books, Sci-Fi, mainstream literary work, to academic neologisms. The last section demonstrates different kinds of 'Coinage Syndromes', such as deliberate coinages, whimsical coinages, revived recoinages, coinages with disputed origins, coinage conflicts, and regretful coinages. The book ends with a call for readers: 'You Too Can Coin a Word'. Keyes gives us some useful top tips: (1) go short; (2) have fun; (3) please the ear; (4) create word pictures; (5) evoke feeling; (6) use good letters (p. 244). But even with these approaches, the coinage of words is still unpredictable, and that's why they have fantastic stories.

A contribution that is missing from last year's issue of this section is Marc Alexander and Fraser Dallachy's chapter on 'Lexis' (in Adolphs and Knight, eds., *The Routledge Handbook of English Language and Digital Humanities*, Chapter 10, pp. 164–85, briefly introduced in *YWES* 101[2022] 2). After discussing some critical issues and challenges of lexical research in the Digital Humanities (DH), the authors overview an array of resources, ranging from dictionaries and thesauri to large corpora, as well as mentioning several tools that can be used for textual analysis. The final part of this chapter demonstrates the relevant research techniques in a case study of lexical items in the semantic field of 'Money'. As the study shows, information is gathered from a variety of resources, which afford insight into the history (via *HT*), etymology (via *OED*), and usage (via *CQPweb*) of lexis in the field of 'Money'.

*Words and Worlds: A Lexicon for Dark Times*, edited by Veena Das and Didier Fassin, brings together thirteen short essays on the political lexicon. Although each of the essays in the volume is given a central term from the political lexicon, such as 'Democracy', 'Authority', 'Openness', and 'Crisis', many topics actually intertwine with each other. The volume as a whole provides a cross-disciplinary perspective on our contemporary world; it does so in an innovative way by discussing 'the self-evidence of the term in question', proposing 'an alternative reading' of the term, and putting the term 'to work within specific contexts in which it would uncover distinct realities' (p. 7).

Covid-19 and its aftermath are continuing to influence our lexicon. To refer to the linguistic creations on this topic, the term 'coroneologism' has been coined. Lan Li adopts a corpus-based approach to explore the relations between 'Words, Dictionaries and Sociology' and 'The Impact of Coroneologisms' (*LexAsia* 8[2021] 80–104). Also discussed in this study are the efforts of the *OED* lexicographers in documenting these coroneologisms. Amanda Roig-Marín overviews some widely-circulated 'English-Based Coroneologisms: A Short Survey of Our Covid-19-Related Vocabulary' (*EnT* 37[2021] 193–5). These new lexical items, irrespective of whether they are produced by blending or compounding, feature 'the profound interrelation between language and society' (p. 194).

Language contact, as always, is fertile ground for new words. A relevant chapter here is ‘English and Spanish in Contact in North America: US Latino Communities and the Emergence of Transnational Mediascapes’ by Christian Mair (in Perez et al., eds., *English and Spanish: World Languages in Interaction*, pp. 233–57). Mair briefly introduces the complex relations between English and Spanish, two of the world’s major languages, and then offers a range of examples of Spanish-English code-switching in the media and on the web.

Research on globalization of the English lexicon is also emerging. Yi Zhang focuses on online communication in ‘English as a Linguistic Resource: Localizing English in Micro-Blogging by Users of Chinese’ (*EnT* 37[2021] 34–41). A number of multilingual online practices are examined in the study, showing great creativity and complexity of micro-bloggers in mainland China. Another study that displays linguistic creativity in Chinese social media is ‘Translanguaging Hybrids on Chinese Gateway Websites’ (*AEnglishes* 23[2021] 152–65), by Fang Qi and Kun Zhang. English hybrids, regarded as language play by the authors, demonstrate the intercultural interaction between the two languages, but also bring challenges to the ideology of linguistic purism in China. Shifting the focus from China to Japan. Vincent B. Y. Ooi discusses ‘Issues and Prospects for Incorporating English Use in Japan into the Dictionary’ (*AEnglishes* 23[2021] 62–78). Ooi proposes a ‘Concentric Circles Model’ to encapsulate the range of English use in Japan, and concludes that both ‘competitive lexicography’ and ‘cooperative lexicography’ welcome the codification of words from the Japanese English lexicon, though in very different forms.

Laura R. Bailey and Mercedes Durham conduct ‘A Cheeky Investigation’ on the very British word *cheeky* by ‘Tracking the Semantic Change of *Cheeky* from *Monkeys* to *Wines*’, and answer the question ‘Can Social Media Spread Linguistic Change?’ (*EnT* 37[2021] 214–23). This case study demonstrates the importance of social media for spreading new meanings in different English-speaking countries. A noticeable trend in the field of lexicology and lexical semantics is that studies show a shift of focus, away from content words, like nouns, verbs, and adjectives. In ‘“That’s Proper Cool”: The Emerging Intensifier *proper* in British English’ (*EnT* 37[2021] 206–13), James M. Stratton uses data from two BNC corpora. The results show that the frequency of *proper* has increased over a span of twenty years from 1994 to 2014, but that the most frequent intensifiers in BrE have remained the same, that is, *very*, *really*, and *so*.

A special issue on ‘Discourse Markers and World Englishes’ (*WEn* 40[2021]) brings together ten papers, each of which investigates discourse markers in specific and under-researched contexts, such as Englishes in the Outer and Expanding Circle as well as online contexts: ‘*Basically* in Singapore English’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 488–501), ‘*Like* in Korean English speech’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 548–61), ‘*So* in video-mediated communication in the Expanding Circle’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 594–610), ‘*Actually* in Nordic tweets’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 631–49), and many others (see also section 10, pp. xxx). Without doubt, the contributions in this special issue are of great interest to researchers in the domains of WE, lexicology, and lexical semantics.

The final two books in this section are aimed at a wider audience of general readers. Their styles are quite similar: each chapter in these two books is phrased as a question about the English language. In Arika Okrent’s *Highly Irregular: Why Tough, Through, and Dough*

*Don't Rhyme—And Other Oddities of the English Language* (illustrated by Sean O'Neill), over forty questions related to the weirdness of English words are addressed and answered in an entertaining way. The title of Laurie Bauer and Andreea S. Calude's volume is even more straightforward: *Questions About Language: What Everyone Should Know About Language in the 21st Century* (a 2020 publication); it contains a series of key questions about language that are answered by sixteen language professionals. Of course, linguists and non-linguists will be gripped by their answers.

## 8. Onomastics

With apologies for the interruption to service due to unforeseeable circumstances, this entry aims to cover the publications in onomastics for the years 2020 and 2021 collectively. Various forms of disruption have affected research around the globe during this time, and some of that challenge has inevitably affected publication schedules; the pandemic has not been the only difficulty, with much journal scholarship remaining underfunded and dependent on good will. *Nomina*, the Journal of the Society for Name Studies in Britain and Ireland, broke with tradition by publishing its thirty-ninth volume in 2018, covering 2016-18 (rather than the anticipated 2016 single volume), and seems to be continuing this new pattern, with volume 40 (2019-21) released in 2022; the publication date being 2022, *Nomina* 40 will be addressed in the next issue of *YWES* in accordance with usual practice. More encouraging is the recovery of the publication schedule for *Onoma*, the Journal of the International Council of Onomastic Sciences, with volumes 53-56 (for years 2018-21) completed during 2020-21. Recovery is also anticipated for the regular publication of *Onomastica Canadiana*; while the journal has not released any new volumes since volume 97 (2018), a new call for papers was announced online by the Canadian Society for the Study of Onomastics in October of 2022.

Onomastics continues to be a growing sub-discipline and with all manner of issues relating to identity politics and language and power having a foothold in elements of different subjects, the texts reviewed here are unlikely to be exhaustive, although it is hoped that the major journals and publications of greatest relevance have been given sufficient treatment. It should be noted, though, that scholarship in onomastics is just as likely to appear in a specialist publication on subjects as diverse as social media, anthropology, politics, history, geography, and many other disciplines. Developments in other fields cannot be ignored here; work on name studies that may sit primarily within human geography or sociology (kindred subjects to sociolinguistics), or in psychology or marketing (frequently intersecting with subdisciplines such as cognitive linguistics, semantics, and lexicology), is also included in the discussion.

Maoz Azaryahu's book, *An Everlasting Name* (2021), represents a significant contribution to the commemorative value of names and will be of particular interest to socio-onomasticians. In this monograph, Azaryahu considers the relationships between names and memorialization looking particularly at the ways in which names of the dead are represented and remembered. Each chapter considers a different facet of this subject, concentrating for example in chapter 2 on the role of names as powerful symbols of enduring fame and immortality, and in chapter 3 on the ability of poetry, public inscriptions, and commemorative place-naming. The act of inscribing names on memorials is understood as a response to the 'sacred obligation to remember the dead' (p. 66), often augmented by aural recitations which may be perceived as 'echoes of ancient traditions' (p. 67). Contexts employed as sites of onymic commemoration range from local and personal associations with place, such as the name of a loved one attached to a seat in their favourite theatre, to the political employment of street-names, airports, and other municipal sites to convey honour, prestige, and status to the person and their legacy. The genres in which inscriptions are found

also vary from the formal use of state-sanctioned war memorials to the hand-crafted personal or political statements found in onymic graffiti. Some of the latter only survive where the cultural significance of the individual has enabled this to happen. A case in point is the preservation of '[t]he name of Lord Byron inscribed at the Temple of Poseidon at Cape Sounion, Greece' (p. 113). The book is thoroughly researched and engages with contemporary work by scholars including Mary Beard and Zygmunt Bauman, while reflecting on the onomastic and commemorative legacies of Judeo-Christian religious texts, and on the works of ancient scholars such as Cicero and Plato. The theoretical discussions are highly engaging, with arguments illuminated using extensive examples from Mesopotamia BCE to the 9/11 Memorial. It will provide an informative and practical introduction to anyone interested in onomastics and commemoration, and should provide a springboard for further comparative study and analysis of other countries and territories.

Two collections published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing deserve special attention here: *Shifting Toponymies: (Re)naming Places, (Re)shaping Identities* (2020), edited by Luisa Caiazzo and I. M. Nick, and *Naming, Identity and Tourism* (2020), edited by Luisa Caiazzo, Richard Coates, and Maoz Azaryahu. Both volumes will be of particular relevance to anyone working on critical onomastics or socio-onomastics. The first of these is addressed fully in a separate review currently in press (*Onoma* 57[2022], *forthcoming*), so suffice to say here that it is an extremely valuable compendium of recent thinking on the dynamics and consequences of power-laden acts of renaming. Chapters are contributed by ten international scholars with expertise in linguistics, psychology, and related fields, covering a wide range of contexts and examples, from Caiazzo's examination of the uses of 'India versus Bharat' (pp. 25-42) to Sara Louise Wheeler's analysis of 'toponymic eponym *Cofiwch Dryweryn* [Remember Tryweryn]', a slogan expressing Welsh national identity, particularly after Brexit (pp. 186-208, p. 200).

The second onomastic collection from Cambridge Scholars Publishing, *Naming, Tourism and Identity*, provides insights from anthropologists, economists, linguists, geographers, again proving that the greatest strengths of onomastics are to be found in its interdisciplinarity. The influence of this collection is likely to be wide ranging, and it is notable that the text is reviewed in specialist marketing journals such as the *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* (20[2020] 540-2), which notes 'the scarcity of scholarship related to such an encouraging topic' (p. 540). In chapter 1, 'Name-Making as Place-Making' (pp. 11-27), Maoz Azaryahu argues that the construction of names directly impacts on the construction of place. Here, place-naming is understood to be an act central to the process of place-making, with the act of name coinage socially and culturally binding conceptions of identity, location, history, and memory. In chapter 2, 'Naming, Packaging and the Management of Expectations' (pp. 29-44), Richard Coates asserts that it is the lack of an 'inherent synchronic linguistic meaning (sense)' which enables names to be adapted and rebranded, this flexibility being of 'immense potential value to the tourist industry' (p. 43). Next, Luisa Caiazzo considers the perceptions of names associated with magic and superstition. Her chapter, 'From the Spell of a Name to the Fear of a Name: Tourism and Identity' (pp. 45-64) focuses on Salem, Massachusetts, in the United States of America, infamous for its 'witch' trials, and Colobraro in Basilicata, Italy, considered to be an 'unlucky' place. The fourth chapter by Elena Bellavia explores 'Toponymy in Alto Adige-

Südtirol: Between Identity Conflicts and Market Laws’ (pp. 65-77), looking specifically at ‘[t]he spectre of forced Italianization’ present in perceptions of names introduced originally by Ettore Tolomei in the early twentieth century. It highlights the difficulty inherent in the uses of this group of contested names, and concludes that the proposal offered by Green Party politician Brigitte Foppa may offer a possible solution, i.e. by officially recognizing the older German names and facilitating a better understanding of the Tolomei names, so the community can ‘build a new [history] in which we can get on well together’ (p. 77). Kathryn M. Hudson’s chapter considers ‘The Consequences of Names: Archaeology, Identity, and Tourism in Contemporary Mesoamerica’ (pp. 79-98), focusing on the associations of heritage and value attached to indigenous place names. These names are employed in ‘the agentive reformulation of the region’s indigenous population’, but their use by ‘different groups with different agendas and heritages’ (p. 96) results in a complex onomastic network reflecting competing ideologies. Although chapter 6, by Valéria Tóth, focuses on ‘Toponyms, Identity and National Heritage Protection: The Digital Database of the Hungarian National Toponym Registry’ (pp. 99-112), it remains informative to researchers of other contexts because of its reflections on the design and applications of the project, and its approach to collecting multilingual onomastic evidence. Sara Matrisciano’s chapter, ‘Dialect Goes Business: Subtextual Dialect Use as Part of a New Naming Strategy in Italy’ (pp. 113-33) is similarly important for comparative analysis. It looks at the Museo della Pace (Museum of Peace) in Naples and its use of the acronym MAMT, from Mediterraneo – Arte – Musica – Tradizioni (Mediterranean – Art – Music – Traditions), deliberately punning on the Neapolitan term *mammate* ‘your mother’ in its brand construction. In chapter 8, Esterino Adami looks at ‘Naming the Exotic between Cultural Belonging, Text Building and Railway Heritage Tourism’ (pp. 135-51), with reference to the Darjeeling Himalayan Railway in Bengal, considering its etymology and symbolic meaning. Chapter 9, ‘Name – Culture – Identity: The Semantic Structure of Names’ (pp. 153-67), by Katalin Reszegi, looks at names in Hungary, but draws conclusions of relevance to wider linguistic interests. She argues that extant cognitive linguistic approaches are not currently attuned to aspects of onomastic referential meaning and should include ‘identity-indicating function (variants reflecting dialectal or register differences)’, illustrated by the contrasting perspectives involved in referring to the same person as either ‘*Mr Kovács* or *Péter*’ (p. 162). In chapter 10, ‘Name Changes and the Semantics of Toponyms’ (pp. 169-80), Jean Louis Vaxelaire provides an insightful contribution to the different perspectives on name usage in acts of destination creation which recognize that the symbolic and associative meanings of a name may take priority over theoretical positions within which names are regarded as semantically void. In doing so, he provides a timely challenge to the dominance of the view, currently dominant in linguistics and philosophy, that names are ‘rigid designators’ (after Saul Kripke). He argues that if names were semantically empty labels, they would be simple to change as the referential function would remain stable; in practice this is far from the case, as names of destinations attest: ‘It is not because a toponym does not perfectly describe the place to which it refers that it is semantically empty, it has a symbolic weight for those who live there, but also for those who could go there: the managers of tourist offices consider that an attractive name is preferable’ (p. 178). In chapter 11, Vincenzo Asero and Douglas M. Ponton report on their quest for the fictional town, ‘Vigata’, represented in the Italian detective series ‘Montalbano’,

which was adapted for television from the novels by Andrea Camilleri: ‘In Search of Vigata: Rebranding Sicilian Towns in a Tourism Perspective’ (pp. 181-201). Economics and fiction have effectively combined to create a commercial symbiosis between the two locations. Chapter 12, by Eleonora Sasso, considers ‘Extinction Tourism: The Use of Inuit Art and Names in Documentary-induced Tourism’ (pp. 203-12), concluding that polar tourism, made possible only by devastating changes in the climate and ecosystem, is an existential threat to the Inuit way of life, further eroding its ‘hunting culture’ and ‘cultural survival’ (p. 211). In the final chapter, Elsa Skënderi examines the ‘Linguistic Landscape of Touristic Tirana’ (pp. 213-24), finding that the area of the Albanian capital known as *Blloku* (used during the period of communist rule to designate a residential neighbourhood occupied by state officials) is now visibly multilingual, in an effort to attract tourists. English dominates the foreign languages identified in the landscape, and the introduction of foreign elements to Albanian as a result of such contact has had a mixed reception, representing ‘European integration’ to some, and triggering concerns over ‘language change as language corruption’ for others (p. 221).

Conference proceedings of note to the onomastic community published 2020-21 include specialist themed volumes. The intersection between business and onomastics is the theme of *The Economy in Names – Values, Branding and Globalization: Proceedings of Names in the Economy 6<sup>th</sup> International Conference, Uppsala, 3-5 June 2019*, edited by Katharina Leibring, Leila Mattfolk, Kristina Neumüller, Staffan Nyström, and Elin Pihl (2021). A comprehensive review of this volume is provided by Sergey Goryaev (*Onoma* 56[2021] 305-310), who marks out Paula Sjöblom for special praise for her ongoing contributions to the study of commercial names, a burgeoning sub-discipline within the ‘shoreless ocean of onomastics’ (p. 306). A notable contribution to anthroponymy for the period under review is the *Proceedings of the International Onomastic Conference ‘Anthroponyms and Anthroponymic Researches in the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century’, Dedicated to the 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Birth of Prof. Yordan Zaimov, Dr. Sc. (1921-1987), 20-22 April 2021, Sofia*, edited by Anna Choleva-Dimitrova, Maya Vlahova-Angelova, and Nadezhda Dancheva (2021). Reviewing this collection, Gergana Petkova details the contents of each thematic section: Historical Anthroponymy, Contemporary Anthroponymy, First Names Fashion in the Global World, Theory of Proper Names, and Anthroponyms in Toponymy (*Onoma* 56[2021] 321-37). The volume also contains written versions of the plenary papers, which include a celebratory chapter on the life and work of the late Professor Yordan Zaimov, and his contributions to hydronymy, toponymy, anthroponymy, etymology, and diachronic linguistics. Scholars of English-language focused onomastics may find the Theory section the most relatable and accessible, although the more locally specific papers on diverse European languages and geographical areas are in many cases an invitation to further and comparative study of similar patterns and phenomena worldwide.

Books aimed primarily at the more populist market are often of mixed utility to the serious researcher and are not usually addressed here unless they are especially noteworthy. One such exception is Stephen B. Heard’s book, *Charles Darwin’s Barnacle and David Bowie’s Spider: How Scientific Names Celebrate Adventurers, Heroes, and Even a Few Scoundrels* (2020). It provides a very readable introduction to scientific taxonomy which may prove inspirational to anyone delivering general courses on onomastics or looking for

interdisciplinary opportunities. A comprehensive review by I. M. Nick is available for the curious (*Names* 70[2022] 53-59). A more problematic book is *A History of English Placenames and Where They Came From* (2020), by John Moss, which may serve to whet the appetite of the novice onomastician, but is sadly of little use to the linguistic scholar as it does not clearly attribute any of its data. The bibliography does not include some anticipated sources such as *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names* (2007) by Victor Watts, but does reference *A Dictionary of British Place-Names* (2011) by A. D. Mills. Some reverse-engineering may therefore be attempted, but the historical onomastician is more likely to consult the Survey of English Place-Names (SEPN) and Digital Survey of English Place-Names (DSEPN) for scholarly interpretations. There is a long history of place-name dictionaries liberally ‘borrowing’ from one another, so the criticism here is not so much levelled at the recycling of the work of the giants on whose shoulders we all stand. However, without knowing from whence any of the name explanations have come, expert readers will find the book of limited application. We are not the intended audience, but may find it useful to be aware of and beware of such resources, particularly if marking essays.

Three volumes of the SEPN were issued during 2020-21, taking the total published to date to ninety-six, publication having begun in the 1920s. The material from these most recent volumes has not yet been incorporated into the online version of SEPN, DSEPN, available on the English Place Name Society (EPNS) website <https://epns.nottingham.ac.uk/about>, which is itself a few years out-of-date in its commentary on progress. At the time of writing the page notes that ‘89 volumes have been published to date (2013)’, and provides no further information on the turnaround time between new volume publication and incorporation into the online database. The online survey remains a critically important resource for researchers working on English historical toponymy, so it is to be hoped that this work continues to catch up with the published books.

SEPN volume 94 by A. D. Mills constitutes Part Five of the sequence addressing the county of Dorset, focusing specifically on names of districts and rivers, and providing the introduction, analyses, and index to the group of volumes on Dorset collectively. Full county surveys often take a long time to undertake, and are published intermittently through the numbered sequence of volumes as they are completed. Part One of the county survey of Dorset, also by Mills, appeared over forty years ago in 1977, the publication of Part Five in 2020 underlining the time and tenacious commitment required by survey authors. As Mills acknowledges in the Preface, this volume ‘concludes the survey of the county’s names [he] began in the early sixties and therefore completes what has turned out to be a lifetime’s project’ (p. vii). The book includes helpful and detailed Addenda and Corrigenda (pp. 29-43) to the previous four volumes, adding abbreviations to additional sources, and augmenting the lists of historical name forms with additional examples where these have been subsequently identified. The Introduction is itself an invaluable guide to naming practices in Dorset, summarizing key patterns in the data, including French influence on manorial names (p. 51) and medieval additions of Latin affixes to existing names, attesting to its status as the ‘principal language of law and administration’ (p. 52). The volume then provides a substantial dictionary of elements found in Dorset place- and field-names (pp. 93-271), followed by a list of personal names also identified (pp. 273-293). Additional materials include a discussion on ‘Some Categories of Field-Names and Minor Names’ (pp. 295-299)

and ‘The Anglo-Saxon Charter Boundaries of Dorset’ (pp. 301-318). The index to all five parts of the Dorset survey occupies the final substantive section of the book (pp. 319-487). Publication of this volume marks a significant personal achievement by Mills, from whose expertise and considerable effort all scholars working on English place-names and their history will continue to benefit substantially for many years to come.

SEPN volumes 95 and 96 constitute Parts Eight and Nine respectively of the Survey for Shropshire, both derived from the materials collected by the late Margaret Gelling and the late H. D. G. Foxall, who produced the first six volumes for the county (volume 95, p. vii). Part Eight covers the geographical areas of Overs Hundred, the Borough of Ludlow, the Southern Part of Munslow Hundred, and the Stowe Division of Purslow Hundred, while Part Nine covers Chirbury Hundred and the Bishop’s Castle Division of Purslow Hundred. While production of the SEPN is funded primarily by the British Academy, the authors are keen to acknowledge the additional support granted for the production of these two volumes by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, which allowed a team of scholars to collaborate specifically on the construction of Part Nine (p. x). Both volumes follow the typical structure of the SEPN, each including a section on significant topographical features before the main geographically organized survey of historical forms recorded for each place-name in scope. The introductions to each volume summarize the dominant trends observable in the data. Part Eight, for example, explains that names indicative of Brittonic influence are ‘rare in the more easterly hundreds of Overs and Munslow’ but more commonplace in the west (p. xiii), and details some of the evidence for Shropshire dialectal lexis and morphology found in toponyms (p. xiv). Part Nine reviews the topography as reflected in recurring generics and historical land-use, reflected in specifics relating to local flora (pp. xiv-xvii). While political engagement with the historical toponymy is not the remit of the SEPN, the evidence collected invites further scrutiny from a critical perspective, especially in relation to the fortifications and watchtowers prevalent across the landscape, and the relationships between languages.

The English Place-Name Society (EPNS) series, ‘Your City’s Place-Names’, has not produced any additional material since the appearance of the fourth volume in 2019, by Richard Coates, on names in Cambridge. However, a single locally-focused volume by Coates on *Grimsby and Cleethorpes Place-Names* was issued online by EPNS in 2020. The format of this book is very similar to that of the EPNS ‘City’ series, being accessibly written and assuming no prior knowledge of linguistics or onomastics.

2021 also saw the publication of *An Index to Personal Names in English Place-Names*, by Keith Briggs, a useful ‘finding aid for locating personal names in books about English place-names, primarily those published by EPNS’ (p. 1), and represents the culmination of a project first announced in 2015. Briggs has included all personal names ‘from the Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England (PASE, [www.pase.ac.uk](http://www.pase.ac.uk)) project’, and the personal names proposed in etymologies for toponymic charter boundary markers in the long-running Anglo-Saxon Charters series, which began publication in the 1970s by Oxford University Press for the British Academy (p. 4). Personal names proposed as solutions for onomastic data found in numismatic sources have not been included, and Briggs directs readers to the works of Fran Colman as a starting point for this material, e.g. her important monograph *Money Talks: Reconstructing Old English* (1992). For anyone investigating

historical personal names, Briggs guide should prove invaluable as a navigational and time-saving aid. It is freely available on the EPNS online publications page.

Publication of the English Place-Name Society's journal has continued unbroken through the first years of the COVID-19 pandemic, although quite a high number of articles were written by the same contributors, and some small but striking oddities in production quality hint at the inevitable pressures editors have had to contend with in 2020 and 2021. Keith Briggs, for example, is a prolific contributor, with four items in Volume 51 (for 2019, published 2020) and two in Volume 52 (for 2020, published 2021). Volume 51 opens with an article by Briggs on 'Old English Collective Plant-Names in Place-Names' (*JEPNS* 51[2019] 5-14), in which he argues that 'there are more examples of [...] collective nouns in English place-names than generally appreciated', and calls for a more systematic study of this group of neglected names (p. 6). This is followed by a second article by Briggs, on the subject of 'The River *Mearcella* in Suffolk, Once Again' (*JEPNS* 51[2019] 15-21). Here, he proposes the identification of later reflexes of the name in records dating to the late fifteenth century, the name previously being identified only in two Old English charters, and argues that the continuity of later forms with <c> suggest an original Old English [k] pronunciation. The third article, by Barrie Cox, discusses '*Corieltavi*, Romans and Romano-British: a Leicestershire Legacy' (*JEPNS* 51[2019] 23-35), tracing the echoes of the early British names, and detailing and examining their etymologies. He argues that this evidence points towards continued land dating back to 'at least the later Iron Age' (p. 23). Next, Kevin James examines 'Windsor, *Windofer* and Iverley: Illustrating the Place-Name Element \**ofer* Within the Anglo-Saxon Road Network' (*JEPNS* 51[2019] 37-64). He proposes that rather than denoting a gently-sloping hill, it should be understood as a term for 'a convenient and well-used route to high ground' (p. 37). Sarah Wager's short article (really a note) on 'A British wood in medieval Warwickshire' supports Margaret Gelling's earlier assertion that the twelfth-century name *munechet*, for which the interpretation of historical spellings is disputed, very likely contains a Brittonic ancestor of Welsh *coed* 'wood' (*JEPNS* 51[2019] 65-67). Two notes follow the articles. Keith Briggs suggests that the Old English personal name *Wulfrūn* may explain a problematic etymology in 'The Wolverine: An Animal-Name for a Personal Name?', noting also that the Anglo-Saxon animal may have been quite different from the modern wolverine, perhaps some form of weasel or aquatic mammal (*JEPNS* 51[2019] 69). Richard Coates then provides a short commentary, 'More Gay Names' (*JEPNS* 51[2019] 71-72), in which he notes some additions to his corpus of names containing 'an element *gay* or similar, not conclusively explained' (p. 71) and that more work is needed to gather together all possible examples in the pursuit of a satisfactory etymology. Also contained in the volume are a number of valuable reviews of recent works published on topics relevant to the study of medieval England, the Bibliography (for 2017), and the usual collection of 'Notices and addenda' including the annual notification of the Alfred Oscroft Prize, and the Reports and Accounts for the Society.

*JEPNS* Volume 52 begins with an article by Abigail Lloyd on '*Stonyborow*: A Clue to a Roman Settlement in Rural Oxfordshire? The symbiotic Relationship Between Field-Names and Archaeological Data' (*JEPNS* 52[2020] 5-20). Here Lloyd argues that historical and linguistic evidence may be combined to argue that 'the 1605 name *Stonyborow* appears to contain a memory of built (Roman?) remains at the specific spot bearing the name' (p. 5).

In the second article, ‘Jumbo, Lancashire: A Toponomastic Study’ (*JEPNS* 52[2020] 21-67), John W. Taylor provides an appropriately substantial account of the place-name and its linguistic relatives, looking at the wider corpus of *jumb-* and *jump-*root names, and the semantic range of *jumble* in English and Scots. A collection of names in West Yorkshire, Derbyshire, Cumberland, Westmorland, and Lancashire containing these elements is provided in section five, Taylor concluding that the use of the term is ‘rooted in the vocabulary of the Danelaw’ (p. 55), *jumb* denoting ‘a deep pool in a stream or brook’, its shape metaphorically and philologically connecting it to vessels used to contain liquid such as basins and cups (p. 56). The next article, another by Keith Briggs, proposes that Eilert Ekwall’s first historical spelling for ‘The Earliest Records of Newmarket’ (*JEPNS* 52[2020] 68-75) must have been inferred from its use in a personal name, and that the actual earliest historical form for the place is found in records dating from 1218/9. The origin of the surname is therefore also called into question. Intentionally or otherwise, rather unhelpfully none of the place-name dictionaries cited, such as Ekwall’s *Dictionary of English Place-Names* and the *Dictionary of British Place-Names* by A. D. Mills, are included in the list of references. Also by Briggs, the fourth and final article, ‘Thelnetham and Whelnetham in Suffolk: Early Christian Sites?’ (*JEPNS* 52[2020] 76-84), reviews the historical phonology for these two names and proposes that both originally took a form that may be reconstructed as *\*Þwēal-fæt-hām*, suggesting this may be from *þwaēlfæt*, denoting a ‘baptismal tank’ (p. 82). A section detailing three notes then follows. Richard Coates contributes ‘A Note on *Whewes*’ (*JEPNS* 52[2020] 85-9), in which he suggests the term ‘woe’ may exist in field-names denoting ‘intractable or unrewarding land’ (p. 88). Coates also contributes ‘Some Notes on Mount Skippet’ (*JEPNS* 52[2020] 90-6), adding further examples to the lists compiled by Margaret Gelling in her earlier work, and reviews some possible etymologies. The final note is by John Insley, in which he considers ‘The Wolverine Again’ (*JEPNS* 52[2020] 97-102), concluding that the place-names thought to contain this element are instead composed of compounds formed from Old English *wulf* ‘wolf’ and Old English *\*rān* ‘a strip of uncultivated land which serves as, or follows, the line of a boundary’ (p. 101). The volume also includes an obituary for Professor Jim Wilkes (1932-2020), a chemical engineer who took an active interest in toponymic research on his retirement, in part inspired by the legacy of his grandfather, Alfred Oscroft, who had conducted extensive work on English place-names. Building on Oscroft’s research, Wilkes compiled the *Place-Names of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight* (2015), particularly notable for its helpful inclusion of colour images of maps (p. 106). The volume then proceeds with the Bibliography (for 2018), followed by the annual, and here quite poignant, Notice of the Alfred Oscroft Essay Prize, awarded by the Society. The volume ends with the EPNS Annual Reports and Accounts.

Several articles in the *Journal of Scottish Name Studies* will be of interest to scholars of English and its close cognates, including Scots. Volume 14 was a special issue on the topic of ‘Diversifying Approaches to Onomastics in Scotland’, guest edited by Sarah Künzler, and marks a new phase for the journal following the retirement of Professor Richard Cox from his editorial role. In the introductory article, ‘Once Upon a Place-Name’ (*JSNS* 14[2020] 1-15), Künzler explains that the collection in this volume grew out of two Glasgow University research workshops held in 2019 and 2020 (p. 1), and reminds readers that ‘traditional methods for analysis and the sole focus on finding the earliest attested source together with

the correct etymology do not always allow us to capture the ongoing human engagement with these place-names', arguing that 'folk etymologies' and 'everyday experiences' also provide important contributions to our understanding of the social uses of a name (p. 3). This appears to be a slightly oblique reference to the increasing interest in socio-onomastics and critical onomastics, which is primarily concerned with the relationships between names, people, and power rather than with the pursuit of historical name forms and origins. Although focusing on the uses of a Scottish Gaelic term, Alasdair C. Whyte's article, 'The Cailleach in Place-Names and Place-Lore' (*JSNS* 14[2020] 16-58), will be of interest for comparative theoretical consideration of similar phenomena; terms for 'old women' appear in names around the globe. Additionally, Whyte argues that this research should promote 'engagement with and understanding of the dynamism of local namescapes and the wide-ranging sources for place-names, as well as promoting and safeguarding local heritage' (p. 47). In their article, Anouk Busset and Sofia Evemalm-Graham consider 'Places of Belief in Medieval Glen Lyon and Beyond: Onomastic and Archaeological Perspectives' (*JSNS* 14[2020] 59-120), examining a chronology of belief reflective of the areas evolving onomastic audiences. Busset and Evemalm-Graham provide a partial survey of the area's names, recognizing and documenting folk etymologies as valuable components of name analysis not to be dismissed, and asserting that this information 'can tell us just as much about people's relationship(s) with place as traditional onomastic approaches, albeit with different chronological emphasis' (p. 104). The focus on chronological evolution is also central to the article by Alison Burns, 'We're Going Through Changes: Transition in Aberdeen Field-Names' (*JSNS* 14[2020] 121-139). She highlights the importance of new methods of research when working on this type of material, documenting her own use of socio-onomastic interviews conducted for her PhD thesis, 'Field-names of North-East Scotland: A Socio-Onomastic Study' (2015). Leonie Mhari's article, 'Littorally Speaking: Metaphor and Narratives of 'Weathering' in Berwickshire's Coastal Names' (*JSNS* 14[2020] 140-170), draws attention to the value of the narratives provided in the Ordnance Survey Name Books (OSNB) in understanding names in the area. She adapts the term 'weathering', more commonly encountered in environmental studies related to climate change, 'to elucidate the ways in which place-name evidence contributes to how inhabitants and their environments are inter-related and implicated in creating landscapes and how this contributes to the continual cycle of reinterpretation' (p. 142). The volume concludes with the 'Bibliography of Scottish Name Studies for 2019', compiled by Simon Taylor, followed by an appendix of 'County Abbreviations for Scotland with Some England (Pre-1975)'; these historical counties are often used as reference points for historical name studies, given their longevity and contextual significance. Some delays were incurred for *JSNS*'s recent volumes, in part due to the changeover in the editorial team and the adoption of a different online publication, based at the University of Glasgow, with the result that Volume 15 (for 2021) was released in 2022; its contents will therefore be addressed in the next *YWES* issue.

Four volumes of *Onoma*, the journal of the International Council of Onomastic Sciences (ICOS), were published in the period 2020-21: Volume 53 (for 2018), Volume 54 (for 2019), Volume 55 (for 2020), and Volume 56 (for 2021). As noted earlier, this is very good news for the international onomastic community in general and for ICOS specifically, and puts the publication schedule back on course, after a number of difficult years. Compared

to most issues, volume 53 is a slim tome of 124 pages, with papers grouped around the theme of ‘Explorations in Literary Onomastic Theory’. The introduction, by Martyna Gibka and Richard Coates, provides a statement on recent developments in scholarship on literary onomastics (*Onoma* 53[2018] 7-10), noting the importance of key international journals such as the *Journal of Literary Onomastics* (p. 8). By drawing together a special collection on theory, it is hoped that this volume will foster the development of ‘a strong international society for literary onomastics and a platform for international cooperation’ (p. 10). This is therefore an appropriate juncture at which to note that the *Journal of Literary Onomastics* (*JLO*) has unfortunately not issued any volumes since 2019; it is to be hoped that the current interruption to publication is only temporary and a result of recent global problems.

The articles in *Onoma* 53 each focus on different genres of text, or on different aspects of literary onomastic theory. In ‘Linguistic Aspects of Literary Name Organisation’, Richard Coates offers a further excursus on his widely-critiqued ‘Pragmatic Theory of Properhood’ in relation to literary names, identifying four categories of authorial coinage (*Onoma* 53[2018] 11-31). In ‘Notes on Functions of Proper Names in Literature’, Žaneta Dvorská outlines the main typologies of literary name functions presented in relation to Czech literature, namely: *identification, characterization, mythization, associating, symbol, classification, aesthetics, and illusion*, arguing these should be understood against the wider intersections of genre, culture, poetics, linguistics, and semantics (*Onoma* 53[2018] 33-50). Martyna Gibka’s two additional contributions revisit theoretical questions addressed in Gibka (2019), examining the ‘Functions of Characters’ Proper Names in Novels’ (*Onoma* 53[2018] 49-66) and the ‘Functions of Characters’ Proper Names in Television Series’ (*Onoma* 53[2018] 67-80). She recounts developments in and limitations of literary onomastic theory, revisiting her ‘theory of two acts’ (p. 53), previously described as being ‘based on two acts: the naming act in a literary work and the act of using a name in a literary work’ (Gibka 2019, p. 47). Models of permanent and momentary functions in literary name use are provided (pp. 59, 70-2, 76), being adapted to the television content in the second chapter by replacing ‘the author’ with ‘the script team’, and ‘the reader’ with ‘the viewer’, etc. (p. 78). Volker Kohlheim’s enigmatically-titled article ‘Proper Names in Literature: A “Reevaluation of All Values”’ (*Onoma* 53[2018] 81-92) uncontroversially argues that in literature, names invoke a new evaluative framework that challenges, disrupts, and ludically engages with frameworks typically associated with everyday onomastic usage and communication. The final article, by Grant W. Smith, considers ‘Naming as Art in Shakespeare’s *Tempest*’ (*Onoma* 53[2018] 93-106), looking at names as ‘a type of sign’ (p. 105) and evaluating their symbolic function, symbolic meaning occurring, after Peirce, ‘when a sign evokes two or more indexical referents in the mind of an interpreter’ (pp. 95-6).

Volume 54 of *Onoma* takes as its theme ‘Young Scholars of Onomastics’, and is edited by Lasse Hämäläinen, the second person to serve as student representative on the Board of ICOS since the inception of the role in 2014 (*Onoma* 54[2019] foreword). In the introduction (*Onoma* 54[2019] 7-13), he recounts some of the highlights of the first ICOS Summer School, a five-day course held in August 2019 and attended by twenty-one students from fifteen countries, taking ‘Methods of Onomastics’ as its theme (p. 9). All student participants had the opportunity to introduce their PhD projects, and given the positive feedback received, it is hoped that this event will become a regular occurrence (p. 10).

Several articles in the volume focus on naming contexts where languages other than English take precedence, but many of these will be of interest to onomastic scholars worldwide. The second article is one such example, its socio-onomastic approach interesting in its own theoretical right alongside its geographical and linguistic focus on ‘Community Microtoponymy: Proposals to Read an Oral Corpus from Marene (Piedmont, Italy)’ (*Onoma* 54[2019] 15-38). Here, Sara Racca adapts Aldo Prosdocimi’s proper name theory to examine ‘the toponym creation process’ (p. 22) in an area where the standard language (in this case Italian) is typically used in situations that are both formal and informal, and the local dialect (in this case Piedmontese) is socially restricted, and typically used only informally. This sociolinguistic situation, described by Gaetano Berruto as ‘dilalia’ (p. 18), is found in many other contexts internationally, so Racca’s approach and findings will be of widespread interest. Dialectal representation in toponymy is also discussed in the third article, on ‘The Realisation of Traditional Local Dialectal Features in the Address Names of Two Western Norwegian Municipalities’ (*Onoma* 54[2019] 53-75). In this part of the world, in which ‘it is acceptable to use dialects in both private and public contexts’ (p. 53), Wen Ge observes that this tolerance of dialectal forms is paralleled to some extent in the local toponymy. Dorcas Zuvalinyenga and Alan Libert provide ‘An Analysis of the Relationship Between Toponyms and a Variety of Historical and Cultural Specificities in the Discursive Construction of Identity in a Regional Town in Zimbabwe’ in their contribution (*Onoma* 54[2019] 77-98). From a mixed-methods analysis of evidence from the town of Bindura, they conclude that the toponyms ‘discursively embody’ aspects of social identity, history, and culture (p. 93), while also recognizing that the representation of women is ‘sidelined and unrecognised’, especially in odonymic contexts (p. 92). Fatemeh Akbari reviews economic and social practices in her article, ‘Immigrants’ Business Naming: Persian Restaurants and Supermarkets in Vienna’s Linguistic Landscape’ (*Onoma* 54[2019] 99-116). Cataloguing the ways in which aspects of Persian language and Iranian geography are incorporated into commercial naming practices, she identifies these as internationally recognized markers of identity, used to convey cultural authenticity to products, businesses, and services. This study especially invites further comparative research to determine whether the patterns observed in the Viennese data are more widely applicable to other multicultural contexts. Taking on another topic of global interest, Oleksandra Kuzmenko explores ‘The Role of Pragmatonyms in the Formation of a Post-Apocalyptic Worldview in a Role-Playing Video Game’, looking specifically at the game series *Fallout* (*Onoma* 54[2019] 117-35). Pragmatonyms or ‘product names’ contribute to user perceptions of the fictional gaming world, contributing to ‘worldview modelling’ (pp. 117-18). From an analysis of *Fallout* ‘as a media text’ (p. 119), Kuzmenko concludes that its pragmatonyms are semantically polarized to match the pre- and post-war bifurcated structure of the game, with products taking on either positive or negative connotations (e.g. *Fresh*, *Infected*) (p. 132) that contribute to the players’ understanding of the virtual space and how best to navigate it.

Volume 55 of *Onoma* (for 2020) is themed around the topic of ‘Personal Names and Cultural Reconstructions’, and includes fourteen articles, most of which concentrate on naming practices in specific European countries or contexts. These articles developed from papers given at the conference of the same name, held in Helsinki in August 2019. While the entirety of the collection will be of interest to anthroponomasticians, the articles of most

general relevance to English Language scholars are probably the contributions by Anna-Maria Balbach, ‘*Caesar, Jack, and Cuffee: African-American Fugitive Slave Names in the 17<sup>th</sup> to the 19<sup>th</sup> Century*’ (*Onoma* 55[2020] 205-27), and Bertie Neethling, ‘The So-Called Coloured people of South Africa: Modern Anthroponymic Reconstruction?’ (*Onoma* 55[2020] 229-46). For her research, Balbach uses the Cornell University database *Freedom on the Move: A Database of Fugitives of American Slavery* (2016). This important resource includes the first names of over 3800 slaves who escaped their captors and affords considerable new insights for linguistic and sociological research. She compares this data set with that collected for Newbell N. Puckett’s *Black Names in America: Origins and Usage* (1975), categorizing names on the basis of their origins to shed new light on the patterns in the data. For example, she finds that ‘names with pejorative connotations continue to be used for female slave names until the 19th century’ (p. 224). Neethling’s article looks at naming practices amongst the people still typically classified by the current government of South Africa as ‘Coloured’, a deeply contested designation. Nevertheless, the country’s population is frequently described in official documents as consisting of four dominant types, including this ‘inappropriate ethnonym’ (p. 232): ‘(Black) African, Coloured, Indian/Asian and White’ (p. 231). The ‘Coloured’, according to Neethling, is generally understood to be descendants of ‘groups of slaves [...] imported, initially, from Batavia and Madagascar, but later also from Indonesia, India, Angola and Mozambique’ although this too is a contested point; some of this ‘group’ claim descent from the Khoi, for example (p. 232). From an examination of a variety of contemporary sources, Neethling concludes that this population is currently embracing a new approach to naming, breaking with older traditions of choosing ‘semantically transparent’ names that ‘carry meaning [...] usually extremely positive’ (p. 238). These new names do not have the same etymological motivation, and this trend appears to be growing, with many respondents to the study speaking ‘proudly’ of their innovative names (p. 242). A short corpus is provided as an Addendum to the article, which may inspire future research. A paper authored with or by members of this dubiously designated group, for example, might provide additional insights that complement this work.

*Onoma* 55 additionally contains a review by Frank Nuessel that discusses I. M. Nick’s monograph, *Personal names, Hitler, and the Holocaust: A Socio-Onomastic Study of Genocide and Nazi Germany* (2019). This important work was unfortunately omitted in error from the YWES issue for that year, so special attention is drawn to it here, by way of apology. Nuessel provides a glowing report on the book, which is the first to provide a detailed examination of the weaponization of personal names by the Nazis, particularly through their introduction of legislation dictating the addition of affixes to all Jewish names, this labelling deliberately used to mark people for death (p. 315). He judges this as ‘a highly informative yet deeply sensitive onomastic account of the Holocaust [...] a must read book for everyone’ (p. 318).

Volume 56 of *Onoma* (for 2021) takes as its focus ‘Dynamics of the Anthroponymic System’, its nine thematic articles each considering examples reflective of different cultures, most of which examine contemporary practices. This is another important collection for the comparative study of personal names and includes papers on contemporary naming practices in Sweden, Slovakia, Serbia, Turkey, Romania, Hungary, Czechia, and Bulgaria. Of particular relevance to English historical linguists is Oksana Dobrovolska’s article, ‘Middle

English Names of Workers in Metal: Etymology and Functioning as Common Nouns and Proper Names' (*Onoma* 56[2021] 123-48). From an analysis of onomastic evidence in the second edition of the *OED* (through curiously not the online Third Edition, perhaps due to access or paywall issues), the freely available online *MED*, and P. H. Reaney's *A Dictionary of British Surnames* (1966) – again somewhat curiously, rather than the more compendious authoritative four-volume *Oxford Dictionary of Family Names in Britain and Ireland* (2016), perhaps also for reasons of access – she identifies 2417 Middle English occupational terms, including 2015 used in surnames, 209 of which relate to workers in metal (p. 128).

Reviewing the etymologies of these terms, she draws several statistical conclusions which would each benefit from some closer analysis if they are to shed light on social practices underlying the 'evolution of the Middle English semantic system' (p. 136). This could be approached by assessing for example whether the finding of the 'predominance of Romance vocabulary over Germanic' (p. 136) is indicative of French crafts and techniques being imported into England, of French immigration into England, or of other phenomena. The Appendix (pp. 139-48) is detailed and comprehensive, and adds value to the subject.

Several unthemed articles are also included in the volume. Osei Yaw Akoto's article, 'Geographical Markers in Church Names: A Synergy of Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Landscape Methodologies' (*Onoma* 56[2021] 213-34), reports on his use of corpus software *AntConc* (v. 3.5.8) to interrogate data collected from around a thousand Ghanaian posters. He classifies the geographical markers into groups according to their reference to an institution, city, nation, continent, or to the globe, noting that the position of these geographic markers is 'informed by the kind of identity church namers seek to construct' in each instance (p. 231). In 'Not by Any Other Name: The Onomastics of Government Schools in New South Wales, Australia' (*Onoma* 56[2021] 251-68), Colin Symes draws much needed scholarly attention to the symbolic uses of school names, many of which encode elements of the colonial past. In 'Street Naming Practices: A Systematic Review of Urban Toponymic Scholarship' (*Onoma* 56[2021] 269-92), Mihai S. Rusu provides an extremely practical summary of the work conducted thus far on this area. His article is an excellent guide for anyone new to this subject and his suggested directions for further research are a timely provocation.

*Nomina Africana* once again presents a fascinating collection of onomastic research and commentary, some articles specifically focusing on African languages, but many of general interest and comparative application to other contexts. Zvinashe Mamvura, Charles Pfukwa, and David E Mutasa's article, 'Scale, Street Renaming and the Continued Visibility of Colonial Street Names in Harare' (*NomAf* 34[2020] 21-32) considers 'the re-inscription of the cultural landscape' (p. 21), looking particularly at the central business district of the city. Finding that the longer, more visible streets have been renamed, while more minor streets have not, they conclude that this geographical pattern of reclamation was 'a conscious process of pursuing populist politics meant to pacify a restive African population' (p. 31). In 'The Choice of Craft Beer Names in Present-Day South Africa: An Analysis' (*NomAf* 34[2020] 45-56), Bertie Neethling catalogues brand names and their linguistic origins. He reports that while more established brands still dominate the market, younger people are becoming more interested in craft beers, perceived to offer 'exciting new names, formats, designs and tastes' (p. 55). In Vincent Jenjekwa's article, 'Post-2000 Revitalisation of Shona Place Names in Zimbabwe: Recovering Voices from the Past' (*NomAf* 35[2021] 1-14),

challenges involved in reinstating indigenous names are reviewed. It is argued that ‘revitalised toponyms play a critical role in the revitalisation and preservation of African indigenous knowledge systems’ (p. 1). Bertie Neethling contributes an article on ‘Choice of Naming: Lifestyle Estates in Cape Town and Surroundings’ (*NomAf* 35[2021] 15-29), reviewing developers’ approaches to naming new upmarket estates. Exploring several examples in depth, he considers their etymologies and the various reasons why each may be associated with prestige, and, following Bourdieu, asserts that ‘symbolic capital is found in the realm of the everyday where it manifests through branding and advertising which create unique place identities’ (p. 28). In ‘The Semiotics of Unconventional Automobile Naming in Zimbabwe’ (*NomAf* 35[2021] 31-40), Raphael Nhongo and Primrose Baba Tshotsho explore secondary names given to vehicles by their users. This fascinating socio-onomastics study identifies the key semantic domains from which these names are drawn, influenced particularly by ‘shape, efficiency, speed, primary name, politics, social acceptability and socio-economic factors’ (p. 31). In ‘Names and Ethnic Heritage: A Study of Ethnic Diversity in the company Director Network on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange’ (*NomAf* 35[2021] 41-54), Burgert A. Senekal and Eduan Kotzé reveal a socio-economic landscape ‘dominated by directors with Indo-European, Germanic and English surnames, followed by directors with Niger-Congo and Negro-African surnames’ (p. 41).

The Journal of the American Name Society, *Names*, moved to a new online platform and became fully open-source in 2021. This should be a boon to all scholars of onomastics, and particularly those with independent status who often struggle to access resources otherwise constrained behind paywalls; a footnote for the bibliographer is that from Volume 69 onwards, the journal no longer uses continuous pagination across its quarterly issues.

The issues for 2020 include some important contributions to theory and methodology. In his article, ‘*Greece, The Netherlands and (the) Ukraine: A Corpus-Based Study of Definite Article Use with Country Names*’ (*Names* 68[2020] 1-16), Heiko Motschenbacher considers the observable, yet variable syntactic patterns associated with these English exonyms in the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Noting that the use of ‘a country name with a definite article is often perceived to date back to times before the respective geographical entity became an independent nation and may therefore possess a colonial or outdated flavour’ (p. 3), he applies a more systematic approach than has been offered by non-corpus based previous analyses. His investigation shows that (at least in the context of COCA), names in plural forms, names incorporating nouns such as *republic*, and initialisms typically pattern with the definite article, while the structures of non-plural formations, names with specifiers such as *south*, and monomorphemic names typically ‘block the use of a definite article’ (p. 14). This is an important contribution that demonstrates the advantages of corpus techniques in onomastic contextual analysis. Motschenbacher further explores the use of COCA in his prizewinning contribution, ‘Corpus Linguistics Onomastics: A Plea for the Corpus-Based Investigation of Names’ (*Names* 68[2020] 88-103), awarded the title of ‘Article of the Year’ for 2020 publications in the journal. Read together, these articles provide some very compelling evidence for the need to study names in their wider linguistic context, and show that robust, systematic conclusions may be drawn from such analyses. In ‘Simplex Generic Toponyms in Four English-speaking Jurisdictions’ (*Names* 68[2020] 17-31), Jan Tent provides an important theoretical paper that carefully considers the often-

neglected name construction, underlining the prevalence of such names and the need for them to be studied and ‘recognized as a discrete toponym class’ (p. 28). In ‘Ambivalence, Avoidance, and Appeal: Alliterative Aspects of Anglo Anthroponyms’ (*Names* 68[2020] 141-55), Stephen J. Bush provides a comprehensive analysis of available public data from England and Wales from 1838-2014. He finds that alliterative names pattern through time, appearing scatteredly in the nineteenth century, declining through the twentieth century until the 1970s, before becoming much more popular in the late twentieth century. He concludes that this evidence can be related to contemporary social attitudes, with the need for names to be more distinctive driving the increased use of such names in more recent times.

Interlingual and intercultural topics are also explored. In ‘Exploring the Logic of Name Changes and Identity Construction: A Reflective Self-Narration of Assimilation Expectations’ (*Names* 68[2020] 32-41), Xing Xu provides an insightful piece of autoethnographic research, examining her personal experiences as both ‘Xing’ and ‘Helen’. She traces the socio-cultural tensions she encountered, documenting the motives for her decision to ‘initiate the reclamation of [her] ethnic name, Xing’ (p. 39). ‘The Linguistics of Name Translation: Preferred Personal and Business Names in English, Korean, and Chinese’ (*Names* 68[2020] 104-24), by Jong-mi Kim, demonstrates through the use of survey data that ‘sound translation is preferred from and to English, meaning translation from and to Chinese’, with a mixed pattern of preference from and to Korean (p. 104). ‘A Preliminary Study on the Nicknames of the FIFA National Football Teams’ (*Names* 68[2020] 104-124), by Wang Feng, Zhang Shuyue, and Chen Cheng, brings together a collection of 315 nicknames applied to the 211 teams. They identify a number of patterns in the data, such as the absence of the term ‘football’, and the cultural variance in the uses of terms including ‘lion’ and ‘dragon’ (p. 67). Lindsey N. H. Chen, ‘Lexico-Cultural Variations in Product Naming: A Note on the Names of Handcrafted Soaps’ (*Names* 68[2020] 76-87), demonstrates that names relating to plants and food dominate this market in both US and Taiwanese marketing. More ‘novel’ imaginative names were found for US products, whereas the Taiwanese brand names were more likely to be descriptive of the products’ function (p. 76). In her article ‘Black Rising: An Editorial Note on the Increasing Popularity of a US American Racial Ethnonym’ (*Names* 68[2020] 131-40), I. M. Nick observes that media reporting on activism by movements such as ‘Black Lives Matter’ has encouraged the ethnonymic use of the term ‘Black’ rather than the term ‘African(-) American’. She asserts that use of the term is changing, and ‘for many, the decision to use the autonym *Black* is more than an expression of personal taste. It is a public declaration of unity with other peoples of color who face similar discrimination’ (p. 137).

The issues of *Names* also provide a rich collection of articles on names in multiple genres and contexts. Two papers look at literary onomastics in particular. In “‘Harry, You Must Stop Living in the Past:’ Names as Acts of Recall in John Updike’s *Rabbit Angstrom*’ (*Names* 68[2021] 210-21), Peter Backhaus explores the use of out-of-date names. The habit of the character Harry ‘Rabbit’ Angstrom to refer to people by nicknames they no longer use, married women by their ‘maiden’ names, and shops by the names of former businesses on the same premises is understood to represent his desire to continually invoke his own past, itself and expression of his ‘infatuation with a former version of himself’ (p. 210). In ‘The Essential Self of Natalie Waite in *Hangsaman* by Shirley Jackson’ (*Names* 69:i[2021] 1-9),

Susan J. Behrens explores the ways in which the character's experiences are 'tracked' by the multiple versions found to exist in their inner life, and by the names they adopt at different points in the text, including 'the gender-ambiguous *Tony*' (p. 2).

Stephanie S. Shih and Deniz Rudin's article, 'On Sound Symbolism in Baseball Player Names' (*Names* 69:i[2021] 20-35), identifies trends in nicknaming practices, both 'mediated by language-specific hypocoristic formation processes' (p. 21) and correlated by association, for example when names with high vowels are given to smaller players (p. 30). The data for this research was drawn from Sean Lahman's online Baseball Database (2018). Sporting names are also examined by Michael D. Sublett in 'Geographical Accuracy of Place-Based Collegiate Athletic Conference Names in the United States' (*Names* 68[2020] 222-237). He reports that while many place-based events are accurate in their geographical referents, this is far from universally true; the Missouri Valley Conference, for example, being held at the Universities of West Texas and New Mexico (p. 235). However, 91 of the 142 conferences considered in the study were found to have 'an excellent geographical connection' (p. 235).

Anthroponymy is revisited by Melanie MacEacheron in 'Women's Marital Surname Change by Bride's Age and Jurisdiction of Residence: A Replication' (*Names* 68[2020] 193-209). From a study of brides marrying in 2010 in Hawai'i, where, unusually, official records note whether or not a woman will continue to use her premarital name, she reports that age was seen to be a determining factor, with older brides more likely to retain premarital names.

The second issue of *Names* for 2021 opens with a contribution by the editor, I. M. Nick, 'In the Name of Hate: An Editorial Note on the Role Geographically Marked Names for COVID-19 Have Played in the Pandemic of Anti-Asian Violence' (*Names* 69:ii[2020] 1-10). In this thoroughly-researched piece, Nick calls out those who may believe name-calling is not a serious cause for concern, not just because verbal threats may provide 'important forensic indicators' for actual physical harm, but also because of the well-documented impact of verbal abuse affecting both mental and physical well-being (p. 6). This issue focuses on topics relating to various international naming practices. For example, in the article 'The Adoption of non-Chinese Names as Identity Markers of Chinese International Students in Japan: A Case Study at a Japanese Comprehensive Research University' (*Names* 69:ii[2021] 11-9), Jinyan Chen finds that these students either adopted names of Western or Japanese origin. The reasons for these self-naming strategies were identified as being 'influenced by teacher-student power relations, Chinese conventions for terms of address, pronunciation, and context-sensitivity of personal names' (p. 12).

An unusual example of socio-onomastic detective work is explored by Lasse Hämäläinen, Ari Haasio, and J. Tuomas Harviainen in 'Usernames on a Finnish Online Marketplace for Illegal Drugs' (*Names* 69:iii[2021] 3-15). They discovered that pseudonyms were coined to enable individuals to 'blend in' rather than 'stand out', and were mostly of Finnish origin, typically using slang or non-standard language (p. 4). There was no attempt by users to mimic marketing strategies by choosing names to draw attention, suggesting that 'users do not seek publicity and do not wish to enhance their online reputation' (p. 4). 'Corpus-Based Methods for Recognizing the Gender of Anthroponyms' (*Names* 69:iii[2021] 16-27), by Rogelio Nazar, Irene Renau, Nicolas Acosta, Hernan Robledo, Maha Soliman, and Sofia Zamora, demonstrates how linguistic analysis may be applied in a Spanish context to

determine gendered forms of address appropriate for individual people. This is certainly very interesting as an example of applied onomastic investigation, and the methodology may translate to other languages that use similar systems of grammatical gender which facilitate identification of individuals through their gendered word choice. However, it is not clear whether this could work for languages with different morphological patterns, nor how it might be enabled to recognize people who do not self-identify according to normalized binary expectations.

In ‘*Corn Belt* as an Enterprise-Naming Custom in the United States’ (*Names* 69:iv[2021] 1-12), Michael Sublett traces the chronology of this onymic act, evidence for which has been recorded for over a hundred years (p. 9). The patterns identified within this practice provide insights into the vernacular applications and connotations of the term that are reminiscent of W. F. H. Nicolaisen’s article, ‘Onomastic Dialects’ in the journal *American Speech* (*AS* 55[1980] 36-45). It may be time to revive this approach. Sublett indicates similar usages may also be mapped for other ‘Belts’ such as the USA’s ‘Cotton Belt’ and ‘Borscht Belt’ (p. 10). Also on the theme of commercial naming, Dan Zhao considers ‘Snack Names In China: Patterns, Types, and Preferences’ (*Names* 69:iv[2021] 13-20). He analyses 121 names found in *Chinese Famous Local Delicious Food and Special Products* (2008), published by Foreign Languages Press in Beijing, finding that these names typically have three syllables, tend to be constructed following high-pitched sound patterns, and often took descriptive forms for ease of identification (p. 18). These findings should inform comparative onomastic culinary analysis.

Mahmoud Afrouz tackles some complexities of onomastic translation in his article, ‘How Three Different Translators of The *Holy Qur’an* Render Anthroponyms from Arabic into English: Expanding Vermes’s (2003) Model of Translation Strategies’ (*Names* 69:iv[2021] 21-29). The challenge of rendering a name to enable readers of the target language to ‘understand the implied meaning of anthroponyms’ (p. 22) is addressed through techniques such as substitution (i.e. where a recognized parallel form is available in the target language, in this case a Biblical name) and transference (where the name is adopted in its original form), and occasionally by modification, using a considerably altered form (p. 26). Techniques varied according to native-speaker background. For example, ‘translators who were native speakers of either Arabic or English mostly used substitution’ (p. 27). Afrouz shows that Vermes’s model does not cover all approaches used by the translators in the study, and should be expanded to include ‘Interpretative Equivalents and adding Notation’ (p. 27).

In ‘A Revised Typology of Place-Naming’ (*Names* 69:iv[2021] 30-47), David Blair and Jan Tent report on the approach they devised for the Australian National Placenames Survey. The typology takes as its foundation the need to identify ‘a set of intuitive semantic components relevant to toponymic motivation’ and to produce ‘a set of motivation levels by a logical sequence of those components’ (p. 33). Nine classes of specifics (ten, if one includes ‘unknown’) are identified, each having a number of sub-sets: descriptive, associative, occurrent, evaluative, shift, indigenous, eponymous, linguistic innovation, and erroneous (pp. 32-33). They map the relationship between *motivation* (why something should be named), *intention* (how it should be named), and *expression* (what type of name would ‘express the desired intention’, e.g. descriptive, associative, etc.) to illustrate name formation (p. 36). While the authors concede that the name typology has limitations – it does not, for example,

cover all expressions found in the Antarctic (p. 44) – the schema they provide should prove instructive for researchers working on projects that require answers to similar questions.

The texts discussed above examine names from various perspectives, EPNS publications for example, tend to focus on historical forms, etymologies, and data collection, while those in *Onoma* 53 apply different linguistic interpretations to the uses of names in literature. For various reasons, often due to scope, scale and approach, the political dimension of naming is often omitted or simplified in such analyses, e.g. the occurrence of French elements in place-names in England may be stated factually, without being linked to ideas of linguistic prestige. Critical onomastics has been growing since the mid-twentieth century, and is clearly present in the subdiscipline of critical toponymy, but there is much more to be said about names and power. Recognition of onomastic politics is currently evolving in the field of raciolinguistics, and should prove a very fruitful area for further investigation. Mary Bucholtz provides an especially provocative chapter, ‘On Being Called out of One’s Name: Indexical Bleaching as a Technique of Deracialization’ (pp. 273-89), in the highly influential collection edited by H. Samy Alim, John R. Rickford, and Arnetha F. Ball, *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes Our Ideas About Race*, originally published in 2016 and reprinted in paperback in 2020. The opportunity to include this chapter in the ‘Onomastics’ section of *YWES* for 2016 was unfortunately missed, so this omission is addressed here. Bucholtz calls out the demeaning practices of ‘renaming, denaming, and misnaming of students from linguistically marginalized and ethnoracially minoritized backgrounds’ (p. 274), echoing concerns expressed by theorists including Judith Butler and Geneva Smitherman, and drawing attention to the effects of such acts in both genuine and fictionalized contexts. Recognizing that ‘mislaming is wielded by whites against racialised groups’, she concludes with a set of behavioural recommendations to mitigate the power imbalances, biases, and (perhaps unconscious) racisms that may manifest anthroponymically where one person perceives another’s name as strange or unusual, i.e. to ‘[a]void treating some names as normative and others as nonnormative’ (pp. 286). This paper and the sociological arguments with which it engages should be especially thought-provoking to anyone working on names and identity, heralding a new direction in raciolinguistic critical anthroponymy.

The years 2020-21 have been positive for the significant volume of, and quality in, publications in onomastics. However, the disruptions encountered during this time have meant that access to these texts has sometimes been problematic; for this reason it has not been possible to address a number of important publications here, including: *Names and Naming: Multicultural Aspects* (2021), edited by Oliviu Felecan and Alina Bugheşiu, and published by Palgrave Macmillan; Grant W. Smith’s *Names as Metaphors in Shakespeare’s Comedies* (2021), published by Vernon Press; Allison Dollimore and Peter Jordan’s edited volume, *Place Names and Migration: Proceedings of the Symposium in Vienna, 6-8 November 2019* (2021), published by Verlag Dr. Kovač. These omissions will be addressed in the next issue.

The growing number of publications available as open-source materials is good news for the internationalization and democratization of the discipline, and it is hoped that the creation of better access to scholarship does not result in weakening of membership (and therefore funding) for the academic societies and scholarship supporting the onomastic community around the globe. One positive outcome of the pandemic is the increase in

accessible online events, enabling wider engagement and participation, particularly by students. The advent of the ‘Onomastics Online’ seminar series (2022), organised by ICOS, is also to be welcomed.

## 9. Dialectology and Sociolinguistics

We will start the overview of studies in dialectology and sociolinguistics with this year's textbooks and more general collected volumes, before moving on to regionally specific studies for the British Isles and North America, and closing with studies focusing on ethnic groups, gender, and specific age groups. Ronald Wardhaugh and Janet Fuller have updated *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, now in its eighth edition, with an extensive glossary and accompanying website. This voluminous general introduction (of now over 450 pages) still provides an overview of a wide range of topics, besides variationist and ethnographic sociolinguistics also including pragmatics and discourse analysis, language in education, and language policy. The eighth edition has updated information especially on AAVE, multilingual societies, gender and sexuality, language attitudes, and the social meaning of linguistic forms (e.g. enregisterment and indexicalization), and is thus still the most comprehensive overview of the field and quite a number of neighbouring areas, even though some more specific fields seem to be absent.

One of these newer approaches missing in Wardhaugh and Fuller is instead covered by Tyler Kendall and Valerie Fridland this year, who introduce us to the field of *Sociophonetics* – a field they claim has contributed significantly to the recent advances in the study of variation (p. 12). In the very detailed chapter 3, their ‘researcher's guide’ (p. 71), Wardhaugh and Fuller take the reader through intricate manual acoustic vowel and sibilant analysis, including token selection, formant extraction, measuring, visualization, plotting, and normalization. They illustrate each step with a host of examples from the sociophonetic literature, and discuss thorny topics in extra text boxes, using these two groups of features (vowels and sibilants) as examples. The following chapters then read more like a standard introduction to sociolinguistics, as they deal with regional variation (chapter 4), social factors (what they call the ‘big four’: class, gender, age, ethnicity, chapter 5), style and identity (chapter 6), and sound change (chapter 7), albeit always with a focus on the contribution of sociophonetics to the study of variation. Thus sociophonetics allows the researchers to zoom in on the realization of changes in individual speakers, also in relation to their orientation to the speech community; to compare what looks like the same change across dialects; and to identify in more detail ‘how, rather than just if, regional identification on the basis of phonetic features occurs’ (p. 90). Sociophoneticians have discovered substrate influences in ethnolects, and are able to describe phonetic gradience and gradualness, also in the exemplary studies on sibilants and style, moving from more macro-social categories to individual, flexible social meanings. Kendall and Fridland also provide a methodological outlook on computational, more automatic tools of the sociophonetics of the future (chapter 8). However, they caution us that the goal should not be ‘to build larger and larger datasets ... but rather to get the most useful and appropriate data for a given problem and to strive for methods that are interrogable and replicable’ (p. 208-9) – something this textbook admirably and successfully sets out to teach.

Karen V. Beaman and Isabella Buchstaller have edited *Language Variation and Language Change Across the Lifespan*, concentrating on the results gleaned from longitudinal studies of individuals, based on various languages – again a topic covered only cursorily in Wardhaugh and Fuller above. In ‘Panel Studies of Language Variation and

Change: Theoretical and Methodological Implications' (pp. 1-13), the editors claim this field is 'vibrant' (p. 1) and 'igniting' (p. 9), but clearly there is still much work to be done to determine which linguistic features can change after the 'critical age', why later changes happen, and how speakers' mental representations of language are affected – something this volume at least sets out to begin to answer. Where individual contributions relate to English, these are discussed in the regional sections below. On a critical note, John R. Rickford points out that most longitudinal studies do not sufficiently account for 'Stylistic Variation in Panel Studies of Language Change: Challenge and Opportunity' (pp. 79-96), because besides interviewer and setting effects speakers may also metaphorically code-switch, or show differences in personality or mood. Rickford therefore calls for several recordings of individuals in the same time period, and the investigation of more than one linguistic variable, to allow for 'more diversified and multi-faceted measures of speakers' sociolinguistic competence' (p. 92). Suzanne Evans Wagner asks 'What's the Point of Panel Studies?' (pp. 267-79), pointing out that they are characterized by 'typically fragmentary, sparse data' (p. 267). She calls for expanding the linguistic and geographic reach as well as including more diverse informants; tracking the functions, not just the forms, undergoing change; and trying to integrate other socio-cognitive factors (mood, memory, personality) in the analyses.

Lauren Hall-Lew, Emma Moore, and Robert J. Podesva have edited *Social Meaning and Linguistic Variation: Theorizing the Third Wave*, whose relevant individual contributions are discussed in the regional sections below. This year also sees an emphasis on the study of grammatical variation, propelled, e.g., by Karen V. Beaman, Isabelle Buchstaller, Sue Fox, and James A. Walker's collection *Advancing Socio-Grammatical Variation and Change: In Honour of Jenny Cheshire*, which concentrates on non-standard morphosyntax. Individual studies are presented in the regional sections below. Lesley Milroy makes a general point in 'Historical and Ideological Dimensions of Grammatical Variation and Change' (pp. 15-31), asking in particular the question 'what is meant by a standard, independently of a prescriptive definition' (p. 27); she suggests that results from historical sociolinguistics might answer this question.

For Britain more generally, Donatella Montini and Irene Ranzato have edited a collection of papers on the representation of *The Dialects of British English in Fictional Texts*, employing a rather wide sense of *text*, since this collection covers 'Voices on Page', 'Voices on Stage', and 'Voices on Screen'. Regionally specific contributions are again presented below, but in the collection a more general topic is taken up by Patrick Zabalbeascoa, who has 'Some Observations on British Accent Stereotypes in Hollywood-Style Films' (pp. 133-49). After WWII, BrE was used for ruling characters (from ancient Egypt to Star Wars), but has also come to index 'British men as stuck-up, self-conscious prudes, ... endearing wimps' (p. 137) vs AmE 'jocks'.

Starting our regional overview in the very far North of Scotland, *The Shetland Dialect* by Peter Sundkvist is the first book-length study of this very close-knit society of the Northern Isles. Here, Norn was in use until the eighteenth century, but the traditional dialect (and society) has been in decline since the rise of the oil industry in the 1980s. Sundkvist focuses on the 'conservative, traditional dialect, ... spoken by older, rural individuals' (p. 7), rather than on the (strengthened) Scottish StE end of the continuum. His chapter on

‘Vocabulary and Grammar of the Shetland Dialect’ (Chapter 4) shows lexis of Scots, Norn (apparently ‘particularly common in the taboo language which once existed among fishermen’, p. 51), Low German, Celtic, and French origins, plus relic grammatical features like the second-person personal pronoun *du*, a three-term deictic system, relative *at*, the *be*-perfect (*I’m read da book*), as well as a wider use of the progressive (*I’m no caring*). Phonologically, next to the Scottish Vowel Length Rule, Shetland is characterized by front round vowels, soft mutation (a complex vowel shift going back to historical palatal vowels before voiced, often palatalized consonants), a system of complementary quantity (across vowel and consonant) inherited from Norn, and rather distinctive pulmonary ingressive speech, perhaps another trace of Scandinavian. Sundkvist’s careful phonetic analyses of the vowel systems (chapter 6) not only provide detail on the individual regional systems, but also compare the individual vowels across the islands, showing a remarkable geographical range in realizations, some of which also seem to carry social meaning. Thus an open vowel in BIT ‘is associated with Whalsay’ (p. 136), whereas back variants of SAAT ‘salt’ are heard as typical of the North Isles. This is not easy, introductory reading, but phonetics experts will find much to marvel at.

On the mainland, for the North East of Scotland, David Adger and Jennifer Smith are ‘Explaining Variability in Negative Concord: A Socio-Syntactic Analysis’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 229-45). They observe that in this dialect, Negative Concord with negative subjects is categorically absent, possessive *have* can variably appear with or without Negative Concord, and existential *be* is strongly preferred with it.

Towards the more standard end of Scottish English, Philipp Meer, Robert Fuchs, Anika Gerfer, Ulrike Gut, and Zeyu Li investigate ‘Rhotics in Standard Scottish English’ (*EWJ* 42[2021] 121-44), finding that even formal ScE has become variably rhotic. The same result is found by Thomas Jauriberry in ‘Variation and Change of Middle-Class /r/ in Standard Scottish English’ (*Lingua* 256[2021] doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103059). In addition, he examines the phonetic quality of /r/ and finds a change from alveolar tap to postalveolar approximant, especially after consonants and intervocalically, in his speakers from Kinross, but more traditional tap realizations in Dundee.

Zeyu Li, Ulrike Gut, and Ole Schützler also look at phonetic variation inside the ‘NURSE Vowels in Scottish Standard English: Still Distinct or Merged?’ (*JEngL* 49[2021] 305-30), and find that especially before /r/, words like *fir*, *fern*, and *fur* are still distinct, but their vowels are more centralized than in KIT, DRESS, and STRUT, and partial mergers in individual speakers exist.

Turning to historical fiction, Marina Dossena describes ‘Scots as the Language of the Uncanny: The Case of Nineteenth-Century Gothic Narratives’ (in Montini and Ranzato, eds., pp. 11-28), at a time when Scots was associated with antiquarianism and an ‘ancestral, pre-rational past’ (p. 11). Dossena claims that the actual use is more ambiguous, and sometimes contradictory, since Scots is used both as a tool ‘with which to preserve tradition and also the language that relegates that tradition to the past’ (p. 25), thus both involving and distancing readers.

Heli Paulasto, Rob Penhallurick, and Benjamin A. Jones present a book-length study this year of *Welsh English*, where they stress the role that Wales’ geography has played and still plays for the retention of Celtic Welsh, contact with English English (EngE), and the

resultant varieties of WeE, mainly divided into south(west)ern vs northern Welsh English (WeE). The book contains a complete description of the contemporary ‘Phonetics and Phonology’ (chapter 2, pp. 45-69), an overview of the ‘Morphosyntax’ (chapter 3, pp. 71-131), and an interesting collection of ‘Lexis and Discourse Features’ (chapter 4, pp. 133-76) of WeE, before giving an overview of the history of Wales, a survey of the main sources for studying WeE, and a chapter of sample texts. The book of course contains a wealth of interesting, up-to-date details of linguistic variants and their regional distribution, but some diachronic trends stand out. Thus, for phonetics, the authors observe a possible decrease of long monophthongs for FACE and GOAT, increasing TH-fronting (in fact, this seems to be the first description of WeE that notes the arrival of this new supralocal feature in the far west of Britain), and decreases in rhoticity overall and rolled /r/ in particular, bringing WeE phonetically more in line with mainstream EngE trends. In the morphosyntax, besides a large number of features shared with vernacular EngE, the authors note the continuing existence of habitual markers (unemphatic *do*, and the progressive form), focus fronting (*Quite excited over that we used to get*), and different prepositional uses, especially those employing *with* (*It was painful with her*), which still make WeE subtly distinctive. For discourse features, the authors document (among others) invariant *isn't it* (*Let's finish off this box, isn't it?*), which is still ‘one of the most salient and productive features of WeE’ (p. 158).

Claire Childs links data from Glasgow, Tyneside, and Salford and looks at ‘The Grammaticalization of *Never* in British English Dialects: Quantifying Syntactic and Functional Change’ (*JL* 57[2021] 531-68), tracing constraints of what she calls ‘Type 2’ *never* (events that could have occurred in a specific window of opportunity, *She waited but he never arrived*) in non-standard punctual *never* (*I never watched that last night*), which is equivalent to StE *didn't*. Like Type 2 *never*, non-standard *never* is particularly frequent with achievement predicates, and is used pragmatically to counter expectations. Childs is also concerned with another feature of negation in ‘Mechanisms of Grammaticalization in the Variation of Negative Question Tags’ (*JEngL* 49[2021] 419-58), which she compares across the same three locations. Full forms (*isn't it*), reduced forms (*int it*), and coalesced forms (*innit*) show signs of increasing phonetic erosion across localities, but, in contrast to London (cf. Pichler below), little evidence of decategorialization. Tyneside, the site with the least erosion, shows strong social stratification of the variants, and the change towards *innit* seems to be led by young men. See also section 5 (p. 24) for additional information on Childs’ studies.

Erez Levon, Isabelle Buchstaller, and Adam Mearns direct our attention ‘Towards an Integrated Model of Perception: Linguistic Architecture and the Dynamics of Sociolinguistic Cognition’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 32-54) by capturing ‘moment-by-moment reactions to [local] variables’ (p. 34) in speakers from Newcastle. They find a striking difference between phonetic variants (where listeners only react after encountering a variant several times) and morphosyntactic variants, where a single occurrence is enough to trigger a negative perception. The one exception seems to be zero subject relatives, which are (falsely) treated as an index of formal speech. Based on longitudinal data, Isabelle Buchstaller, Anne Krause-Lerche, and Johanna Mechler are ‘Exploring the Effect of Linguistic Architecture and Heuristic Method in Panel Analysis’ (in Beaman and Buchstaller eds., pp. 185-208), for the features (ing), the realization of /t/, and the quotative system in the Northeast. They find that

socially and geographically stable speakers are more likely to show no longitudinal change, and that inventory changes (as opposed to changes in frequency) are rare. The type of feature also matters: the quotative system is more prone to change than the phonetic variables.

Sandra Jansen examines ‘Social Meaning and the Obsolescence of Traditional Local Structures: Loss of H-Dropping in Maryport, West Cumbria’ (*EWV* 42[2021] 1-28). Even in the far Northwest, this traditional feature is decreasing in apparent time, starting with speakers born after 1960, and is perhaps linked to the loss of jobs and the breakup of micro-local social network ties in Maryport at that time.

On a historical theme, Javier Ruano-García looks at historical Lancashire: “‘Aw'm Lancashire, Owd Cock, and Gradely Hearty’”: Enregistered Lancashire Voices in the Nineteenth-Century Theatre’ (in Montini and Ranzato, eds., pp. 108-28). Ruano-García finds that ‘dialect was utilised as a missing link between the city and rural Lancashire’ (p. 114), and also to mark social differences (e.g. between servants). Frequent features employed are the pronouns *aw*, *thou*, *hoo* (for *she*), plural *-n* (*they looken*), or Definite Article Reduction, but also L-vocalization, realization of the MOUTH-vowel (*neaw*), ME /ɛ:/ (*cleon*), or FACE-monophthongization (*mak'*, *tak*). Pantomimes used more local features for a more local audience, whereas ‘Factory Melodramas’ combined local dialect with more general non-standard Northern features for an audience outside of Lancashire.

For the Liverpool area, Paul Cooper and Sofia Lampropoulou ask, “‘Scouse’ but not ‘Scouser’? Embedded Enregistered Repertoires for Adolescent Girls on the Wirral’ (*L&C* 78[2021] 109-21), where features of Scouse have spread through increased mobility. Cooper's and Lampropoulou's informants, adolescent girls from Wirral, associate strong Liverpool accents with ‘youth’, ‘social deprivation’, and ‘being unintelligible’; in particular they are aware of the intensifier *dead* (*dead good*), second-person plural pronoun *yous*, TH-stopping, and T-lenition (to /h/) as features of Scouse, but distance themselves from the dialect, even though they use the features themselves.

Slightly further South, but still in the North, Danielle Turton and Maciej Baranowski claim it is ‘Not Quite the Same: The Social Stratification and Phonetic Conditioning of the FOOT-STRUT Vowels in Manchester’ (*JL* 57[2021] 163-201). The authors find that even in this speech community without the FOOT-STRUT split, ‘the higher the social class, the lower the STRUT vowel’ (p. 163), possibly a result of cumulative effects of co-articulation. Also for the Manchester area, George Bailey investigates ‘Insertion and Deletion in Northern English (ng): Interacting Innovations in the Life Cycle of Phonological Processes’ (*JL* 57[2021] 465-97), where variation between /ŋ/ and /ŋg/ (e.g. in *young* or *wrong*) remains until today. In the framework of stratified phonology, Bailey claims that this is the result of two processes: the original historical deletion, overlaid by synchronic pre-pausal /g/-insertion, especially in younger speakers.

Based on data from Bolton in Greater Manchester, Emma Moore discusses ‘The Role of Syntax in the Study of Sociolinguistic Meaning: Evidence from an Analysis of Right Dislocation’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 73-90). Right dislocation (*She's lovely, her mum*) is typically connected with northern, working-class speech, but in her female teenage speakers Moore finds a stronger correlation with ‘anti-school’, ‘rebellious’ Communities of Practice, and proposes that this construction functions to emphasize an evaluation. Moore continues with the topic of ‘The Social Meaning of Syntax’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 54-79),

stressing that ‘many of the difficulties in conducting studies of syntactic variation become irrelevant when we take a stylistic approach to the study of language variation’ (p. 58). In the same data from her female Bolton teenagers, she finds that Negative Concord typically correlates with vernacular phonological tokens (H-dropping, TH-fronting, alveolar <ing>), and again is used most by the anti-school ‘Townies’, especially in talk about, and thus indexing, delinquent behaviour (and boys).

Hannah Leach links ‘/h/-Dropping and Occupational Role in Stoke-on-Trent’s Pottery Industry’ (*JSoc* 25[2021] 350-73), based on historical interviews, and shows that H-dropping is in particular used by speakers with more manual, factory-floor-based roles (firing, glazing, decoration), even though the whole pottery industry is ‘blue collar’.

In our next regional textbook, Peter Trudgill gives an overview of *East Anglian English* from prehistoric, Brittonic times to today, covering the distinctive phonology, morphosyntax, lexis, and discourse features of this well-known, but also ‘unofficial’ dialect area. East Anglia is important because Norwich was once one of the biggest cities in England, and East Anglian English may well have had a strong influence on the emerging standard, as it was ‘often ... in the vanguard in terms of linguistic change’ (p. 37) in eModE times (e.g. in the Great Vowel Shift, the loss of rhoticity, or /sj/ assimilation). Indeed, until eModE East Anglia seems to have been expanding as a linguistic area. In the twentieth century, traditional East Anglian is still distinctive, especially in terms of its vowels. ME long mid vowels are still distinct (*days* vs *daze*, *moan* vs *mown*, merged in StE in FACE and GOAT), and in some lexical instances they are shortened (so-called ‘East Anglian short o’, p. 64f., thus *road* /rod/). Weak vowels are merged in /ə/, and DRESS and TRAP are raised. The NURSE vowel has a distinctive realization as /ʌ/. LOT is unrounded, and perhaps served as input to transatlantic varieties. Trudgill in addition adduces North American YOD-dropping, and the lack of third-person singular <-s> in AAE as possibly due to East Anglian influence. In terms of grammar, East Anglia is still known among dialectologists as the only dialect to have generalized third-person singular zero (*The kettle bile*; *Do it freeze*); it also uses simple forms instead of the progressive, and has explicit *you* in imperatives (*Do you sit down!*). There are some instances of pronoun exchange (*I’ll give he what for*), and, still found in the dialect today, third-person singular *that* (*That’s raining*). Overall, however, for today Trudgill notes the influence of London, Cockney, and the wider Southeast on the speech of younger East Anglians (although he makes the case that T-glottalling, perhaps the vernacular feature spreading the most quickly across all of Britain today, has its origin in East Anglia, not London). This book also contains a large collection of East Anglian texts, from the fifteenth century to the present, each followed by an analysis of their East Anglian characteristics. This is an eminently readable book, and we also get to meet young Pete and his family (and their dialect) in the many footnotes this book is sprinkled with. A gem for your dialectology bookshelf!

For (the spelling of) historical East Anglia, Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy monitors ‘Corpus-Based Lifespan Change in Late Middle English’ (in Beaman and Buchstaller eds., pp. 164-80). In particular, he investigates the spelling change from <þ> to <th> in the fifteenth century (although he does not include the variant <t>, according to Trudgill above present in ME East Anglian ‘as the norm’, Trudgill p. 33). In the Paston letters, Hernández-Campoy observes individual writers following the general trend,

especially when writing to equals, such that ‘their increasing use of <th> results in significant differences with their earlier selves’ (p. 170).

For East Anglian English today, David Britain asks, ‘What Happened to Those Relatives from East Anglia? A Multilocality Analysis of Dialect Levelling in the Relative Marker System’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 93-114). Due to counterurbanization, ‘a shift away from the larger cities into the countryside’ (p. 94) largely buoyed by wealthier, more educated, more white-collar speakers, the traditional non-standard relative marker *what* is in decline in apparent time, the older minority variant *as* is obsolescent, and zero subject relatives are also declining, all in favour of *that*.

Erez Levon, Devyani Sharma, Dominic J.L. Watt, Amanda Cardoso, and Yang Ye uncover ‘Accent Bias and Perceptions of Professional Competence in England’ (*JEngL* 49[2021] 355-88), where they find persistent biases especially against speakers of Estuary English and Multicultural London English, more than against Northern dialects. These prejudices are held in particular by older Southern speakers – speakers who have much influence over elite employment and seem to act as gate-keepers here.

Amanda Cole and Bronwen G. Evans look at ‘Phonetic Variation and Change in the Cockney Diaspora: The Role of Place, Gender, and Identity’ (*LSoc* 50[2021] 641-65); they focus on Debden, Essex, where many East-End Londoners were relocated after WWII. Speakers have maintained Cockney vowel features, even though identification with ‘Cockney’ has decreased over time. Amanda Cole is also ‘Disambiguating Language Attitudes Held towards Sociodemographic Groups and Geographic Areas in South East England’ (*JLG* 9[2021] 13-27) more generally. She finds that across the Southeast, working-class and ethnic-minority speakers are evaluated most negatively for social status and solidarity measures, which is compounded if the speakers are from East London or Essex, possibly due to the historical link between the two varieties, thus echoing Levon et al. above. For new East London, Christian Ilbury calls out “‘Ey, Wait, Wait, Gully!’ Style, Stance and the Social Meaning of Attention Signals in East London Adolescent Speech’ (*ELL* 25[2021] 621-44), *ey* being the new majority attention signal (ousting the stereotypical Cockney *oi*) used especially by the ‘gully’ (an urban group of street-oriented, anti-establishment older male adolescents) ‘to deploy a dominant stance as part of a more general performance of hegemonic masculinity’ (p. 640) and to manage group boundaries.

Heike Pichler observes ‘Grammaticalization and Language Contact in a Discourse-Pragmatic Change in Progress: The Spread of *Innit* in London English’ (*LSoc* 50[2021] 723-61) from a contraction of *isn’t it* to an invariant tag. Pichler claims that ‘language and dialect language contact may have played an ancillary role’ (p. 743), which would explain why invariant *innit* spread in ethnic minority speech first (for additional information on this study, see section 10, p. 109).

For West London, Devyani Sharma presents ‘Prestige Factors in Contact-Induced Grammatical Change’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 55-72) in second generation British Asian English speakers. Rather than taking over features of Multicultural London English or Cockney, these British Asian English speakers shift to Southern StE prestige forms, keeping elite IndE forms (especially definite article allomorphy) to ‘create an ethnically marked but upwardly mobile grammatical style’ (p. 56). Sharma expands on this in ‘Social Class across Borders: Transnational Elites in British Ideological Space’ (*JSoc* 35[2021] 682-702),

concentrating on the fact that (younger) second-generation British Asian speakers ‘refashion a few originally Indian phonetic forms into a distinctively local British Asian variety over time’ (p. 683). In this, they orient towards a global cosmopolitan elite rather than a British prestige system, since educated IndE conveys new symbolic capital (linked to ‘business, IT, or Bollywood’, p. 694).

Sharma also points out a new phenomenon in ‘Biographical Indexicality: Personal History as a Frame of Reference for Social Meaning in Variation’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 243-63), which can contradict usual covariation, such as ‘accent divergence to signal solidarity [rather than dissociation], [or] the use of non-standard forms to signal formality [rather than informality]’ (p. 244). For example, vernacular London T-glottalling has in some cases been reinterpreted by Punjabi migrants as indexing cultural, ethnic Britishness and is thus used in more formal situations, contrasting not with StE /t/, but with Indian English [t].

Still on London, Paul Kerswill and Eivind Torgersen are ‘Tracing the Origins of an Urban Youth Vernacular: Founder Effects, Frequency, and Culture in the Emergence of Multicultural London English’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 249-76) since the 1980s. Since JamE and Creoles were first in the mix, they exerted an inordinate influence on the emerging multi-ethnolect, also culturally, as still seen in the predominance of Jamaican lexemes in Grime music.

A speaker who had possibly the highest prestige is Queen Elizabeth II. Her English is the subject of Jonathan Harrington and Ulrich Reubold in ‘Accent Reversion in Older Adults: Evidence from the Queen’s Christmas Broadcasts’ (in Beaman and Buchstaller eds., pp. 119-36). The authors find that after thirty years of changing towards more mainstream English, Queen Elizabeth II, in older age, showed evidence of some retrograde changes in GOOSE, HAPPY, and especially TRAP, although this retrograde change does not lead to a complete reversal of the earlier changes. (The question remains, why?)

Speaking of the ‘Queen’s English’, Luca Valleriani asks, “‘Why is [S]he Making a Funny Noise?’ The RP Speaker as an Outcast’ (in Montini and Ranzato, eds., pp. 194-209), pointing out that speaking RP (or a Southeastern variety) may be a liability, rather than an asset, in other parts of the British Isles. This is instrumentalized, for instance, in the TV-series *Derry Girls* (set in Northern Ireland), where clearly RP has no overt prestige, but serves ‘the colonized’ (p. 207) to laugh at the colonizer.

William Standing and Peter Petré are ‘Exploiting Convention: Lifespan Change and Generational Incrementation in the Development of Cleft Constructions’ (in Beaman and Buchstaller eds., pp. 141-63) in seventeenth-century data, mostly from the Southeast of England. *It*-clefts acquired new rhetorical uses (emphasis, contrastiveness, introducing new foci), showing that ‘even substantive changes to the organization of a construction’s schema are possible over the adult lifetime’ (p. 156). This change seems particularly pronounced in individuals without a university education, and with a higher social mobility.

For the westernmost end of Britain, Joan C. Beal observes ‘Enregistering Nationhood: Cornwall and “Cornu-English” in the Works of Alan M. Kent’ (in Montini and Ranzato, eds., pp. 30-45), a present-day Kernowcentric dialect writer who aims to portray the ‘Cornish difference’ (p. 37), i.e. from mainstream English, the latter being linked to education and social and geographical mobility. Kent writes against the Cornish English stereotypes (rurality, backwardness, lack of education). He links this variety more positively with

localness and traditional industries and occupations, in the process also contributing to the enregisterment of this (not yet very salient) dialect.

Moving our attention across the Atlantic, Davide Zullo, Simone E. Pfenninger, and Daniel Schreier ask whether there is ‘A Pan-Atlantic “Multi Modal Belt”?’ (AS 96[2021] 7-44) (answer: yes). They find that for multiple modals, ‘Anglo-American English varieties are similar, yet not identical, to Scottish and Northern English ones’ (p. 32), suggesting direct heritage, even though the American systems are more complex and varied. By contrast, the Caribbean systems have smaller repertoires. Caribbean modals were brought to North America, where they ‘merged in new heterogeneous patterns that contained elements of both clusters’ (p. 33), especially in AAE and Gullah. Also comparing North America and the UK are Bill Haddican, Daniel Ezra Johnson, Joel Wallenberg, and Anders Holmberg, who study ‘Variation and Change in the Particle Verb Alternation across English Dialects’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 205-28), i.e. the difference between *She cut the melon open* (VOP) and *She cut open the melon* (VPO). Apart from well-known heaviness constraints, Haddican et al. find a trans-Atlantic difference both in perception and production, such that in Britain, the newer VOP order (due to Object movement) is preferred, whereas in the U.S., VPO (due to Particle movement) is still dominant. In neither country are there internal regional differences, in contrast to previous assumptions.

Moving now to Canada, Karlien Franco and Sali A. Tagliamonte focus on an ‘Interesting *Fellow* or Tough Old *Bird*? Third-Person Male Referents in Ontario’ (AS 96[2021] 192-216), which are undergoing ‘substantive language change’ (p. 192), namely a gradual loss of variants. Instead of these older variants, *guy* has become nearly categorical, especially in cities and larger urban communities, promoted by male, working-class speakers. Staying in the area, Lisa Schlegl and Sali A. Tagliamonte ask, “‘How Do You Get to Tim Hortons?’” Direction-Giving in Ontario Dialects’ (CJL 66[2021] 1-30), and they find that Torontonians tend to use landmarks and proper street names, whereas Northern Ontario communities use more relative directions.

In the domain of phonetics, Pocholo Umbal finds that ‘Filipinos Front *Too!* A Sociophonetic Analysis of Toronto English /u/-Fronting’ (AS 96[2021] 397-423), and that in fact second-generation Filipino speakers front /u/ even more than Anglo speakers in coronal and palatal contexts, perhaps because ‘they ascribe greater symbolic capital to a more fronted /u/’ (p. 413). Also for Toronto, James A. Walker is ‘Modelling Socio-Grammatical Variation: Plural Existentials in Toronto English’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 165-84) in speakers of British/Irish, Chinese, and Italian descent. In all speakers, *there’s* with plural subjects is increasing in apparent time. Sali A. Tagliamonte and Alexandra D’Arcy look at ‘*That* Beyond Convention: The Interface of Syntax, Social Structure, and Discourse’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 343-59) for the variation between complementizer *that* and zero, the latter of which is also increasing diachronically. *That* is still used in more formal contexts, but interestingly also when fluency is compromised, since it serves to ‘reinforce the relationship between two disrupted clauses’ (p. 355). Sali A. Tagliamonte also notes, ‘*Wait*, It’s a Discourse Marker’ (AS 96[2021] 424-49). In her data from Ontario *wait* is increasing rapidly in apparent time and is now the dominant discourse marker in young people (vs *hang on*, *hold on*), with the new function of indicating ‘an update to the information ... expressing the speaker’s revised knowledge, belief, and stance’ (p. 444), in evidence since the 1970s.

Sali A. Tagliamonte and Jennifer Smith also observe ‘Obviously Undergoing Change: Adverbs of Evidentiality Across Time and Space’ (*LVC* 33[2021] 81-105), namely in Canada and Northern England. In both communities, *obviously* has advanced rapidly to become the dominant adverb of evidentiality, starting with speakers born in the 1960s. Also comparing Toronto and York in the UK, Matt Hunt Gardner, Derek Denis, Marisa Brook, and Sali A. Tagliamonte investigate ‘*Be Like* and the Constant Rate Effect: From the Bottom to the Top of the *S*-Curve’ (*ELL* 25[2021] 281-324). They show that *be like* has now ‘saturated the quotative systems of young speakers in multiple countries’ (p. 281) at a usage rate of about 75%, a change that can be modelled quite well with the Constant Rate Effect across apparent time.

Another general vernacular feature is investigated by Stephen Levey, Carmen Klein, and Yasmine Abou Taha in ‘Sociolinguistic Variation in the Marking of New Information: The Case of Indefinite *This*’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 361-76), which they link to differential argument marking. Based on data from Ottawa, they find that unstressed *this* (*They built this custom home*) is restricted to ‘a small subset of specific indefinites’ (p. 362) to introduce discourse-new topical referents, but the authors remain ‘agnostic’ (p. 369) as to whether they can observe stable age-grading or change in apparent time for this feature.

Michael Friesner, Laura Katronic, and Jeffrey Lamontagne discuss the ‘Dynamics of Short-*a* in Montreal and Quebec City English’ (*AS* 96[2021] 450-80), which is retracted as part of the Canadian Shift, but is also tensed in prenasal environments, as in the wider North American development (see below). As expected, due to their isolated status as a minority community, Quebec City English speakers are less advanced in the Canadian Shift than speakers in Montreal, but both groups take part in the more widespread prenasal tensing – a surprising result, given previous reports of prenasal *retraction* for Montreal English.

Charles Boberg has founded the new field of the ‘sociodialectology of mass media language’ this year with the milestone publication of *Accent in North American Film and Television: A Sociophonetic Analysis*. Boberg investigates phonetic variation in the best-known performances of the most famous actors in mainstream films and TV comedies and dramas. His regional analyses focus in particular on the changes in the portrayal of New York City English, of the Southern States, the Inland North, Canada, AAE, and (in much less detail) other ethnic accents, spanning essentially the whole of the twentieth century. Particularly interesting as background reading is his chapter 3, ‘The Emergence of General North American English: Eight Decades of Sound Change’ (pp. 109-64), where he traces the gradual increase of constricted /r/, of the low-back merger, the rise of a nasal short-*a* system, BAG-raising, retraction of DRESS and TRAP/BATH, GOOSE-fronting, and changes before /r/, resulting in an ‘Index of Phonetic Innovation’ (p. 134) that can serve as a measure for TV (and film) speakers’ innovativeness, or conservativeness. (There are more indexes in the book, measured against this General North American English Index, e.g. a New York City Index, a Southern Index, and Inland North Index, a Canadian Index, and an African American Index, should you be interested in conducting analyses of your favourite shows.) Overall, this book shows that ‘real-time patterns in film and television speech ... match the apparent-time patterns observed in recent studies of the private speech of ordinary people’ (p. 300), and are thus an important real-time resource. Over time, the non-regional AmE heard in these media has shifted from an earlier (pre-1960s) standard based on middle-class New

York, to patterns heard in the Western US today. Especially younger actors today sound more similar, as Boberg observes a trend towards ‘transregional convergence’ (p. 303).

Off-camera, David Ellingson Eddington and Earl Kjar Brown conduct ‘A Production and Perception Study of /t/-Glottalization and Oral Releases Following Glottals in the United States’ (AS 96[2021] 78-104), e.g. in *kitten* or *not ever*. Oral releases of prenasal /t/ and glottal stops for prevocalic word-final /t/ are produced more by younger speakers than by older speakers; these variants are heard as ‘rustic’, ‘less friendly’, and ‘less educated’. What happens *before* /t/ is investigated by Míša Hejná, Kamil Kaźmierski, and Wenyu Guo, who claim that ‘Even Americans Pre-Aspirate’ (EWW 42[2021] 200-26), more exactly in the sequence of sonorant and phonetically voiceless obstruent. They find that pre-aspiration (e.g. *hit* [hr<sup>h</sup>t], *hiss* [hr<sup>h</sup>s], *cash* [kæ<sup>h</sup>ʃ]) does indeed occur in AmE across regions, and seems to be linked to more formal speech situations. On a general point, John P. Ross, Kevin D. Lilley, Cynthia G. Clopper, Jennifer S. Pardo, and Susannah V. Levi uncover ‘Effects of Dialect-Specific Features and Familiarity on Cross-Dialect Phonetic Convergence’ (JPhon 86[2021] doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2021.101041), such that dialect-specific features ‘facilitated phonetic convergence’ (p. 1) with the target dialect, and familiarity with the target dialect increases the size of convergence.

A historical perspective is provided by Stephen Levey and Gabriel DeRooy’s study ‘North Versus South: Regional Patterns of Grammatical Variation in Nineteenth-Century American English’ (AS 96[2021] 297-331), which is based on Civil War letters written by semiliterate soldiers from Massachusetts and Alabama. Especially in writers from Alabama, *was*-levelling is pervasive (*folks was well*) and *wh*-relativizers are rare; instead, relative *that* and zero are used.

Andrea Beltrana and Laura Staum Casanto introduce us to ‘The Social Meaning of Semantic Properties’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 79-104) by way of the intensifier *totally* in the US. They point out that ‘marked variants are stronger social-meaning carriers than unmarked ones’ (p. 96), as can be seen from *totally*, which is especially noticeable in its non-lexical use with bounded expressions (*He was totally born in January*). This use of *totally* is rated as more ‘outgoing’, ‘friendly’, and ‘cool’, but also as ‘less articulate’, ‘less mature’, and ‘less serious’ than the unmarked (unbounded) uses. Eric K. Acton discusses ‘Pragmatics and the Third Wave: The Social Meaning of Definites’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 105-26). In the difference between *Americans love cars* and *The Americans love cars*, the use of the definite article with a plural noun may serve to subtly distance the speaker from the group.

Stuart Davis and Kelly Berkson have edited this year’s *Publication of the American Dialect Society* (106), on the topic of *American Raising* – a mostly new phenomenon in American speakers born in the 1990s and after, who raise /aɪ/ before voiceless consonants (but not /aʊ/), and thus differ markedly from Canadians north of the border. Contributions focus on a host of different locales from across the U.S. (see below), but Elliott Moreton begins the volume with a more general contribution, paying attention to ‘Phonological Abstractness in English Diphthong Raising’ (pp. 13-44). He points out that ‘mature’ raising dialects show three characteristic features: raising to /aɪ/ before voiceless consonants (as pointed out above), (opaque) raising before T-flaps (*writer*), but not before foot-external triggers (*citation*). Both offglide and nucleus are affected, and the resultant raised diphthong

is also shorter. (Mature, opaque) American Raising is thus a phonological, not just surface phonetic process.

Let us now turn to regionally specific contributions for the U.S. Apart from /aɪ/-raising, several studies this year also concentrate on the TRAP-vowel in Northern areas (see also Friesner et al. above). Thus Isaac L. Bleaman and Daniel Duncan introduce ‘The Gettysburg Corpus: Testing the Proposition That All Tense /æ/s are Created Equal’ (*AS* 96[2021] 161-91). Their material consists of YouTube recitations of the Gettysburg address from the Inland North and New York City. The authors find Northern breaking (part of the Northern Cities Shift (NCS)) in Inland North, but not New York City speakers, and even significant differences in pre-nasal /æ/-tensing, previously thought to be produced identically. Bill Haddican, Michael Newman, Cecelia Cutler, and Christina Tortora also discuss /æ/ in ‘Aspects of Change in New York City English Short-a’ (*LVC* 33[2021] 135-63), where the traditional, highly complex split-/a/ system is giving way to the supraregional pre-nasal /æ/-tensing, but also to a second system before oral obstruents, and a third change orthogonal to the first two: supraregional lowering and retracting TRAP-backing.

Sharese King is ‘Rethinking Race and Place: The Role of Persona in Sound Change Reversal’ (*JSoc* 25[2021] 159-78) in Rochester, NY. King finds that BAT-lowering and retraction (indeed, a reversal of this part of the NCS) is led by the emergent persona of the ‘Mobile Black Professional’, ‘defined by their desire to relocate for work in a declining post-industrial economy’ (p. 160), and recalling D’Onofrio’s similar analysis below. King, in addition, points out that linguistic features racialized as ‘white’ can ‘index more than just race’ (p. 174).

Exploring a consonantal phenomenon in Philadelphia English, Laurel MacKenzie and Meredith Tamminga present ‘New and Old Puzzles in the Morphological Conditioning of Coronal Stop Deletion’ (*LVC* 33[2021] 217-44). The authors uncover additional constraints besides the well-known monomorphemic constraint, such that attributive stative passives are characterized by a much higher rate of deletion than preterites or perfects, as are prefixed or compound forms compared with true monomorphemic words.

Further down south, Natalie Schilling documents ‘/aɪ/ Raising on the U.S. East Coast: Resurgence, Retreat, and Resilience’ (in Davis and Berkson, eds., pp. 147-70). In contrast to many of the other localities, in Ocracoke (North Carolina) and Smith Island (Maryland), /aɪ/-raising was part of the traditional dialect, but has dissipated in Ocracoke, only surviving in the Pelican network, because most young speakers switch to more mainstream features, whereas Smith Island has lost most of its speakers to out-migration, but the dialect has remained intact, and /aɪ/-raising has become even more entrenched, especially before voiceless consonants. However, the indexical meaning in both islands seems to be quite different from new, mainstream American Raising, as raised /aɪ/ traditionally was an island speech stereotype indicating ‘non-standard, nonmainstream and perhaps also peripheral or marginal status’ (p. 164).

Moving inland, for Michigan, Wil Rankinen and Kenneth de Jong try their hand at ‘The Entanglement of Dialectal Variation and Speaker Normalization’ (*L&S* 64[2021] 181-202), testing Lobanov vs Labov normalization. The authors find that sociolinguistic differences between two different heritage language groups (Finnish vs Italian) only show up under Labov normalization, such that Finnish heritage speakers systematically have lower

non-high vowels and backer back vowels. Wil A. Rankinen and Aaron Albin also report on ‘Apparent-Time Evidence of American Raising in Western and Eastern Lower Michigan’ (in Davis and Berkson, eds., pp. 171-203), where raised /aɪ/ is ‘well established’ (p. 185) in rural Lower Michigan, but a change towards more raising is under way in more urban Kent County, led by young women.

Monica Nesbitt follows ‘The Rise and Fall of the Northern Cities Shift : Social and Linguistic Reorganization of *Trap* in Twentieth-Century Lansing, Michigan’ (AS 96[2021] 332-70), which as we know is ‘waning’ (p. 332). According to Nesbitt, the change *towards* NCS-raised TRAP was led by women up to the middle of the twentieth century, as was the change away from NCS TRAP afterwards, linked to deindustrialization and the loss of prestige of (regional) raised TRAP. Also on the change away from the NCS, Annette D’Onofrio investigates ‘Age-Based Perceptions of a Reversing Regional Sound Change’ (JPhon 86[2021] doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2021.101038) in Chicago. Interestingly, although younger speakers lead in the change away from the NCS (with lower DRESS and TRAP vowels), they expect a ‘higher and frontier boundary between DRESS and TRAP than older speakers’ (p. 6); similarly for the back vowels, younger speakers had backer TRAP and LOT vowels, but showed expectations of a frontier boundary, suggesting that perceptions are perhaps formed by exposure to prior generations. D’Onofrio also links TRAP-backing with perceptions of the *business persona* in ‘Sociolinguistics Signs as Cognitive Representations’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 153-75), the *business persona* embodying ‘an upwardly mobile, upper-middle-class persona’ (p. 158) in direct contrast to stigmatized, hyper-local identities of TRAP-frontiers. Interestingly, her study also suggests that ‘we pay more attention to experiences that confirm our expectations, while downplaying or ignoring those that contradict them’ (p. 170). Cognitive representations thus shape our recognition of linguistic variation.

Meredith Tamminga links ‘Social Meaning and the Temporal Dynamics of Sound Changes’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 338-62) in Pittsburgh. For the six vocalic variables she investigates, there is no correlation between the stage of change (or a variant’s evaluation) and a variant’s microtemporal dynamism (speakers using or retreating from a variant). Instead, variants index more specific social meanings. In particular, raised PRICE is used to indicate a speaker’s ‘annoyance’, at least in Pittsburgh. Still on /aɪ/, Erik R. Thomas and Jeff Mielke trace ‘The Phonetic Development of American Raising in Eastern Ohio’ (in Davis and Berkson, eds., pp. 45-62), where it has enjoyed ‘a meteoric increase’ (p. 45), spreading from north to south, and from the glide to the nucleus. Altogether, they observe ‘incremental patterns in the development of American Raising’ (p. 57), such that there is a gradient, not categoricity, between raised and non-raised realizations.

Daniel Duncan uncovers ‘Secondary Education as a Group Marker in St. Louis, Missouri’ (LSoc 50[2021] 667-94), in particular, the difference between speakers who attended Catholic high schools and those who attended public schools. For younger speakers, this distinction is less important as a group marker, since ‘White Flight resulted in the decrystallization of the groupness of Catholics and Publics’ (p. 690). This has led to fewer linguistic differences in NCS-vowels, especially the lowered THOUGHT-vowel, between the groups. In ‘A Note on the Productivity of the Alternative Embedded Passive’ (AS 96[2021] 481-90), Duncan also calls for the more detailed study of constructions like *The cat loves petted* in the North Midland area. Duncan points out that the range of matrix verbs is larger

than previously reported (sc. *need, want, like*) and at least also includes *deserve, love, and hate*; also, its geographical distribution may be a little more extended than just the North Midland.

Again with regard to short /æ/, Dan Villareal and Mary Kohn uncover ‘Local Meanings for Supralocal Change: Perceptions of Trap Backing in Kansas’ (AS 96[2021] 45-77), which is the panlectal change already mentioned above. Although it is also present in their own speech, Kansas speakers link TRAP-backing with California, where it is a stereotypical part of the California Vowel Shift. Locally, however, it indexes positive traits, e.g. ‘politeness, friendliness, and confidence’ (p. 47), rather than supralocalness. Also for Kansas, Christopher Strelluf discusses ‘The Actuation of American Raising in the Heart of America’ (in Davis and Berkson, eds., pp. 95-124), that is, in Kansas City, where /aɪ/-raising is a recent innovation prevalent in ‘urban-oriented White women of relatively high social status’ (p. 101). However, in Kansas City, it also applies before T-flaps, and is thus slightly more ingrained than, for instance, in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Indeed, Stuart Davis, Kelly Berkson, and Alyssa Strickler uncover ‘Characteristics of Incipient American Raising and Lifespan Change: Focus on Fort Wayne’, Indiana (in Davis and Berkson, eds., pp. 63-94), a community new to American Raising and as such in particular characterized by ‘transparent /aɪ/-raising’ (p. 65), i.e. only before (phonetically) voiceless consonants (although there are already some speakers with an opaque system as well) – intriguingly, the authors predict that ‘speakers who display transparent raising today will most likely start raising before *t*-flaps in the future’ (p. 72). They also argue for an internal cause (vowel shortness) rather than dialect contact for transparent raising to occur, and they suggest tentatively that American Raising perhaps indexes ‘aspirational nonrootedness’ (p. 90) across locales.

Still on American Raising, Robin Dodsworth and Mary Kohn, somewhat disappointingly, find that ‘Supraregional Changes are Uncorrelated: A Community Comparison’ (in Davis and Berkson, eds., pp. 125-46). However, there seems to be no correlation of this new shift with other ongoing changes (such as the low back merger, or retreat from the Southern Vowel Shift), as their comparison of speakers from rural Kansas and Raleigh, North Carolina, shows: individuals promoting PRICE-raising are not the same as those promoting other supraregional changes, perhaps because the indexical values differ, or because individuals use individual variables as ‘bricolage’ (p. 143), i.e. mixing and matching them.

Speaking of the South, Jonathan A. Jones and Margaret E.L. Renwick conduct a ‘Spatial Analysis of Sub-Regional Variation in Southern US English’ (JLG 9[2021] 86-105), looking for ANAE [*Atlas of North American English*, Labov et al. 2006] features (of both vowels and consonants) in the older Digital Archive of Southern Speech (a subset of the Linguistic Atlas data). In thirteen vowel and consonantal features, the authors find ‘little evidence of an Inland South region based on acoustics’ (p. 87), but they do find more fine-grained subsections, such as the Piney Woods, Highlands, and Plains, the Mississippi River Delta, and the Piedmont. Joseph A. Stanley, Margaret E.L. Renwick, Katherine Ireland Kuiper, and Rachel M. Olsen examine ‘Back Vowel Dynamics and Distinctions in Southern American English’ (JEngL 49[2021] 389-418), namely the degrees of GOOSE, FOOT, and GOAT-fronting, and the LOT-THOUGHT merger in historical recordings of speakers born between 1886 and 1956. They find that GOOSE-fronting started before GOAT, which lowered

after 1900, whereas FOOT is still stable over time for these speakers, also indicating that the three changes are perhaps not directly linked. In addition, LOT and THOUGHT show no signs of merging (yet).

Looking at the Western states, David Bowie traces ‘Individual and Group Trajectories across Adulthood in a Sample of Utah English Speakers’ (in Beaman and Buchstaller eds., pp. 101-17). He is interested more precisely in the presence or absence of the COT-CAUGHT merger, and in the realization of (wh) in recordings of Mormon preachers since the 1940s, many of whom were recorded over 25 years or more. Bowie finds much intra-individual variation that is ‘wider at any given time than the trend results might make it seem’ (p. 113), but overall there are no speakers that do not show the COT-CAUGHT merger at least some of the time, and the innovative /w/ variant is fully voiced most of the time.

On the West coast, Julia Thomas Swan compares American Raising to Canadian Raising, summarizing the two shifts as ‘Same PRICE, Different HOUSE: English Diphthong Raising in Seattle, Washington, and Vancouver, British Columbia’ (in Davis and Berkson, eds., pp. 204-32): with the expansion of American Raising, she finds that the isogloss with Canadian English is weakened. Swan also shows that /aɪ/-raising is ‘established rather than incipient’ (p. 205) in both locations, but, in contrast to stereotyped /aʊ/-raising, speakers have little awareness of this shift. Also for Seattle, Valerie Freeman compares ‘Vague Eggs and Tags: Prevelar Merger in Seattle’ (*LVC* 33[2021] 57-80), the merger referring to the raising of /æ/ and /ɛ/, and the lowering of /e/ (all before velars), realized as an upgliding diphthong. In this way, lowered VAGUE has become a ‘merger target’ for raised BEG and BAG. Interestingly, BAG-raising is strongest in middle-aged men, not younger speakers, perhaps because it has ‘taken on social salience and stigma ... in recent years’ (p. 73), whereas the BEG-VAGUE merger seems to be completed, under the radar of social awareness. For California, Lauren Hall-Lew, Amanda Cardoso, and Emma Davies link ‘Social Meaning and Sound Change’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 27-53) for the GOAT-vowel in San Francisco. GOAT is fronting in apparent time and is particularly front among Chinese American women born in the 1970s and 80s, who experienced ‘an intense period of racial and ethnic transition’ (p. 42) in the area, and who seem to react to the stereotype of *backed* GOAT as indexing Asian identity. For the same variable of GOAT-fronting, Robert J. Podesva stresses ‘The Role of the Body in Language Change’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 363-80), in particular of mouth setting. Thus, smiling can contribute to GOAT-fronting (resulting in higher F2 values), whereas ‘the adoption of an open-jaw articulatory setting’ (p. 364) – a stereotypical facial gesture linked to the Californian Valley Girl and Surfer Dude – contributes to vowel lowering, and to a more general trend towards a more compressed vowel space. Another stereotypical Californian ‘Valley Girl’ feature is the subject of Pierre Habasque, who asks, ‘Isn’t the Perception of LIKE by California College Students, Like, Paradoxical?’ (*Sols* 15[2021] 247-70) – informants do link the ‘Valley Girl’ with using *like* (like, a lot), but the use of *like* is not ‘intrinsically stigmatized’ (p. 264), and not intrinsically linked to female speakers.

Furthest out west, for Hawai’i, Katie Drager, Kate Hardeman-Guthrie, Rachel Schutz, and Ivan Chik investigate ‘Perceptions of Style: A Focus on Fundamental Frequency and Perceived Social Characteristics’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 176-202), such as gender,

sexuality, and ethnicity. For their Hawai'ian listeners, lower pitch was associated with being male, heterosexual, or a female lesbian, and being of White or Asian heritage.

With regard to ethnicity, a special issue of *JLingA* 31:ii[2021] is devoted to 'Language and White Supremacy', edited and introduced by Krystal A. Smalls, Arthur K. Spears, and Jonathan Rosa (*JLingA* 31[2021] 152-56), which tries to understand 'the ways in which much of the world has been steeped in White supremacist racism and ... how language has been integral to such processes' (p. 152). Jennifer B. Delfino looks at 'White Allies and the Semiotics of Wokeness: Raciolinguistic Chronotopes of White Virtue on Facebook' (*JLingA* 31[2021] 238-57), where posts promoting inclusion and equality actually 'recenter[...] white perspectives on race and the racial difference by recruiting individualist understandings of race and racism' (p. 238), especially opposing 'woke' White anti-racists with the figure of the uneducated and immoral racist (the 'redneck'). However, this individualization contributes to the perpetuation and maintenance of (institutional) White supremacy as ordinary or normal.

Paul V. Kroskrity uncovers 'Covert Linguistic Racisms and the (Re)Production of White Supremacy' (*JLingA* 31[2021] 180-93) affecting Native Americans. Two examples are provided; one is the 'academic pejoration of traditional [Indigenous] narratives' (p. 180) from the 1940s, which saw Native American narrative styles as lacking in several aspects, feeding racist stereotypes; the other concerns anonymous present-day internet jokes about Indians, which feature crude cartoonish Indian figures speaking 'Hollywood Injun English' (p. 187), reinforcing stereotypes about Native Americans as 'backward', 'violent', 'uncivilized', and 'vanishing'. Both examples involve camouflaging the 'pernicious reproduction and circulation of racialized images and the hierarchies they compose' (p. 189).

Inside the special issue of *JLingA* 31:ii[2021], a discussion forum is devoted to 'Language and Anti-Blackness', edited by Krystal A. Smalls (*JLingA* 31[2021] 258-60). In it, Sherina Feliciano-Santos reports 'Of Cops and "Karens": Language and the Bureaucratic Arm of Policing' (*JLingA* 31[2021] 261-6), the two figures showing similar behaviours since they both embody 'the same ethos of white supremacy' (p. 261). Jenny L. Davis and Krystal A. Smalls uncover 'Dispossession Afoot: American (Anthropological) Traditions of Anti-Blackness and Coloniality' (*JLingA* 31[2021] 275-82). They suggest three approaches towards an anti-anti-Black study of language: to engage in collaborative scholarship, 'diligently study and carefully use Black and Native thought', and 'decenter white predispositions and perspectives in the study of language and language practices' (p. 278). Nikki Lane points out that 'Ratchet Black Lives Matter: Megan Thee Stallion, Intra-Racial Violence, and the Elusion of Grief' (*JLingA* 31[2021] 293-7), even though in the public eye 'Black women, girls, and femmes are frequently disregarded – their bodies marked as excessive, loud, disposable, and ... deserving of whatever violence is exacted upon them' (p. 293).

Arthur K. Spears discusses 'White Supremacy and Antiblackness: Theory and Lived Experience' (*JLingA* 31[2021] 157-79), pointing out that 'the closer to White an individual is, the greater the privilege and the better the life outcomes they will experience' (p. 161). The author also points out that in this system language can serve as a 'whitener', especially the ability to shift to StE (more on which below, cf. Weldon). Spears sees the U.S. moving from a system based on race to a system based on skin colour, linked to the change from a White

majority to a coming White minority, a change that ‘does not augur well for increased racial justice’ (p. 174).

Sonja L. Lanehart in ‘Say my Name: African American Women’s Language]’ (G&L 15[2021] 559-68) recalls her own career in a male-dominated field where no-one could imagine studies of African American Women’s Language as fruitful or respectable. However, she was always (as we should be) ‘interested in the two degrees of separation beyond white, heterosexual and (cisgender) male’ (p. 564) – but pushing it to ‘three or more degrees of separation’ (e.g. investigating Black gay men’s speech or Black lesbians’ speech) might still be ‘a unicorn’ (p. 564) today. At the same time, this combination of intersectionality and sociolinguistics is probably a necessary way forward for the field.

Another understudied variety of AAE is examined in detail by Tracy Weldon in *Middle-Class African American English*. Weldon’s overview of studies conducted on middle-class AAE (Chapter 2 pp. 25-45) shows that like women speakers, middle-class AAE speakers are often ‘thought of as lames’ (cf. also Lanehart above p. 563), i.e. not true speakers of the vernacular, and thus not really worth studying. Weldon’s third chapter concentrates on “‘Talking Black“ as Public Performance: Not so Lame’ (pp. 46-99), where she stresses that Black oratorical talent has often been celebrated, in contrast to the widespread stigma of vernacular AAE. In public contexts, black speakers often draw strategically on vernacular features (both phonetic and morphosyntactic ones), to simultaneously appeal to a black audience and to not put off mainstream listeners. In ‘Language and Double-Consciousness: A Personal Account’ (chapter 4, pp. 100-39), Weldon explores the range of features, uses, and attitudes associated with the range of middle-class varieties, in part by experimenting on herself and recording her everyday interactions between the extremes of university lectures and private conversations. As she can show in this careful experiment, middle-class African Americans like her use a specific set of distinctive features to index African American identity and culture, often flying under the radar of mainstream (white) speakers of AmE. These features range from ‘mask[ing their] racial and cultural identity by assimilating to mainstream norms’ using StE (p. 109) via the strategic use of ‘low-risk’ ethnically marked features (e.g. to create rapport with a black audience) to the full use of salient and stigmatized features (‘high risk/high reward’ p. 151) in private and informal situations. Particularly useful for the purpose of double-consciousness are features that Spears has called ‘camouflaged’, as Weldon details in ‘Race, Class, and Camouflaged Divergence’ (Chapter 5, pp. 140-78) – features whose ‘distinctiveness ... goes undetected ... even among speakers who use them’ (p. 143), e.g. continuous *steady* (*She steady whispering*), counterfactual *call oneself* (*I called myself fixing things*), indignant *gon* (*He gon tell me how to raise my kids*), or the newer sense of *read* (‘subtly criticizing someone’). Overall, Weldon clearly shows that ‘divergent patterns of linguistic behaviour between African Americans and European Americans can be observed even at higher levels of the socioeconomic spectrum’ (p. 176). Finally, Weldon adds an attitudinal study where black speakers are associated with ‘coolness’, lack of ‘nerdiness’ or of ‘snootiness’, but at the cost of also sounding ‘Ghetto’ (p. 209). Here, using Standard AAE utilizes ‘a happy medium’ of ‘sounding black, but without many of the negative connotations associated with more saliently marked varieties’ (p. 210). This extensive study thus fills an important gap in our sociolinguistic knowledge of AAE.

Linking race and gender, Mary Bucholtz and deandre miles-hercules deplore ‘The Displacement of Race in Language and Gender Studies’ (*G&L* 15[2021] 414-22) since the inception of the field, also due to the ‘shamefully low number’ (p. 416) of linguists of colour overall. As a way forward, they propose interrogating socio-political identifications more, linking one's research to one's own positionality, and (perhaps most critically) citing Black women in order to stop reproducing white supremacy in the field.

Heiko Motschenbacher explains ‘Language and Sexuality Studies Today: Why "Homosexual" is a Bad Word and why “Queer Linguistics” is not an Identity’ (*JLaSe* 10[2021] 25-36), drawing attention to the promotion of non-heteronormative language (e.g. using *gay* rather than *homosexual*, which has heteronormative pathologizing connotations, is not used by the LGBTQ+ community itself, and has a negative semantic prosody), and to the fact that queer linguistics is a matter of degree, and is something we do, rather than we are.

Lal Zimman looks ‘Beyond the Cis Gays’ Cis Gaze: The Need for a Trans Linguistics’ (*G&L* 15[2021] 423-29), an area which has only recently become more visible. Zimman traces this lack of attention not only to veiled transphobia, but also to more general attitudes in mainstream linguistics that further ‘racism, colonialism, ableism, and linguistic subjugation’ (p. 423). This ties in with the discussion of white supremacist thinking in mainstream linguistics mentioned above. Stephen Turton reports on ‘Deadnaming as Disformative Utterance: The Redefinition of Trans Womanhood on *Urban Dictionary*’ (*G&L* 15[2021] 42-64) – ‘deadnaming’ meaning referring to trans people by their pre-transition name. This practice, when intentional, is a harmful performative act that represents a trans person’s self-determination as illegitimate, but crucially also ‘reveal[s] disquiet about the threat posed to cisnormativity and hegemonic masculinity by the public visibility of trans people, and trans women in particular’ (p. 58).

Iman Sheydaei links ‘Gender Identity and Nonbinary Pronoun Use: Exploring Reference Strategies for Referents of Unknown Gender’ (*G&L* 15[2021] 369-93). These reference strategies include avoiding pronouns altogether (e.g. by repeating a name), using *he* or *she*, or – the preferred strategy, at least for the young speakers investigated here – using singular *they*, even with singular personal name antecedents. Novel gender-neutral pronouns (such as *xe*, *ne*, or *ey*) are not employed by the speakers investigated.

Maeve Eberhardt discusses ‘Raucous Feminisms in Neoliberal Times: Disruptive Potential and the Language of Unruliness on *Broad City*’ (*G&L* 15[2021] 65-88) – a comedy series whose two main female characters ‘refus[e] to embody the ideals of a disciplined femininity’ (p. 67) by transgressing norms of female sexuality and norms of bodily self-surveillance (e.g. talking about excrement, or menstruation), perhaps a way towards ‘a collective and liberatory intersectional feminism’ (p. 65).

Kathryn Campbell-Kibler uncovers ‘The Cognitive Structure behind Indexicality: Correlations in Tasks Linking /s/ Variation and Masculinity’ (in Hall-Lew et al., eds., pp. 127-49), confirming earlier studies that men show lower peaks in their production of /s/, that fronted /s/ is rated as less masculine, and that the border between /s/ and /ʃ/ is shifted towards /s/ for more ‘masculine’ speakers. However, the author did not observe a correlation across tasks for the informants investigated, suggesting that indexicality is characterized by ‘complexity, flexibility and reliance on multiple coexisting systems’ (p. 145).

For southeast England data, Heike Pichler investigates ‘Tagging Monologic Narratives of Personal Experience: Utterance-Final Tags and the Construction of Adolescent Masculinity’ (in Beaman et al., eds., pp. 377-98). Her data show that *yeah*, *innit*, and *right* are used by young men ‘to assert their right to audience attention and their desire to claim a certain masculinity’ (p. 378), namely as ‘violent’, ‘delinquent’, and ‘street-wise’. Pichler also deals with ‘Intersections of Class, Race and Place: Language and Gender Perspectives from the UK’ (*G&L* 15[2021] 569-81), arguing that place references are an ‘important filter for our experience of language, gender and sexuality’ (p. 269). Thus, Bangladeshi girls contrast their urban identities with the Sylheti villages of their potential suitors, elite West London girls distance themselves from other (even better-to-do) ‘Val D’Isère’ girls, and North London Finchley indexes ‘wealth’ and ‘Jewishness’ for south-eastern London Black young men.

Finally, we report on two mainly age-related studies. Karin Aijmer looks at an old intensifier in ‘“That’s Well Good”: A Re-Emergent Intensifier in Current British English’ (*JEngL* 49[2021] 18-38), which has recently (since the 2010s) become more frequent again, especially in predicative structures (*That was well wicked*) in adolescent use; for an additional mention of Aijmer study, see section 5 (p. 25). Susan Reichelt examines ‘Recent Developments of the Pragmatic Markers *Kind Of* and *Sort Of* in Spoken British English’ (*ELL* 25[2021] 563-80). She observes that since the 1990s *kind of* has increased drastically, again led by younger speakers, but that *sort of* has remained stable. And with these studies we conclude this year’s overview of the work done in sociolinguistics and dialectology.

## 10. New Englishes and Creolistics

This section covers works on New Englishes and Creolistics that have been published in 2021. We begin with those publications which include several varieties of English before moving to region-specific monographs and articles. Several special issues with a focus on New Englishes have been published in 2021 which offer many new insights into how to conceptualize, investigate, and understand variation of English around the globe.

One of the most impactful publications of 2021 has been *Bloomsbury World Englishes*, edited by Mario Saraceni. It offers a comprehensive assessment of the current role, use, and functions of the English language around the world. For the present section of *YWES*, the first two volumes are of relevance. We will start with Volume 1, 'Paradigms', edited by Britta Schneider and Theresa Heyd. In the 'Introduction' (pp. 1-6), the editors provide a reader-friendly overview of the field of WE and introduce their volume as reflecting the most recent shift in perspective in the field. After shifting from a monolithic understanding of English towards recognizing many Englishes, the field is shifting, so the editors argue, from considering 'only' national boundaries to focusing more on social structures and communicative practices. Part I 'Reflecting Research Paradigms of World Englishes' focuses on methods, models, and interdisciplinary approaches to WE. Kingsley Bolton, in his chapter 1 'World Englishes: Approaches, Models and Methodology' (pp. 9-26) starts Part I off with a comprehensive overview and introduction of models, methodologies, and approaches that have been developed for, or have been influential in, the field of WE. In chapter 2, Christian Mair takes the reader 'From Methodological Nationalism to a Global Perspective' (pp. 27-45), presenting the complexity of Englishes worldwide and their interrelations. Against the national bias, which used to be very much present in earlier research, he depicts current developments, theoretical approaches, and models towards the English Language Complex that include transnational dynamics and connections. Moving into the multidisciplinary character of the field of WE, Tamara M. Valentine, in 'The Role of Gender in the Study of World Englishes' (pp. 46-64), argues for the importance of gender-based WE research. While researchers' attention towards variation within a speaker group is increasing, Valentine postulates that 'adopting a critical gender-based approach to the study of WE, along with other social factors, as a research strand in new WE landscapes offers the opportunity to move beyond established descriptive and formal explanations to examine the interconnectedness of language and gender identity at multiple levels of interaction [...]' (p. 59). In chapter 4, Claudia Lange continues this interdisciplinary focus: 'The Role of Corpora in World Englishes Research' (pp. 65-79) describes the potential and limitations that the use and/or compilation of corpora in WE bring. Axel Bohmann concludes the first part of the volume with his discussion of 'Register in World Englishes Research' (pp. 80-96). While register analysis is often neglected in WE research, Bohmann argues in chapter 5 that it can usefully be employed in predicting variation in corpus texts, as register mediates changes in WE (p. 93). Part II of Volume I focuses on 'Postnational Framings, Discourses and Perspectives' and starts with chapter 6, 'Translingualism and World Englishes' by Jerry Won Lee and Suresh Canagarajah (pp. 99-112). The authors show where paradigms of translingualism and WE overlap or converge and where they differ from each other. Susanne Mühleisen offers a critical perspective on 'English-speaking Diasporas' (pp. 113-27).

Mühleisen argues that adding diasporic and transnational movements and developments to research foci allows for an analysis of change inside, outside, and across any (framework-implemented) boundaries. In chapter 8, Sender Dovchin and Rhonda Oliver introduce another perspective that has been added to the WE paradigm quite recently, i.e. ‘English and Social Media’ (pp. 128-41). The authors argue that the use of English by groups of social media users might be conceptualized as linguascapes (cf. 130-2). Jinhyun Cho completes this second part with chapter 9: ‘Neoliberalism and the Global Spread of English: A Korean Case’ (pp. 142-55). With neoliberalism, the author focuses on the most recent shift in research (and society); based on two television shows and with special focus on neoliberal personhood for English language learners, she describes to what extent English has become a commodity in South Korea and has spread within Korean society. The final Part ‘Empirical Cases: Transnational Ties and New Localizations’ presents English in various ‘new’ locales. In chapter 10, ‘Ship English of the Early Colonial Atlantic’ (pp. 159-76), Sally J. Delgado introduces Ship English as a supra-regional variation of English used and formed by mobile maritime communities. Sarah Bunin Benor focuses on ‘Jewish Englishes in the United States and Beyond: An Ethnolinguistic Repertoire Approach’ in chapter 11 (pp. 177-89). Benor offers an overview of the sociolinguistic variation Jewish speakers of English show and suggests that Jewish English should be further included into the WE paradigm. In chapter 12, Michael Westphal and Lisa Jansen discuss ‘English in Global Pop Music’ (pp. 190-206). They show how pop music reflects the global sociolinguistic diversity of English, which makes it is fruitful data for scholars. Sofia Rüdiger continues the musical topic in chapter 13 ‘Non-Postcolonial Englishes in East Asia: Focus on Korean Popular Music’ (pp. 207-23). After providing a brief overview of Englishes in East Asia, i.e. China, Taiwan, Mongolia, and Japan, Rüdiger zooms in on South Korea and the use of English in K-pop music. Jennifer Dailey-O’Cain discusses ‘Digital Englishes and Transcultural Flows’ in chapter 14 (pp. 224-40) and focuses on online conversations in which English is part of transidiomatic practices. Dailey-O’Cain shows that English, in these communications, serves various communicative purposes that could not be taken over by any other language. Chapter 15 continues the focus on digital communication with Mirka Honkanen presenting ‘Diasporic Englishes in the United States: The Case of Nigerian Digital Communication’ (pp. 241-57). Based on data from the web forum Nairaland, Honkanen assesses speaker repertoires of US-Nigerian posters. In chapter 16, ‘English in Maghreb’ (pp. 258-73), Camille Jacob introduces the linguistic context of Maghreb to which English is a comparatively new addition. Jacob discusses to what extent English can reproduce or neutralize existing social hierarchies. In the last chapter of this volume, ‘When Africans Meet Chinese: Is Calculator Communication a Form of World Englishes’ (pp. 274-88), Dewei Che and Adams Bodomo discuss frameworks that are relevant to African migration to China and introduce the concept of ‘calculator communication’, an effective form of communication for speakers on the markets of Guangzhou who do not share a language.

For a comprehensive overview, we will present *Bloomsbury World Englishes*, Volume 2: ‘Ideologies’, edited by Rani Rubdy and Ruanni Tupas, in its entirety. Mario Saraceni, Rani Rubdy, and Ruanni Tupas present a brief ‘Introduction’ (pp. 1-6) on the presence of ideologies and their implications within the WE paradigm. Part I ‘Theoretical Understandings of Global English’ starts with chapter 1 ‘Entanglements of English’ by

Alastair Pennycook (pp. 9-26). The author details ‘how English is entangled in social, cultural, political and economic relations’ (p. 21). In chapter 2, John O’Regan offers an assessment of the historical rise of English as a global language when discussing ‘Capital and the Hegemony of English in a Capitalist World-System’ (pp. 27-42). O’Regan builds on the Marxist concept of ‘capital’ to explain the development of the economic relevance of English. Chapter 3 is concerned with “‘The Tide is Coming in Fast’: Ideologies of English, Global Linguistic Coloniality and Decolonial Pluriversalism’ (pp. 43-63). In this chapter, Ahmed Kabel argues that English language ideologies should not be assessed and cannot be understood without incorporating the ‘epistemics of global linguistic coloniality’ (p. 56). In chapter 4, Joseph Sung-Yul Park and Lionel Wee present another economic perspective on ‘World Englishes and the Commodification of Language’ (pp. 64-80). The authors link the ideology of language as a neoliberal commodity to various domains in which English as a global language is at use and discuss its position within markets of language and political economy. Ryuko Kubota completes Part I of this volume with chapter 5, ‘Examining and Overcoming the Theory/Practice Divide in World Englishes’ (pp. 81-9). She discusses ‘the gap between the pluralistic ideal sought by scholarly work on WE [...] and the real-world tenacity of normative beliefs about language’ (p. 81). Part II ‘Unpacking Ideologies of English’ begins with chapter 6 ‘Linguaculture, Cultural Travel, Native-Speakerism and Small Culture Formation on the Go: Working up from Instances’ by Adrian Holliday (pp. 101-13). The author presents two case studies and argues that the language use presented in them – and any language use really – should be assessed from a non-normative, decentral perspective of instances rather than against norms of native-speakerism. In chapter 7, ‘Ideology, Identity, and World Englishes: Toward a Heteroglossic Framework’ (pp. 114-26), Jerry Won Lee and Christopher Jenks assess the relation between Global English, its ideologies, and (local) identities; they argue for a heteroglossic framework to best incorporate the complexity and multiplicity that are at work in this relation. Chapter 8, ‘Interrogating Race in the NEST/NNEST Ideological Dichotomy: Insights from Raciolinguistics, Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy and Translanguaging’ by Peter I. De Costa, Curtis Green-Eneix, Wendy Li, and Hima Rawal (pp. 127-40), incorporates a pedagogical perspective on (standard) language ideologies. The authors argue that racial bias, under the smoke screen of nativeness, has caused the biggest divide in English learning and teaching contexts. In the final chapter of Part II, Sender Dovchin, Rhonda Oliver, and Jaya Dantas discuss ‘Translingual Englishes and the Psychological Damage of Global English’ (pp. 141-58). They describe the use of translingual Englishes by speakers with migration backgrounds and find that this strategy is linked to mental health issues as it, for example, offers relief from the pressure to use StE. Part III ‘Ideological Pluralities of English’ begins with chapter 10 on ‘Ideological Plurality: English in Policy and Practice in India’ (pp. 161-76) written by Usree Bhattacharya and Ajit K. Mohanty. Using the linguistic context of India, the authors investigate the many co-existing language ideologies concerning the use and roles of English. In chapter 11, ‘Challenging the Economic and Cultural Currency of English’ (pp. 177-93), Nathan John Albury presents two case studies in which the high status of (Global) English is challenged. Rachele Lawton turns to the English-only ideology of political movements in the United States in chapter 12 “‘We’re a Nation that Speaks English’’: Language Ideology and Discrimination in the US English Only Movement’ (pp. 194-212), and analyses how this

ideology is represented in political discourse. The last chapter of Part III focuses on Brazil. In chapter 13, ‘Conflicting Language Ideologies About What Counts as “English” in the Brazilian National Common Core Curriculum: Arenas for Permanences and Disruptions’ (pp. 213-29), Paula Szundy investigates how English is commodified in the core curriculum of conservative Brazil. Part IV of this volume presents ‘The Local Politics of Global English’ and starts with chapter 14 on ‘Non-Localizable vs Localizable English: New Linguistic Hierarchies in “Democratizing” English in Spanish Education’ by Eva Codó (pp. 233-52). Based on an investigation of two schools in Catalonia, Codó finds that although English in Catalonia is becoming more accessible, ideological hierarchies of English prevent its comprehensive democratization. In chapter 15, ‘Probing “Erasure” for Transnational Language Policy and Practice: English amongst Multilingual Ismaili Muslims in Northern Pakistan and Eastern Tajikistan’ (pp. 253-69), Brook Bolander ‘explores how “erasure” offers a window onto language policy by highlighting the importance of what is left unsaid [...]’ (p. 253). In chapter 16, Funie Hsu investigates the economic and ideological value of English as part of a bilingual policy in ‘Taiwan and Mandarin-English Bilingualism: International Competition and Competing Colonialisms’ (pp. 270-87). This volume ends with chapter 17, by Indika Liyanage and Tony Walker, on ‘Exploring Contested Language Ideologies in Kiribati’ (pp. 288-305). The authors investigate which language ideologies underly shaming practices in the Republic of Kiribati.

Tobias Bernaisch is the editor of a 2021 volume on *Gender in World Englishes*. In the ‘Introduction’ (pp.1-22), Bernaisch describes the aim of the volume as furthering multifactorial analyses of gender and other language internal and external factors affecting variation in World Englishes, especially those of the Outer circle. Note that chapters considering only one continent will be dealt with in the publications dealing with regional varieties below. In chapter 5, Tobias Bernaisch considers several varieties in his study of ‘Hedges and Gender in the Inner and Outer Circle’ (pp.94-120), based on examples of causal and non-causal hedges. The author compares the usage patterns of British English speakers with speakers from Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Singapore and finds that British speakers hedge more than the Outer circle speakers. Gender effects show a different picture, though. While female learners in Hong Kong and the Philippines use more hedges than male learners, hedges are generally more frequent in all speakers from Great Britain and male learners from Singapore.

Let us turn to articles that consider more than one variety of English. To begin with, ‘On Models and Modelling’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 298-317) by Marianne Hundt aims at bridging the perceived gap between models that wish to explain complex variational patterns in the development of New Englishes, such as Kachru’s concentric circles or Schneider’s model of post-colonial Englishes, and the feature-centric approaches of statistical modelling in corpus studies of WE. Based on various examples, Hundt provides evidence that statistical models often cannot corroborate the expectations set in theoretical models of WE and concludes that only multi-method approaches based on usage data and other sources of information may be more successful at bridging the gap. In the article ‘Stative Progressives in Inner and Outer Circle Varieties of English’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 318-332), Christophe Lenoble compares the extension of the progressive to stative verbs between the Inner Circle Varieties BrE and AmE and the Outer Circle Varieties SingE, IndE, and PhilE; he finds that differences in the stative

progressive appear to result from reanalysis. Andrew Moody discusses the interplay of ‘The Authority and Authenticity of Performative Englishes in Popular Culture’ in examples from outer and expanding circle Englishes (*WEn* 40[2021] 459-79). The author shows that while the authority of exonormative standards is challenged in the media examples from Malaysia and Singapore, the expanding circle variety JpE still values exonormative speech patterns over authentic local speech. Cross-variety comparison of usage features is also the topic of Michael Westphal’s study of ‘Question Tags across New Englishes’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 519-33). Westphal uses dialogic text types from ICE-PHI and ICE-Trinidad & Tobago to analyse question tags such as *alright*, *eh*, and *you know*. The author finds that the two varieties rarely make use of variant question tags, and that over fifty percent of the invariant question tags occur in both corpora, perform similar functions, and are used in comparable ways in the communicative contexts investigated. In ‘Predicting voice alternation across academic Englishes’ (*CLLT*, 17[2021]189-222), Marianne Hundt, Melanie Röthlisberger, and Elena Seoane also use the ICE corpora of seven different varieties (AmE, BrE, SingE, HKE, IndE, FijE, and PhilE) to investigate the use of *be*-passives in academic writing. In their multivariate analysis of the data from these corpora, they modeled the factors ‘complexity of the verb phrase’, ‘weight’, ‘animacy’, and ‘givenness’ as well as the variety (and thus substrate and superstrate influence). The expected difference between the ENL varieties AmE and BrE could not be supported by the data. Alexander Haselow’s study of conversational repair strategies is another comparison of varieties drawing on the ICE corpora, namely BrE, East African English, IndE, JamE, PhilE, and SingE, and specifically on the conversational sections ‘exclusively [involving] informal, everyday face-to-face interactions in casual, non-hierarchical contexts’ (p.327). Focusing on ‘other-initiated self-repairs’, Haselow finds that these repairs are realized similarly in all varieties in the sample, but that they differ in the dispersion of format types and the distribution of relative costs amongst speakers (*EWJ* 42 [2021] 324–49). Peter Collins compares cultural keywords across eight varieties in the GloWbE corpus (GloWbE-GB; GloWbE-AU; GloWbE-NZ; GloWbE-IN; GloWbE-SG; GloWbE-HK; and GloWbE-KE) to identify frequent vocabulary items in fifteen cultural domains such as administration, education, and religion. Collins finds significant differences between Kachruvian inner and outer circle varieties as well as similarities in more closely connected varieties such as AusE and NZE (*ICAME Journal* 45[2021] pp.5-35).

We now turn to publications focusing on regional varieties of English. We start with African Englishes, which were considered in a great number of publications in 2021. Anne Schröder has edited a volume on *The Dynamics of English in Namibia*, which contains eleven multi-faceted contributions. In chapter 1, ‘Introduction’ (pp.1-20), Schröder introduces the volume by describing Namibia’s social and historical make-up and its resulting linguistic complexity as rooted in its African history as well as German and South African colonial rule. In chapter 2, ‘English in Namibia’ (pp.21-41), Gerald Stell pays close attention to the historical development of the dominance of English. Stell also surveys the current status of the language as the most prestigious language but also as the lingua franca of the various ethnic groups present in the country. The author argues that NamE varieties develop alongside varieties still oriented towards SAE (pp. 21-41). In chapter 3, ‘Voices from the Post-Independence Classroom’ (pp. 45-62), Helene Steigertahl discusses the rapid shift to English-only instruction after Namibia’s independence in 1990 and the resulting doubts

abandoning mother tongue education in classrooms. Despite the obvious high prestige of English, teachers report problems in English comprehension among their students, especially in ethnolinguistically less diverse regions, where English is not often spoken as a lingua franca. In ‘English and Multilingual Repertoires in Healthcare’(chapter 4, pp. 63-82), Nelson Mlambo describes the complexity of interacting in multilingual spaces self-reported by his nineteen interview participants, who are all healthcare professionals in Windhoek. In Mlambo’s questionnaire, participants indicated their willingness to communicate in local languages, but they stated that they mainly used English on a daily basis. In chapter 5, Marion Schulte describes ‘The Linguistic Landscape and Soundscape of Windhoek’(pp. 83-105). Schulte uses pre-independence linguistic landscape data as a point of comparison to her own collected landscape and soundscape data, in order to investigate how public language use has changed over the past decades. The author finds that the use of English in the landscaping data has increased, while the soundscape of Windhoek is more diverse, including indigenous languages and Afrikaans alongside English. In chapter 6, Anne Schröder, Frederic Zähres, and Alexander Kautzsch describe ‘The Phonetics of Namibian English’ (pp. 111-33). Based on analyses of the DRESS, TRAP, NURSE, and WORK vowels, they find both uniting features with SAE (TRAP-DRESS merger) as well as unique features of NamE (NURSE-WORK split). In chapter 7, ‘Broadcasting Your Variety’(pp. 135-167), Frederic Zähres employs data from YouTube to conduct an analysis of the vowels investigated in the previous chapter as well as the KIT vowel, and evaluate the methodological challenges encountered in using such data. Comparing data from four Namibian YouTubers to data from four Namibian Newscasters, he finds evidence of the NURSE-WORK split, the KIT split, DRESS raising, and NURSE fronting. In chapter 8, Sarah Buschfeld analyses extended progressive use, employing recordings of sixty Namibian participants; her aim is to evaluate ‘The Question of Structural Nativization in Namibian English’(pp. 169-94). Results show that Black speakers are more likely to use extended progressives than white speakers and younger speakers are less likely to use them. Buschfeld further concludes that extended progressive use is apparent mostly in African-descendent groups and to varying degrees, indicating the existence of various Namibian Englishes at least to some extent. Anne Schröder and Klaus P. Schneider take ‘A Variational Pragmatic Approach to Responses to Thanks in Namibian English’(pp. 195-215) in chapter 9. Based on focus interviews and role play data recorded with Namibian students in grades 8 and 11, they find that *Pleasure* is the most common response to thanks. Furthermore, familiarity with the other and formality of the situation inform the choice of response, allowing for *No problem* and *Welcome* as choices for younger Namibians in less formal encounters and with peers. In chapter 10, Kerstin Frank provides an overview of ‘Namibian Literature in English’(pp. 219-39) with a focus on pre- and post-independence writing that portrays the topic of identity. Anne Schröder, in chapter 11, focuses on the ways in which the linguistic diversity of ‘A Land in Transition’ (pp. 241-271) is represented in two Namibian novels: Deischo’s *Born of the Sun* and *Troubled Waters*. Schröder shows how the author code-switches to appropriate English in constructing multilingual identities and how both novels depict the relationship between language and power. The final chapter of the volume summarizes the findings by discussing ‘The Dynamics of English in Namibia’(pp. 275-97). Edgar W. Schneider and Anne Schröder conclude that NameE, while sharing features with other varieties in Africa, can reasonably be considered a unique and thriving variety of

English, brought forth both by the social context in which it develops as well as language policies. Namibia is also the location of Gerald Stell's article on 'The Founder Principle and Namibian English' (*WEn* 40[2021] 407-23). Stell discusses the complex role of different ethnic groups as founders of NamE, in particular the Afrikaans-speaking initial settlers and the Ovambos. Based on an analysis of the vowel systems and the ethnographic data of twelve representatives of each ethnicity (Afrikaners, Coloureds, Damaras, Hereros, and Ovambos), Stell concludes that Afrikaners, and to some extent Coloureds, orient towards White South African models, while the Black and especially Ovambo speakers created a new local urban variety with more Bantu-like vowels. South Africa is also the focus of a *WEn* special issue edited by Werner Botha, Bertus van Rooy, and Susan Coetzee-van Rooy that investigates the complex status and functions of Englishes in South Africa (*WEn* 40[2021] 1-11). The two types of colonial transplantations and the resulting Englishes (SAE, BSAE, ISAE), multilingualism, and new patterns of contact after Apartheid have created a unique situation for research that the papers in this issue focus on. In his article 'Colony, Post-Colony and World Englishes in the South African Context' (*WEn* 40[2021] 12-23), Rajend Meshtrie problematizes the linearity of Schneider's dynamic model in describing post-colonial Englishes and the lack of importance of politics, arguing that elite SAE and Africanness are constantly negotiated in South African politics. Meshtrie shows through four contestations that association with the colonizer and White elites through dialect are often reprimanded and uses this as an argument for a contingency model that focuses more on social complexity and less on procedural development steps. Van Rooy looks at three possible areas of 'Grammatical Change in South African Englishes' (*WEn* 40[2021] 24-37) (WSAE, BSAE) to establish patterns of convergence and divergence. To do so, the author investigates three cases: modal usage, changes in progressive aspect, and complementizer omission. He finds that modal usage increases in WSAE and Afrikaans, which diverges from BSAE. Due to language contact with Bantu languages, progressive aspect is extended in BSAE while complementizer omission increases over time in both WSAE and BSAE. Ian Bekker questions Schneider's assumption that literary creativity at the end of the 20th century can be seen as proof of endonormative stabilization in South Africa in 'Literary Reflections of Early Postcolonial English in South Africa' (*WEn* 40[2021] 38-51). Bekker provides examples from the first half of the twentieth century (*The Beadle* (1929), *Mafikeng Road* (1947)), which already show some of the characteristics of 'vital and viable new literature' (p. 39) in English with links between Afrikaans and English as postcolonial variety. He concludes that both works include 'Bakhtinian double-voicedness, dialogicality and hybridity' (p. 47), which he identifies as characteristics of post-colonial literature. Idah Makukule and Heather Brooks study 'English in the Identity Practices of Black Male Township Youth in South Africa' (*WEn* 40[2021] 52-62). They show that English has shifted in social meaning in congruence with social change, such that those who aspire to the mainstream use English and those who reject the mainstream avoid English. They find that the division between Black and White SAE holds in the nineties, in line with post-apartheid tensions, and becomes less distinct in the second half of the 2000s. Werner Botha and Susan Coetzee-Van Rooy, focusing on 'Language Mixing in the Social Network of a South African Student' (*WEn* 40[2021] 63-83), analyse the level of mixing present in interactions with members of the student's network in the first-order network zone, which incorporates those network members who also know each

other. The authors argue that finding a matrix language within these interactions is impossible. The language proficiency and social context of the listener are most relevant for the identified switches. Mtholeni Ngcobo and Lawrie Barnes survey the current usage of English at universities across the country in ‘English in the South African Language-in-Education Policy on Higher Education’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 84-97). In focus groups and interviews, the researchers found that most students prefer English as a unified language of instruction, but they do feel it is a barrier for academic performance and would profit from learner support in the African home language. Susan Coetzee-Van Rooy depicts ‘Being English in Multilingual South Africa’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 98-120). The author looks at the language repertoires of English home language speakers in South Africa and examines in which ways these compare to inner and outer circle speakers of English. Coetzee-Van Rooy finds that the second strongest language spoken by English speakers is often Afrikaans or an African language. They consider ‘school, reading, friends, family, and watching TV’ (p. 107) as the strongest factors influencing the use of English as their home language. Gary Barkhuizen analyses results from a longitudinal study of a female migrant from South Africa to New Zealand on the basis of three short stories in ‘South African English, Social Inclusion and Identity Integration in New Zealand’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 121-35). While the first story, elicited before she moved to New Zealand, shows her anticipation of the situation and values attached to it, the other two stories were collected after she had been living there for more than a decade and underline the importance of her English proficiency and the complexity of social dynamics for social inclusion. In a further special issue, two articles investigate English in North Africa. Marii Abdeljaoued and Tahar Labassi discuss ‘English as the Lingua Franca of Academic Publishing in Tunisia’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 245-58). Based on twelve interviews and a corpus of ninety reviews, they show that although content is more often commented on than language, reviewers more often criticize lexis and syntax than discourse and rhetorics. They conclude that having to publish in English is a challenge that Tunisian scholars are generally very willing to take on, despite potential issues with writing in English. Houssine Soussi describes ‘World Englishes in Multilingual Morocco’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 259-267). Despite the importance of local languages, French, and Spanish, current investigations underline the importance of English for the job market. Accordingly, English instruction is implemented in newer policies concerning both secondary and tertiary education, leading the author to conclude that English is currently replacing French in education.

From English in North Africa, we now move to studies of NigE. Foluke Unuabonah and Rotimi Oladipupo carry out a corpus analysis of ICE-Nigeria and GloWbE to investigate six ‘Bilingual Pragmatic Markers in Nigerian English’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 340-406). The markers are generally more often used for interpersonal than for textual functions and often appear in clause-final position. In line with the importance of politeness in Nigerian culture and the dominance of Yoruba, the most frequent markers are *jare*, *biko*, and *jor*. The others exhibit agreement-seeking (*shebi*, *shey*) and emphatic functions (*fa*). Foluke Unuabonah employs the same method of corpus analysis and the same corpora in “‘Oya Let’s Go to Nigeria”” (*IJCP* 36[2021] 370-95) to investigate five bilingual pragmatic markers. The markers are borrowed from Yoruba (*oya*, *ke*, *ni*), from Arabic through Hausa (*walahi*), and from Hausa (*ba*). He finds that *oya* has the highest frequency and is an attention marker. Most of the markers favour clause-final positions while *oya* and *walahi* favour clause-initial

positions. In one further study of Nigerian English, “‘Abeg Na! We Write So Our Comments Can Be Posted’” (*Pragmatics* 31[2021] 455-81), Foluke Unuabonah, Folajimi Oyebola, and Ulrike Gut use similar methods and the same corpora to investigate three borrowed Nigerian Pidgin markers: *abeg*, *sef* and *na*. They find that *abeg* is used for mitigation and emphasis, *sef* is used for emphasis with additive and dismissive functions, and *na* is used purely for emphasis. In their investigation of the pragmatic marker *now* in ICE-Nigeria, Oladipupo and Unuabonah find ‘Extended Discourse-Pragmatic Usage of *Now* in Nigerian English’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 371-89). Based on a handful of examples, they argue that *now* has a rising pitch contour, occurs in the final position of utterances, and indexes emphasis or mitigation. They conclude that *now* shares many properties with bilingual pragmatic markers in NigE. In the Nairaland Corpus, with data from an online forum, Mirka Hokanen and Julia Müller investigate ‘Interjections and Emojis in Nigerian Online Communication’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 611-30). They find that Nigerian expressions are likely to occur in utterances that contain NigP, orthographically lengthened words, and positive emotions, thus illustrating the combined existence of NigP and NigE in online spaces and the interactive and emotional nature of language use in these written spaces. Moving to island nations, Susanne Mohr analyses the usage patterns and pragmatics of the English discourse markers ‘*You Know* and *I Think* in English(es) in Zanzibar’ in tourism (*WEn* 40[2021] 534-47). Based on audio recordings of six sociolinguistic interviews with male Zanzibaris, she finds that *you know* occurs in all sentence positions and occurs quite frequently; *I think*, on the other hand, is less frequent and is mostly used in sentence-initial position. The author finds that, in line with previous research in WE, both markers mostly fulfil speaker-centric functions such as requesting the listener’s attention, utterance planning and repair (fumbling device), and expressing epistemic stance. Kwabena Sarfo Sarfo-Kantankah uses the weekly published protocols from the Parliament of Ghana to conduct a corpus investigation of apologies in GhE in ‘I Withdraw and Apologise but...: Ghanaian Parliamentary Apologies, the Issue of Sincerity and Acceptance’ (*JPrag* 180[2021] 1-14). The author observes that sincerity is an important aspect in the interpretation of these apologies, which can be compromised where justifications, superficiality, or explanations are given. However, he finds that sincerity does not necessarily affect the acceptance of apologies. Two chapters in *Gender in World Englishes* are also of interest for the African continent. In ‘Localisation, Globalisation and Gender in Discourse-Pragmatic Variation in Ghanaian English’ (pp. 23-46), Beke Hansen investigates the use of *be like* usage by males and females in Ghanaian English. Based on the private dialogue section of ICE-GHA, she finds that it often occurs in inner monologues and is used in the historical present. Language-internally, her model shows an interaction of gender and age, indicating that older females are the least likely to use the feature. Melanie Law and Haidee Kotze look at genitive alternation in ‘Gender, Writing and Editing in South African Englishes’ (pp. 205-32). Using a corpus of texts and their edited counterparts in AfrE (‘a second-language variety used by first-language users of Afrikaans’), BSAE (‘a mostly second-language variety used by black South Africans’), and WSAE (the ‘settler’ subvariety) (p. 210), they find that in the three SAE subvarieties investigated, gender seems to have no impact on the use of genitive alternation in writing or in editing.

Moving to publications on English in the Middle East, we start with Omar I. S. Alomoush’s Linguistic Landscape Analysis of 256 shopping bags to answer the question ‘Is

English on Mobile Linguistic Landscape Resources No Longer Viewed as a Linguistic Threat to Arabic in Jordan?' (*EnT* 37[2021] 50-7). The analysis is complemented by 20 interviews about attitudes towards the use of English in commercials. The author finds that English, often mixed with Arabic, indexes cosmopolitanism, fashionableness, and commercial success. Several articles have been published on Middle Eastern Englishes in a special issue of *WEn*. Hadi Banat surveys 'The Status and Functions of English in Contemporary Lebanon' (*WEn* 40[2021] 268-79) by summarizing findings on the history and the educational policy of Lebanon, as well as research on attitudes about foreign languages. The author finds evidence for the use of English, though often not exclusively, in the regulative, instrumental, innovative, and interpersonal domains. Banat concludes that the motivation for learning and speaking English not only lies in its importance for higher education, but also in its usage in media and technology. Melanie van den Hoven and Kevin S. Carroll address 'English-Medium Policy and English Conversational Patterns in the UAE' (*WEn* 40[2021] 205-18). In their focus group interviews, field observations, and individual interviews, they find evidence of five different modes of English in higher education contexts in Abu Dhabi, i.e. Learner English, Academic English, College-flavour English, Simple English, and Simplified English. The authors take this diversity of identified modes to argue against the existence of a singular variety of English in the region. Tariq Elyas, Muhannad Alzahrani, and Handoyo Puji Windodo describe the current role of English in Saudi Arabia in 'Translanguaging and "Culigion" features of Saudi English' (*WEn* 40[2021] 219-30). They argue that the importance of the language is intricately tied to the global interest in oil and globalization. They summarize features of Saudi English from other studies and argue in favour of further developing English language instruction. Sarah Hopkyns, Wafa Zogbhor, and Peter John Hassall investigate 'The Use of English and Linguistic Hybridity Among Emirati Millennials' (*WEn* 40[2021] 176-90) by exploring the use of English, Arabic, and Arabizi and speaker attitudes towards language mixing. In a questionnaire conducted at the university of Abu Dhabi with 100 participants, students mostly report to always use Arabic at home and to sometimes use English with siblings or friends. Attitudes toward mixing languages range from describing it as a pragmatic strategy in communication to condemning it. Dilek Inal, Yasemin Bayyurt, Münir Özturhan, and Sezen Bektas use pictures of fifty-one signs from the Taksim district of Istanbul to analyse 'Multilingualism in the Linguistic Landscape of Istanbul' (*WEn* 40[2021] 280-89). They find no monolingual Turkish, thirteen monolingual English, twenty-four Turkish-English, and nine Turkish-Arabic-English signs. They use these findings to argue that language diversity is a vital aspect of Turkish life, and monolingual ideologies should therefore be abandoned in education and elsewhere. Peter Siemund, Ahmad Al-Issa, and Jakob Leimgruber investigate 'Multilingualism and the Role of English in the United Arab Emirates' (*WEn* 40[2021] 191-204) with the help of questionnaires from 692 university students and semi-structured interviews with 119 participants. They focus both on attitudes towards English and Arabic, and the characteristics of a new variety of English that they describe as 'Gulf English'. They find some grammatical and morphosyntactic features that may be evidence of 'Gulf English' developing as a lingua franca within the country, which may either localize further or stabilize as a version of 'International English'. Victoria Tuzlokova and Sandhya Rao Metha also conduct a linguistic landscape investigation to explore 'Englishes in the Cityscape of Mucat' (*WEn* 40[2021] 231-

44). They analyse around fifty signs from the main street of the Al Khoud district and find that some monolingual signs exist in Arabic, but there are also many bilingual signs in Arabic and English. They conclude that these findings indicate the growing importance of English in the Muscat cityscape.

Moving on to the Asian continent, we first assess publications on countries in East Asia. One monograph, seven individual journal articles, and one special issue relevant for this section have been published in 2021, which focus mainly on Japan, South Korea (henceforth Korea), and Hong Kong. The special issue as well as one journal article discuss English in Japan. We have not been able to access some of these publications and, therefore, have to postpone them until next year. One article published in the special issue that we have been able to review is ‘The Sounds of Japanese English: Monophthong Vowels and Rhythmic Patterning’ by Daniel D. Lee and Ee-Ling Low (*AEnglishes* 21[2021] 30-50). Investigating (monophthongal) vowel lengths and quality as well as prosody in JpE, this publication finds that (1) monophthongs in JpE do not necessarily show ‘conflation’ in terms of duration or quality and (2) speech rhythm patterning in JpE leans towards being stress-based. Another publication on JpE by Andrew Moody and Yuko Matsumoto discusses ‘Englishization of the Japanese Passive Construction: Evidence for “Contact-Induced Variation”’ (*AEnglishes* 23[2021] 229-50). Based on a corpus of online news articles published on the website of Reuters news service, they investigated passive constructions in native and translated Japanese. Most interestingly, they find that indirect passive constructions formed with causative verbs occur much more often in native Japanese than in translated Japanese. According to the authors, this suggests that causative verbs are less affected by the Englishization of Japanese, as they are unlikely to be used for indirect passive constructions in translations from English to Japanese. The only monograph published in 2021 on New Englishes in East Asia is *The Societal Codification of Korean English* by Alex Baratta. The author convincingly argues why all varieties of English, independent of whether they are used in inner circle contexts or whether their users are considered NES, are equally legitimate uses by reconceptualizing codification as a societal, i.e. bottom-up, practice. Chapter 1, ‘Introduction’ (pp. 1-21), details what has motivated the book, and provides the reader with an overview of the terminology and concepts used. It offers a first glance of the discussion whether English used in Korea is considered a variety of English – and thus should be called *KorE* or *Konglish* – and introduces relevant concepts, such as ‘native speaker’ and ‘language innovations’. This discussion is continued in chapter 2, ‘A Discussion of Four Key Topics’ (p. 23-53), with Baratta assessing how Englishes in expanding circle countries are often referred to, i.e. blended X-ish vs X English, and what these terms imply regarding the recognition and legitimacy of these varieties of English. As variety status requires language innovations are key, these are then compared to usage errors. The chapter ends with an assessment of what constitutes a native speaker. In Chapter 3, Baratta argues that ‘Societal Codification’ (pp. 55-81) is a useful way to determine the progress and use of a language variety. Rather than granting or establishing (international) official variety status, as traditional codification does (e.g. by showing a certain degree of standardization), societal codification reflects the acceptance of a variety by its speakers or within society. It is therefore, as the author argues, also a well-chosen tool to describe and legitimize a variety. After the theoretical groundwork, the author illustrates how this codification might be

applied, thereby strengthening his argument that KorE exists as a variety of English. In chapter 4, ‘The Lexical and Grammatical Aspects of Korean English’ (pp. 83-154) are presented in great detail. Baratta introduces the grammatical and lexical features of Konglish and KorE on the basis of relevant literature and shows that their codification, i.e. their standardization and status, is not agreed upon amongst researchers. He uses online sources, such as blogs, websites, and online dictionaries, for his own investigation of lexical and grammatical features of KorE and Konglish, and presents the definitions of, and differences between, KorE and Konglish as used in the Korean society. In chapter 5, the online focus continues when ‘Media English in Korea’ (pp. 155-76) is assessed. The focus of this chapter is on K-Pop, TV dramas, and advertisements. Although these rather wide-ranging topics are discussed in lesser detail than the grammatical features in the previous chapter, the author succeeds in sketching a coherent picture for the reader. The final content chapter is concerned with ‘Korean English in the EFL Classroom’ (pp. 177-90, chapter 6). Rather than showing how KorE is currently used in Korean classrooms, this chapter offers ideas of how it could be used. In doing so, Baratta presents a strong argument in favour of the use of non-inner circle Englishes in the classroom. The book ends with a short ‘Conclusion’ (pp. 191-3). In addition to this monograph, three shorter works on KorE have appeared in 2021. The first publication is Kang-Young Lee and Randy Green’s ‘Student Perceptions of Sociocultural Aspects of Korean and the Korean Variety of English (KVE): A Study of Korean University Students’ (*EnT* 37[2021] 156-62). The short article starts with a quick glance at the current state of research into the cross-linguistic influence between English and Korean and an overview of ‘sociocultural aspects’ in the use of these two languages. As part of their study, the authors asked eighty university students to identify such sociocultural aspects in English and Korean sentences and found that students perceive sociocultural differences between these two languages easily on a grammatical and semantic level. It remains unclear to the reader, however, what this might mean for KorE. The second publication is a chapter in Marzieh Sadeghpour & Farzad Sharifian, eds., *Cultural Linguistics and World Englishes*, called ‘“So You’re One of Those Vegetarians?” Emergence of Korean English’ by Hyejeong Ahn and Chonhak Kim (pp. 87-100). This article investigates the cultural schemas of *u-li-ju-ui* (Weism) and *jang-yu-yu-seo* (Confucian social relationships/norms of address), based on their use in a renowned novel. The authors find preliminary evidence that although KorE incorporates features similar to those of StE, speakers refer to specific semantic meanings to represent those Korean cultural schemas. The third article publication on KorE is Sofia Rüdiger’s ‘Like in Korean English Speech’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 548-61). Based on the SPOKE Corpus, Rüdiger investigates the role of *like* in the KorE repertoire as well as its discourse-pragmatic function. The author finds that *like* is part of the repertoire of speakers of KorE as discourse marker, quotative, and particle and that, while it is used by all speakers, it is used more often with discourse-pragmatic function than as a particle by speakers who have been abroad or who see themselves as highly proficient speakers than other speaker groups. Turning to English in Hong Kong, Patrice Quammie-Wallen investigates ‘Vague Language in Hong Kong English, “Something Like That”: A comparative corpus investigation into a defining feature of English in Hong Kong’ (*EnT* 37[2021] 13-25). This publication focuses on the function, context, quality, and frequency of use of the lexical bundle *something like that* in the HKCSE. Amongst others, she finds that the expression is used most frequently in informal

settings and it is used more often to express vagueness in the HKCSE than in the sBNC. The second publication on HKE is “‘Till Death Do Us Wed’ – About Ghost Brides and Ghost Weddings in Hong Kong English’ by Denisa Latić (in Sadeghpour and Sharifian, eds., pp. 129-42). The author takes a cultural linguistic approach assessing the conceptual network linking the concepts of FAMILY and GHOST. Using questionnaire data and a corpus comparison between HKE and AmE, Latić argues that the conceptualization of GHOSTS ARE HUMANS is not only salient in Hong Kong culture but is also represented in the various keyword chains used in HKE. The final article on this world region is ‘Cantonese-English Code-Switching in Cantopop Television Drama Theme Songs’ by Chi Wui Ng (*WEn* 40[2021] 354-70), who presents a corpus-assisted discourse analysis, comparing the use of English language elements in thirty Cantopop theme songs. He finds that, in addition to intra-sentential codswitching, inter-sentential code-switching has recently come to be used prominently. Furthermore, he observes that code-switching tends to serve as a tool to foreground or background information.

In 2021, seven relevant articles have been published on varieties of English spoken in Southeast Asia. We will start with a publication comparing several Asian Englishes, before turning towards individual Englishes. In ‘Auxiliary DO in Asian Englishes’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 502-18), Nina Schulz compares the use of DO+, i.e. the affirmative use of auxiliary DO, in eight ICE-corpora: four Inner Circle varieties (ICE-GB, ICE-US (written), ICE-NZ, and ICE-CAN) and four Asian varieties (ICE-HK, ICE-SIN, ICE-IND, and ICE-PHI). Although, in Asian Englishes DO+ tends to be used less frequently, this is just a tendency and does not hold for all varieties or all genres under investigation. Furthermore, Schulz’s analysis shows that, in general, DO+ is used more frequently in spoken public than in spoken private use, where, in turn, it is used more frequently than in written language use. The only publication that focuses on Thai English is ‘Does Thai English Exist? Voices from English language teachers in two Thai universities’ by Veronico N. Tarrayo, Mark B. Ulla, and Panya Lekwilai (*AEnglishes* 23[2021] 280-93). In this publication, the authors investigate the attitudes towards Thai English by eleven teachers of English at two Thai universities, drawing on a qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews. They find that, while the teachers agree that Thai English exists, they feel hesitant about its legitimacy when used in the classroom, which reflects a strong influence of native speaker ideologies. Moving on towards Singaporean English, Claudia Lange investigated ‘*Basically* in Singapore English’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 488-501). Lange uses ICE-SIN to assess the functions and use of *basically*, a quite recent addition to the discourse marker paradigm, and to determine whether its grammaticalization resembles that of *basically* in BrE. The analysis shows that this generally is the case, although ‘*basically* proceeded along its grammaticalization cline much faster than comparable forms such as *actually*, and it displayed pragmatic ambiguity in specific syntactic contexts early on’ (p. 499). The second paper concerned with SingE is ‘Emergent Features of Young Singaporean Speech: An Investigatory Study of the Labiodental /r/ in Singapore English’ written by Kwek Geraldine and Low Ee-Ling (*AEnglishes* 23[2021] 116-36). The authors find that the variant [v], an allophone of /r/ that has been found to be used by young speakers of BrE, is also present in young educated speakers of SingE. Furthermore, preliminary findings show that this new variant is also differentiated acoustically from the more commonly used variant [ɹ] and that it is used more often by female than by male

speakers. The remaining three articles focus on CSE or Singlish. We start with ‘Overseas Singaporean Attitudes Towards Singlish’ by Elsie Shu Ying Lee and Hyejeong Ahn (*AEnglishes* 23[2021] 264-79). In this publication, eight in-depth interviews with graduate students studying abroad in various countries are analysed to assess their attitudes and beliefs about Singlish. Although the negative attitudes towards Singlish that are propagated by the government are somewhat reproduced by the participants, socially, i.e. when it comes to the use of Singlish with outsiders in formal contexts, the authors find that Singlish is widely considered to represent the Singaporean identity and community and, for the students abroad, represents a close connection to their home country. Tsung-Lun Alan Wan and Claire Cowie have assessed ‘Conflicts Between World Englishes: Online Metalinguistic Discourse about Singapore Colloquial English’ (*EWV* 42[2021] 85-110). The paper discusses how Taiwanese migrants discuss SCE in the Taiwanese version of Facebook. Based on the comments of three posts, the paper shows that language ideologies are reproduced in this social media context; especially language hierarchies (English and Mandarin) are mainstreamed and negative ideologies towards SCE are enhanced. A final publication in this section is ‘Ethnic and Gender Variation in the use of Colloquial Singapore English Discourse Particles’ (*ELL* 25[2021] 601-20). In this study, Jakob R. E. Leimgruber, Jun Jie Lim, Wilkinson Daniel Wong Gonzales, and Mie Hiramoto assess discourse particles in CSE, drawing on the Corpus of Singapore English Messages, a corpus compiled of electronic messages. Although discourse particles have been widely investigated, with earlier findings also confirmed by the authors’ dataset, the present study reveals, for example, that previously posited correlations between a particle’s frequency of use and ethnicity have changed. In general, the authors argue that the variation attested in the use of discourse particles can be explained by sociodemographic factors, specifically ethnicity, gender, and age (the latter is not discussed in the reviewed paper). These insights are suggested to also be fruitful to further theorize CSE.

We now move to present publications that focus on English in India. In ‘Comparing Written Indian Englishes with the New *Corpus of Regional Indian Newspaper Englishes* (CORINNE)’ (*ICAME Journal* 45[2021] 179-205), Aysa Yurchenko, Sven Leuckert, and Claudia Lange present their work on regional IndE, investigating the ‘intrusive *as*’ construction in particular. This case study allows them to demonstrate the strengths of the newspaper corpus they have created: comparing ‘intrusive *as*’ in two subsets of the corpus, they show that the Tamil-speaking region Tamil Nadu employs the construction more frequently than the Hindi-speaking region Uttarakhand. They argue furthermore that ‘intrusive *as*’ is a contact feature because Tamil has a similar quotative that Hindi is lacking. Two articles on India were published in *Gender in World Englishes*. In Chapter 3, Robert Fuchs focuses on ‘Sociolinguistic Variation in Intensifier Usage in Indian and British English’ (pp. 47-68). His analysis of intensifiers in spoken data from ICE-GB and ICE-IND establishes that gender differences are pronounced in India, but also more affected by formality as well as group composition. Sven Leuckert and Claudia Lange also use data from ICE-IND to look at ‘Tag Questions and Gender in Indian English’ (pp. 69-93). They find that females use tag questions more frequently than males, both in exclusively female group settings as well as in mixed settings. They further discuss the limitations of studying the intricacies of gendered language use through corpora. In chapter 8, Lucía Loureiro-Porto

compares IndE and HKE investigating ‘Linguistic Colloquialisation, Democratisation and Gender in Asian Englishes’ (pp. 176-204). She analyses three features each to evaluate colloquialization (contractions, analytic *not*-negation, *going to* as a future marker) and democratization (modal *must*, gender-neutral occupational nouns, gender-neutral epicene pronouns). Her findings show that all features are more frequent in HKE than in IndE, and that, in IndE, the features are increasingly used by women in apparent time, indicating that change may be underway. One chapter compares Sri Lankan and British English, ‘The Role of Gender in Postcolonial Syntactic Choice-Making’ by Stefan Gries, Benedikt Heller, and Nina Funke. Drawing on the respective ICE sections, they investigate *of*- and *s*-genitives while employing a new method to identify the effect of interactions in random forests. Among others, they find a strong effect of animacy. In terms of gender, in most combinations of the predictors investigated, SLE speakers use *s*-genitives more than BrE speakers.

On Oceania, one monograph and several articles have been published in 2021. Starting with the monograph, Robert Mailhammer investigated *English on Croker Island: The Synchronic and Diachronic Dynamics of Contact and Variation*. In his first chapter ‘Overview and Context’ (pp. 1-17), Mailhammer provides a general overview of the (linguistic) history of Croker Island and Australia, the resulting language contact and contact-induced changes, and the methodology of his investigation. He, furthermore, previews the two main conclusions of his book, i.e. that ‘English on Croker Island has not stabilized into one variety [and that] a historical layering of contact situations and a synchronic co-existence of contact situations and contact patterns’ (p. 1) hamper the exact definition of contact features. In chapter 2 on ‘English on Croker Island: Sociohistorical Background’ (pp. 18-54), Mailhammer offers a detailed linguistic history of the Northwestern Arnhem Land, which Croker Island is a part of. After discussing the linguistic environment pre-English, he presents the arrival of English, its functions, as well as its increasing (voluntary and involuntary) use as a lingua franca or additional language by the Aboriginal population of Northwestern Arnhem Land in three phases. In chapter 3, ‘Phonetics and phonology’ (pp. 55-73), Mailhammer provides an analysis of the phonological features of English on Croker Island. Describing the phonetic differences between English on Croker Island and Standard Australian English, he finds variation across and within speaker groups. Furthermore, he finds that while English on Coker Island and Standard Australian English show considerable differences in the pronunciation of consonants, vowels, and diphthongs, somewhat surprisingly, they do not differ significantly in syllable structure, (lexical) stress, and intonation. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the features of English on Croker Island on the level of ‘Morphosyntax’ (pp. 74-118). The author presents various aspects of verbal and nominal morphological marking, each grammatical category being accompanied by well-explained examples. In the third section of this chapter he turns to syntactic variation, focusing specifically on ‘features that can be discussed in the context of the contact with local Aboriginal languages’ (p. 96). Mailhammer ends the chapter by presenting a WAVE profile of English on Croker Island and comparing it to the WAVE profile of Aboriginal English (Malcolm, Ian, 2012. ‘Aboriginal English and Associated Varieties. In Bernd Kortmann, Bernd, and Kerstin Lunkenheimer, eds., *The Mouton World Atlas of Variation of English*, pp. 598–619. Berlin: MGruyter). He concludes that ‘English on Croker Island and the WAVE profile of Aboriginal English share a total of 54 features out of the 74 which are attested in

English on Croker Island, corresponding to 73.0%' (p. 116). However, he also shows that the distribution, especially of features rated A and B, differ considerably between Mailhammer's 'Croker corpus' (p. 116) and the WAVE profile of Aboriginal English and that the morphosyntactic features of English on Croker Island vary much more speaker-internally than phonological features do (cf. chapter 3). Chapter 5 (pp. 119-34) focuses on 'Lexicon and Constructions' and completes the feature analysis of English on Croker Island. Using carefully discussed examples, Mailhammer investigates lexical transfer between local Aboriginal languages and English, i.e. borrowings, code-switches, and alternative uses of function words. In the second part of chapter 5, he focuses on constructions and finds that 'there is a high degree of variability in the way words are put together [in English on Croker Island] to express meaning' (pp. 129-30). In chapter 6, 'The Fluidity of Variation' (pp. 135-64), Mailhammer discusses the extensive degree of variability of English used on Croker Island, presented in detail in chapters 3-5. He argues that, although there is systematicity to this variation, English on Croker Island cannot be considered one variety of English. Support for this claim comes from a combined feature and speaker profile analysis, whereby he first presents inter- and intra-speaker variation on various levels of linguistic description before turning towards describing the usage patterns of twenty-six of his participants. In 'Layers of Contact', chapter 7 (pp. 165-208), Mailhammer takes a closer look at contact-induced language changes. He first presents 'a complete picture of possible contact influence in English on Croker Island, and then try[s] to connect the dots to reconstructions of contact scenarios' (p. 165). In chapter 8, 'Theoretical Implications' (pp. 209-31), Mailhammer first discusses his findings against Schneider's Dynamic Model (Schneider, Edgar W. *Postcolonial English*. [2007]. CUP). He positions English on Croker Island at an early stage of Phase 3 (p. 217), stating that 'the key paradox with respect to classifying English on Croker Island is that has been acquired by virtually all community members as L1 but that there is no significant shift, appropriation with or identification with English and no recognisable focusing' (p. 218). Most interestingly, he then argues in favour of English on Croker Island constituting a repertoire rather than a variety (p. 222). Chapter 9 (pp. 232-7) offers a short summary and conclusions. Interested readers might want to start with this chapter to gain a first overview.

Of the five relevant article contributions on New Englishes in Oceania in 2021, three are on AusAbE. The first one we present is Ian G. Malcolm's chapter on 'Australian Aboriginal English and Linguistic Inquiry' (in Sadeghpour and Sharifian, eds., pp. 15-36). In this chapter, Malcolm offers an overview of the development of AAE research. He first presents the focus of early research and compares the linguistic features of AAE to those of AusE. Around the second half of the twentieth century, research turns towards sociolinguistic networks, i.e. communication in more general terms. Following Malcolm, AAE, however, cannot be described in all of its complexity without including cultural linguistics networks to also unveil implicit differences between AAE and AusE. The second contribution is a journal article by Celeste R. Louro and Glenys Collard on 'Australian Aboriginal English: Linguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives' (*LLC* 15[2021] [doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12415](https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12415)). Referring back to Malcolm's work on AAE, the authors present their corpus of naturalistic interaction to describe contemporary AAE spoken in Nyungar country, Southwest Western Australia. Based on fifty hours of yarning, i.e. 'an Indigenous cultural form of storytelling and

conversation' (p. 9), the authors describe in detail the phonology, grammar, lexis and semantics, and discourse pragmatics of AAE in a culturally sensitive way. The final article on AAE is 'Indigenizing Say in Australian Aboriginal English' by Madeleine Clews, Celeste Rodríguez Louro, and Glenys Collard (*AJL* 41[2021] 453-76). The authors investigate the use of quotative *say* by twenty-six speakers of AAE born between 1907 and 1961. Their study shows that, while the quotative system of mainstream Englishes are dominated by *be like*, the speakers under investigation have maintained the dominance of *say* and use it in distinctive ways, including semantic and grammatical innovations that are unique to AAE. The final article on New Englishes in Oceania is 'Samoan English: An Emerging Variety in the South Pacific' by Carolin Biewer (*WEn* 40[2021] 333-53). Presenting the history and role of English in Samoa as well as its linguistic characteristics, Biewer argues that Samoan English is a newly emerging variety of English in the South Pacific. She shows that Samoan English varies with respect to lexical, phonological, grammatical, and pragmatic features from standardized BrE, while showing features of exonormative stabilization as well as of nativization.

One monograph and three journal articles on Caribbean Englishes have been published in 2021. Nicole Eberle published a comprehensive monograph describing the sociohistorical and linguistic profile of *Bermudian English*. It is one of the first book-length descriptions of this kind featuring a combined qualitative and quantitative approach. In the 'Introduction' (pp.1-9) (chapter 1), the author introduces the comparatively small amount of research on Bermudian English to date; the research gaps she thus identifies leads her to present her research design. Her work aims at comparing BerE structurally to other varieties and analysing both morphosyntactic features and consonant cluster reduction. In chapter 2, she describes 'The Theoretical Framework of Bermudian English as a Contact-Based Variety' (pp.11-38). She describes several existing models of language contact scenarios and the mechanisms involved, briefly touches on vernacular universals and angloversals, and then classifies Bermudian English accordingly as an island L1 variety with close connections to varieties of English in the Caribbean. The chapter also includes a discussion of space, mobility, and migration. In chapter 3, the author describes Bermuda's historical development and societal structure, including its colonization and slavery, maritime age, migration patterns, tourism, and current status as financial center. She argues that reconstructing the origins of BerE requires looking at input varieties in the early contact scenarios. She concludes that BerE is homogeneous in terms of region and diverse in terms of other extralinguistic dimensions such as idiolects, ancestries, and mobility. Chapter 4, 'Methodology and Data' (pp.75-88), details how the sociolinguistic interviews were conducted during the author's research stays in Bermuda, resulting in conversations with sixty-nine Bermudians overall. Chapter 5 presents a qualitative and quantitative analysis of 'Bermudian English Morphosyntax' (pp. 89-178). Eberle describes the main characteristics such as lack of affixation, patterns of regularization, and the variable absence of prepositions. She then conducts a typological analysis based on feature judgements in eWave (<https://ewave-atlas.org>), which she compares to her own ratings of the same features in BerE. The author finds that BerE shares the highest number of features with Tristan da Cunha and St. Helena English and the least with Trinidadian Creole. Next, to gauge the impact of language-internal and -external factors in her BerE corpus, Eberle models coda consonant

cluster reduction (CCR) and past-*be* levelling. The models of binarily coded CCR indicate a reduction rate that aligns BerE with other dialect contact varieties and to some extent with African American English. Models of binarily coded past-*be* levelling show an overall rate of less than twenty percent and high inter-speaker variability. This differs greatly from rates reported for comparable varieties, which the author partially attributes to formality in interviews and stigmatization. In the ‘Conclusion’ (pp.179-187) (chapter 6), the author finds that BerE exhibits ‘extensive structural parallels with contact-derived varieties in the South Atlantic, the Caribbean and the U.S.’ (p.187), which complicates typological considerations. The two features that were examined also delivered mixed results in terms of alignment with other varieties, such that only CCR patterns similarly to other contact-derived varieties. A first journal article on Caribbean English comes from Dagmar Deuber, Michael Westphal, and Eva Canan Hänsel, who investigate the differences between perception and production of ‘Quotative *be like* in Trinidadian English’ (*WEn* 40[2021] 436-58). They first analyse production of the quotative marker in face-to-face texts extracted from ICE-Trinidad. In a second step, they carry out online verbal guise reading tasks with 100 participants. While the production of *be like* seems to be relatively low (30%) compared with patterns in other Englishes, the perception study reveals that it is similarly associated with younger groups and females. In line with findings in Jamaica, *be like* is, however, associated with higher social status, which shows that social meaning is regionally bound, even if the feature may have been rooted in globalized US influence. Ulises Escalona Sánchez and Melinda Reichelt describe the current situation of ‘English in Cuba’ (*EnT* 37[2021] 3-12). Based on the importance of AmE for students of all ages, professionals, and diplomats as well as its role in media and tourism, they predict that the interest in English of the Cuban population will further increase. Philipp Meer, Thorsten Brato, and José Alejandro Matute-Flores present their adaption of the Forced Alignment and Vowel Extraction suite (FAVE; Rosenfelder et al., 2014, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.9846>) to aid in ‘Extending Automatic Vowel Formant Extraction to New Englishes’ (*EWV* 42[2021] 54-84). Using a test set of 1758 manually measured vowels produced by thirteen Trinidadian speakers, they train the automated formant prediction method with their data and compare formants predicted by FAVE, their adjusted TRINI-FAVE, and two optimized formant ceiling measures. They find that TRINI-FAVE outperforms all other methods. Guyanne Wilson and Michael Westphal provide an overview of the current status of language attitudes research in the Caribbean. Making use of two mixed-methods studies on language attitudes in Jamaica and Trinidad, they illustrate that responses to written surveys provide limited results and that language labels may cause misinterpretations. The challenges outlined are best addressed by mixed methods designs, as they show in their case studies. In *Gender in World Englishes*, Melanie Rötliberger investigates ‘Social Constraints on Syntactic Variation’ (pp.147-75) by studying the dative alternation in JamE, on the basis of data extracted from ICE-Jamaica. Although language internal factors are found to have most impact on the choice between the double-object and the prepositional variant, a marginal effect of gender indicates that females use fewer prepositional variants.

Three journal articles have been published that center on New Englishes in Europe. We start with publications on two European islands. ‘English in Madeira: History and Features of a Lesser-Known Variety in the Atlantic’ by Sven Leuckert, Theresa Neumaier,

and Asya Yurchenko (*EnT* [2021] doi:10.1017/S0266078421000328). In this article, the use and roles of English in Madeira, described as a quasi-British colony, is for the first time assessed within the WE paradigm. After providing an overview of the history and domains of use of the English language, the authors presenting linguistic features of English in Madeira. This qualitative analysis clearly positions English in Madeira within the field of WE. The second article is by Sandro Caruana and Laura Mori on MalE. In ‘Rethinking Maltese English as a Continuum of Sociolinguistic Continua Through Evaluations of Written and Oral Prompts’ (*EWV* 42[2021] 245-72), the authors take a sociolinguistic perspective and argue that MalE can both be conceptualized as an L2 and as a variety of English. Using data provided by university students, Mainly Maltese Speakers were expected to be leaning towards English as L2 usage, and Mainly English Speakers towards English as a variety. The findings, however, were more complex as perception of, and attitudes towards, MalE ‘depend on overlapping features, where aspects related to its syntactic structure often are less prominent than phonetic and prosodic ones’ (p. 268). The final article to be presented is ‘Grammaticalization and Language Contact in a Discourse-Pragmatic Change in Progress: The spread of *innit* in London English’ by Heike Pichler (*LSoc* 50[2021] 723-61). Pichler takes a variationist approach to the data, which are taken from the interview-based Linguistic Innovators Corpus (LIC), and shows that *innit* increasingly replaces grammatically dependent variants in tag questions. While language contact is assumed to be (one of) the reason of this development, this cannot be reliably confirmed (see also section 9, p. 78).

Finally, we turn to publications on creoles: an edited volume and four articles. One of the most ground-breaking publications of 2021 in terms of Creole language theorization is ‘Creoles, Revisited’, edited by Nicholas Faraclas and Sally Delgado. The overall aim of the book is to challenge theory-building in creolistics to date, and offer evidence encouraging a paradigm shift to more decolonial practices. In the ‘Introduction’, Faraclas and Delgado outline existing misconceptions about Caribbean people, notions of creoleness, and national vs contact languages. In chapter 2, Faraclas provides ‘A Subaltern Overview of Early Colonial Contact in the Afro-Atlantic’ (pp.14-31), where the author depicts the realities of the sugar industry and the agency of the maroons and renegades involved in changing the culture and languages of the colonial Caribbean. He argues that ‘Afro-Portuguese Proto-“Creole” repertoires’ (p.25) first developed along the African coast before becoming important building blocks of languages such as Papiamentu and Saramaccan. In chapter 3, Nicolas Faraclas and Sally Delgado introduce ‘Sociohistorical Matrices for the Emergence of Afro-Atlantic “Creoles” and other pre-1800 Colonial Era Contact Repertoires and Varieties’ (pp. 32-76), in which they discuss the contact spaces at different times in that era and how they impact the resulting languages varieties, creating pre-capitalist ‘Afro-Indiginized European varieties’(p.42) and ‘Europeanized African Varieties’ (p.45). They develop a Matrix Model that allows for the comparison of factors. In chapter 4, Sally Delgado describes the social realities of ‘Renegades, Raiders, Loggers and Traders in the Early Colonial Contact Zones of the Western Caribbean’ (pp.77-113). The author argues that trade in English-lexified languages predates colonization and that its impact on current languages in the Caribbean is commonly overlooked in creolistics. In chapter 5, Fernando Y. Alvarado Benítez and Nicholas Faraclas highlight the historic importance of indigenous people in the Caribbean, often wrongfully classified as “Arawak”, “Carib” and “Garifuna” (pp.114-42). The author

shows how the pluri-lingual realities of these people have been overlooked by linguists who consider monolingualism the norm. In chapter 6, Ian Hancock explores the African roots of languages in Jamaica, by connecting ‘Jamaican Maroon Spirit Language, Krio and Cryptolect’ (pp.143-84). He argues that the links between Krio and Sranan can only be explained by seeing Krio as a derivative of West African Pidgin English, but he also considers aspects of Maroon Spirit Language that exhibit characteristics of a cryptolect. In chapter 7, Micah Corum analyses body part expressions in Afro-Atlantic English-lexifier Creoles to investigate links between ‘Conceptual Construal, Convergence and the Creole Lexicon’ (pp. 185-204). He argues that the creative language use these features are rooted in can be considered ‘embodied universal tendencies’ (p.200) that may stem from multiple African and European sources, which invalidates arguments for a single source language. Overall, the volume is a great resource for those interested in alternate views of the sociohistorical development of the Caribbean and its plurilingualism as well as decolonial linguistics.

In an analysis of seventy questionnaires collected in Nigeria in 2007, Maria Mazzoli portrays ‘The Ideological Debate on Naijá and Its Use in Education’ (*EWJ* 42[2021] 299-323) and finds that Nigerians in the age range 25-33 show negative and positive ideologies towards the local Creole. In particular, negative ideologies include poor language skills, levity or jocularity, lack of economic value, and interference with the use of standard Englishes. Positive ideologies include an open affection towards the language and its value for intimate domains, the widespread usage amongst Nigerians, the communicative ease it offers as a result, and its importance as a unifying decolonial language. Mazzoli argues that these positive ideologies should be used to design and implement language policies in the education system. Britta Schneider analyses the construction of Kriol and English prestige as well as the social meaning of code-switching in ‘Creole Prestige Beyond Modernism and Methodological Nationalism’ (*JPCL* 36[2021] 12-45). The author shows that indexicalities of linguistic resources are varied and exist side-by-side in the Belizian community investigated in her ethnographic study, which calls binary linguistic models such as diglossia or the Creole continuum model into question. Christine Jourdan and Johanne Angeli also look at prestige in their investigation of ‘The Development of Weak Normativity in Solomon Islands Pijin’ (*JPCL* 36[2021] 46-76). While Pijin had long been looked down upon, the authors show a shift in attitude by urbanites as they themselves are being recognized as a group. It is revealed that the overall development of the language is heterogenous among various groups and that, in this complex social environment, normativity is increasingly debated. Attitudes towards local language are also the topic of “‘Broken English”, “dialect” or “Bahamianese”?” (*JPCL* 36[2021] 362-95). In this paper, Alexander Laube and Janina Rothmund discuss findings from a verbal guise study carried out with university students. Comparing covert and overt attitudes, they find that the attitudes toward Bahamian English are similar to other CaribE in being most associated with ‘the language of solidarity, national identity, emotion and humour’, and Standard English being most associated with ‘the language of education, religion, and officialdom’ (Youssef, Valerie. “‘Is English we speaking”’: Trinbagonian in the twenty-first century’, *EnT* 20:iv[2004], p. 44). In their article on ‘Constraints on Subject Elision in Northern Australian Kriol: Between Discourse and Syntax’ (*AJL* 41[2021] 287-313), Connor Brown and Maïa Ponsonnet assess subject elision in Kriol, a topic not yet

discussed in the literature. Based on their qualitative investigation of twenty hours of spoken data by twenty speakers of Kriol, they find that ‘subject elision can be licensed through antecedent–anaphora relations at the level of syntax and through the encoding of unambiguous, continued topics following the beginning of a narrative episode at the level of discourse’ (p. 287).

## 11. Second Language Acquisition

Current research in SLA addresses questions on L2 development and processing using online experimental methods. Corpus learner research is becoming more popular in the field, with numerous publications focusing on various components of L2 grammar (morphosyntax, semantics, phonology, lexicon, and pragmatics), and L2 skills (speaking, listening, writing, and reading). The present section provides an overview of journal articles and books that dealt with these topics where English is featured as the L2. This section is organized by domain of inquiry in second language research. The domains covered are L2 morphosyntax, L2 processing and the mental lexicon, L2 speech production and perception, L2 pragmatics, L2 skills and vocabulary development, and learner corpora. Research on aptitude and motivation is also reviewed.

In the area of L2 morphosyntax, articles continue to attract research within the nominal domain. In ‘The (Mis-)Use of the English Definite Article in Relation to the ‘of-phrase’ Construction by Speakers of Jordanian-Arabic and Cypriot-Greek’ (*JESLA* 5[2021] 70-86), Asma Al-hawi and Sviatlana Karpava tested L2 learners of English on the acquisition of the English definite article in complex NPs. Results showed that L2 groups managed to restructure the configuration of their L1 grammars to match the configuration of English grammar in the use of the definite article. On the other hand, in ‘Knowledge of Indefinite Articles in L2-English: Online vs. Offline Performance’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 121-60), Tania Ionin and Sea Hee Choi examined Mandarin L2 learners. They administered a self-paced reading task and an acceptability judgement task. They concluded that L2 learners showed target-like processing when they encountered errors of article omission and misuse in L2 English. They also argued that L2 learners can perform target-like on an acceptability judgement task if the target property being tested is explicitly marked (underlined) for the participants, and thus if their attention is focused on that element in the structure. In another study, ‘From Interlanguage Grammar to Target Grammar in L2 Processing of Definiteness as Uniqueness’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 91-119), Hyunah Ahn tested Korean L2 learners of English, also using a self-paced reading task. Results showed that target-like processing gradually develops with increased proficiency levels.

Regarding research on language processing, numerous studies were carried out on speech processing and sentence comprehension. In ‘The Effect of Learning Context on L2 Listening Development: Knowledge and Processing’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 329-54), Xiaoru Yu, Esther Janse, and Rob Schoonen tested Chinese L2 learners of English in two contexts: one group in a study-abroad context, and the other group in an at home context. Results showed that the study-abroad group showed better processing speed across three tasks (word recognition, grammatical processing, and semantic analysis). As for sentence parsing and ambiguity, Heather Goad, Natália Brambatti Guzzo, and Lydia White investigated ‘Parsing Ambiguous Relative Clauses in L2 English: Learner Sensitivity to Prosodic Cues’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 83-108). For example, in *The journalist interviewed the daughter of the colonel who had the accident* (p.85), the relative clause (RC) *who had the accident* can modify either the lowest NP2 *the colonel* or the highest NP1 *the daughter*. English and Spanish differ in their attachment preferences for RCs: while English prefers low attachment (RC modifies NP2), Spanish prefers high attachment (RC modifies NP1). Participants in the study were

Spanish L2 speakers of English (low and high proficiency). Results showed an effect of L1 transfer with low proficiency L2 speakers. Testing the L2 interpretation of ambiguous English pronouns in ‘Changing Comprehenders’ Pronoun Interpretations’, Carla Contemori compared the effects of ‘Immediate and Cumulative Priming at the Discourse Level in L2 and Native Speakers of English’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 573-86). Using a sentence interpretation task, the performance of two groups was compared: English native speakers and Mexican Spanish L2 speakers of English. Results showed that the effect of priming in L2 processing of pronoun resolution preferences is related to how well the structure is part of the L2 competence, and that amount of experience does not matter. In another study, Leah Roberts and Sarah Ann Liszka (*SLR* 37[2021] 619-47) tested the L2 processing of temporarily ambiguous sentences in English, using a self-paced reading task with advanced German, Dutch, and French L2 English speakers. They examined the effect of cross-linguistic L1 differences in encoding aspect on the online comprehension of sentences such as *While John hunted the frightened rabbit escaped*. Results showed that the L2 speakers’ online processing differed depending on whether aspect in their L1 was grammatically encoded (French) or lexically encoded (German and Dutch). Two studies can be singled out dealing with predictive processing. In one study, Michelle Perdomo and Edith Kaan examined the effect of ‘Prosodic Cues in Second-Language Speech Processing: A Visual World Eye-Tracking Study’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 349-75). In an eye-tracking experiment, they compared the processing behaviour of English native speakers and Chinese L2 speakers of English. Results showed that both groups used ‘contrastive pitch accent’ to build information structure while listening. However, there were group differences in terms of ‘predictive processing’. Unlike the English native speakers, the L2 speakers were not shown to use prosodic cues predictively while building the information structure. In another related study on ‘Predictive Processing of Implicit Causality in a Second Language: A Visual-World Eye-Tracking Study’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 133-54), Hyunwoo Kim and Theres Grüter examined the phenomenon of implicit causality at the discourse level. Using eye-tracking, they tested Korean L2 learners of English. They found that L2 speakers can engage in predictive processing in real-time but to a ‘limited extent’. On the same topic of prediction and L2 processing, Edith Kaan and Theres Grüter edited a book volume of ten chapters, *Prediction in Second Language Processing and Learning* (2021), presenting current research by experts in predictive processing. Specifically, the chapters cover research on the process of prediction in grammatical and vocabulary learning, and across different linguistic domains. Some chapters examine prediction with code-switching and in bilingual children. Overall, the research reported in the volume illustrates different approaches in the investigation of ‘predictive processing’ in L2 learning. As for research on L2 processing and instruction, a book volume in honour of Bill VanPatten, entitled *Research on Second Language Processing and Processing Instruction*, was edited by Michael J. Leiser, Gregory D. Keating, and Wynne Wong (2021). The volume consists of a collection of ten chapters presenting articles on L2 input processing divided into four areas: after the introduction, the editors present research on sentence processing, research applying VanPatten’s Model of input processing, perspectives on processing instruction, and online methods in research on input processing.

As for the L2 mental lexicon, in ‘Form Prominence in the L2 Lexicon: Further Evidence From Word Association’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 69-91), Nan Jiang and Jianqin Zhang

conducted a study investigating whether the ‘lexical form’ is more prominent in the L2 lexicon compared to the L1 lexicon. Drawing on a critical review of previous research, they carefully designed their stimuli sets, and included stimuli ‘that had both strong semantic associates and orthographically similar words’ (p. 69). In a word-association task, they compared the responses of English native speakers and English L2 speakers. They found that L2 speakers produced more form-related responses than the native speakers. With regard to studies on L2 word collocations, in ‘L1 Transfer, Proficiency, and the Recognition of L2 Verb-Noun Collocations: A Perspective from Three Languages’ (*IRAL* 59[2021] 181-208), Senyung Lee tested Korean and Mandarin L2 groups, investigating the effects of L1 transfer and proficiency on the recognition of (un)acceptable word collocations in English. Results showed no L1 effect even at low proficiency levels on the recognition of unacceptable word collocations. From an L2 processing perspective, in ‘Collocational Processing in L1 and L2’, Doğuş Öksüz, Vaclav Brezina, and Patrick Rebuschat examined ‘The Effects of Word Frequency, Collocational Frequency, and Association’ (*LL* 71[2021] 55-98) on the L1 and L2 processing of English collocations, testing English native speakers and Turkish L2 speakers of English. Results showed that L1 and L2 speakers process word collocations in a similar way. An important book publication within the domain of L2 mental lexicon research is *Language Processing in Advanced Learners of English: A multi-method approach to collocation based on corpus linguistic and experimental data* by Marco Schilk (2020), The book examines the L2 processing of English collocations by advanced L1 German speakers of English. The author proposes a ‘multi-method approach’ for studying collocations based on corpus linguistics and experimental data.

Turning to speech perception, Christine MoonKyoung Cho and Jean-Marc Dewaele carried out ‘A Crosslinguistic Study of The Perception of Emotional Intonation: Influence of The Pitch Modulations’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 870-95) in L2 English by L1 Korean speakers. Unlike in English, pitch in Korean does not play a role in the interpretation of emotional utterances. So, it was tested whether Korean L2 speakers of English can correctly associate the intonation types of English emotional utterances with their meaning. Results show that, unlike for the Anglo-American students, it was challenging for Korean L2 learners to interpret the different pitch levels in English emotional utterances. In ‘A Longitudinal Investigation of Explicit and Implicit Auditory Processing in L2 Segmental and Suprasegmental Acquisition’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 551-73), Hui Sun, Kazuya Saito, and Adam Tierney tested Chinese L2 learners of English over a five-month period of early immersion into the target language. Results showed that the speech of the L2 learners benefited from ‘explicit and integrative auditory processing ability’ (p. 551) at early stages of L2 learning. Testing Spanish L2 learners of English, in ‘Exploring The Potential of Phonetic Symbols and Keywords as Labels For Perceptual Training’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 297-328), Jonás Fouz-González and Jose A. Mompean found that using phonetic symbols and keywords are effective tools for perceptual training of L2 sounds. On the relationship between L2 speech perception and production, in ‘Illusory Vowels in Spanish-English Sequential Bilinguals: Evidence that Accurate L2 Perception is Neither Necessary nor Sufficient for Accurate L2 Production’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 587-618), a group of researchers, Esther de Leeuw, Linnaea Stockall, Dimitra Lazaridou-Chatzigoga, and Celia Gorba Masip conducted a study on the phonotactics of English. Specifically, they tested Spanish-English sequential bilinguals on

whether the accurate pronunciation/production of words such as *spi*, instead of *espi-*, is related to the accurate perception of the discrimination contrast between both words. They concluded that accurate L2 perception is not a pre-requisite for accurate L2 production.

Among studies on L2 speech production is ‘How Does Longitudinal Interaction Promote Second Language Speech Learning? Roles of Learner Experience and Proficiency Levels’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 547-71) by Kazuya Saito, Shinto Suzuki, Tomoko Obama, and Yuka Akiyama, who tested the development of oral proficiency of Japanese EFL learners. Through examining weekly conversational sessions with English native speakers, they found that phonological accuracy, at the level of segmental and word stress, improved the L2 speech of experienced and proficient L2 learners. Examining the L2 speech of bilinguals Jing Yang carried out a ‘Comparison of [Voice-Onset-Time] VOTs in Mandarin-English Bilingual Children and Corresponding Monolingual Children and Adults’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 3-26). Results revealed that the bilingual children ‘tended to separate’ the two VOT systems of Mandarin and English. However, the ‘separation’ was implemented differently by the monolingual speakers. In ‘Influence of Learners’ Prior Knowledge, L2 Proficiency and Pre-task Planning on L2 Lexical Complexity’ (*IRAL* 59[2021] 543-67), Gavin Bui examined lexical complexity in L2 speech production. Results are discussed in light of Levelt’s model of speech production, and pedagogical implications are given for effective content-based language instruction.

On L2 speech learning, Wayland Ratree [2021] edited a collection of articles entitled *Second Language Speech Learning: Theoretical and Empirical Progress*. Overall, the book includes fourteen chapters written by experts in the field, presenting a revision of Flege’s Speech Learning Model. The volume brings together research on five areas of L2 phonology, each presented in an independent part labelled as: Part I, ‘Theoretical Progress’; Part II, ‘Segmental Acquisition’; Part III, ‘Acquiring Suprasegmental Features’; Part IV, ‘Accentedness and Acoustic Features’; and Part V, ‘Cognitive and Psychological Variables’.

In the area of L2 vocabulary development, numerous studies examined EFL vocabulary learning. In a study entitled ‘Effects of Learning Direction in Retrieval Practice on EFL Vocabulary’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 1116-37), Masato Terai, Junko Yamashita, and Kelly E. Pasich tested the effect of the learning direction (L2-to-L1 vs L1-to-L2) in paired-associate English vocabulary learning with Japanese EFL students (low and high proficiency levels). Their findings showed that low-proficiency learners benefited from L2-to-L1 retrieval practice, whereas high proficiency learners benefited from L1-to-L2 retrieval practice. In another study entitled ‘Does it Matter When You Review?: Input Spacing, Ecological Validity, and the Learning of L2 Vocabulary’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 1138-56), John Rogers and Anisa Cheung tested the practical effects of reviewing words on the retention of L2 vocabulary by Cantonese primary school EFL students. Their conclusion stressed the importance of ‘reviewing’ for effective L2 vocabulary learning irrespective of when ‘reviewing’ is provided in the classroom. From a different theoretical perspective, ‘Form-first Approach in Foreign Language Word Learning’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 51-68) is a study by Aleck Shih-wei Chen, testing the ‘the cognitive load theory’ in learning foreign words. The study concluded that EFL learners of low proficiency can learn more effectively when presented with the phonological rhyme of the English word. Using a ‘large-scale crowdsourcing vocabulary test’, Marc Brysbaert, Emmanuel Keuleers, and Paweł Manderla in

a study entitled ‘Which Words Do English Non-Native Speakers Know? New Supranational Levels Based on Yes/No Decision’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 207-31) found that L2 speakers were good at academic words, but bad at words related to family and childhood. They prepared ‘a new list of 20 levels of 1,000-word families’ that could be used by English EFL teachers. Using a lexical decision task with Japanese speakers of English, Tatsuya Nakata and Irina Elgort conducted a study entitled ‘Effects of Spacing on Contextual Vocabulary Learning’; they found that ‘Spacing Facilitates the Acquisition of Explicit, but not Tacit, Vocabulary Knowledge’ (*SLR* 37[2021] 233-60). Vladyslav Gilyuk, Amanda Edmonds, and Elisa S. German conducted a longitudinal study entitled ‘Exploring the Evolution in Oral Fluency and Productive Vocabulary Knowledge During a Stay Abroad’ (*JESLA* 5[2021] 101-14). They examined data from five French L2 learners of English before and after a nine-month stay abroad in an English-speaking country. Results showed no evidence for a relationship between oral fluency development and productive vocabulary knowledge. Finally, examining the effect of pre-reading instruction on vocabulary learning, Ana Pellicer-Sánchez, Kathy Conklin, and Laura Vilkaitė-Lozdienė, in a study ‘The Effect of Pre-reading Instruction on Vocabulary Learning’, conducted ‘An Investigation of L1 and L2 Readers’ Eye Movements’ (*LL* 71[2021] 162-203), in which they measured the amount of attention given to the vocabulary during reading. Results showed that pre-reading instruction is beneficial for vocabulary learning.

As for L2 research on aptitude, in ‘The Associations Between Implicit and Explicit Language Aptitude and The Effects of The Timing of Corrective Feedback’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 498-522), Mengxia Fu and Shaofeng Li tested three forms of corrective feedback (CF): immediate, delayed, and task only (i.e. no feedback) on the L2 learning of the English past tense. They tested school-level EFL learners on an untimed grammaticality judgement task and an elicited imitation task. Results showed that procedural memory (implicit aptitude) was predictive of immediate CF, declarative memory (explicit aptitude) was related to delayed CF and task only, and working memory (explicit aptitude) was predictive of immediate and delayed CF. Another study by Shaofeng Li and Jiancheng Qian entitled ‘Exploring Syntactic Priming as a Measure of Implicit Language Aptitude’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 574-605) tested university level EFL learners on a battery of tests for implicit, explicit, and L2 proficiency. Results showed that ‘syntactic priming’ is unrelated to explicit aptitude and does not predict implicit aptitude or L2 proficiency. This study calls for more research on the ‘construct validity of syntactic priming as a cognitive ability for implicit learning’ (p. 574).

In the area of motivational research and individual differences, a large-scale study was conducted on the predictive power of grit and language mindset on foreign language achievement. This study, ‘A Closer Look at Grit and Language Mindset as Predictors of Foreign Language Achievement’ (*SSLA* 43[2021] 379-402), was conducted by Gholam H. Khajavy, Peter D. MacIntyre, and Jamal Hariri. Grit is defined as the ‘continuous effort and interest for long-term goals’ and language mindset as the ‘individuals’ perception of their language learning ability’ (p. 379). Results from 1,178 university students showed that grit and language mindset work together in predicting language achievement, constituting a two-factor structure. In ‘The Roles of English Varieties and L2 Motivation in English Learners’ Willingness to Communicate in the Internationalization at Home (IaH) Context’ (*IRAL* 59[2021] 293-314), Yih-Lan Chen, Hsing-Fu Cheng, Hui-Wen Tang, and Chaochang Wang

conducted a study in Taiwan with 273 college students, examining the relationship between perception of English varieties (PEV), L2 motivation, and willingness to communicate in English at an international home context. Results showed that the students' willingness to communicate was affected by their PEV and thus their L2 motivation to communicate in English. Mostafa Papi and Gholam H. Khajavy conducted a study investigating the 'Motivational Mechanisms Underlying Second Language Achievement: Regulatory Focus Perspective' (*LL* 71[2021] 537-72). The regulatory focus theory proposes two motivational systems: a promotion system and a prevention system, where both systems regulate 'goal-directed behaviour'. They concluded that a 'promotion-oriented approach' is beneficial for L2 language learning and teaching.

In the domain of L2 learning, one study was 'The Role of Feedback and Instruction on The Cross-situational Learning of Vocabulary and Morphosyntax: Mixed Effects Models Reveal Local and Global Effects on Acquisition' (*SLR* 37[2021] 261-89) by Padraic Monaghan, Simón Ruiz, and Patrick Rebuschat. The participants were tested on an artificial language that they were trained on, and then had to complete a vocabulary and grammatical structure test. They were assigned to one of three conditions: (a) implicit (received no instruction about the structure), (b) explicit (given information about the grammatical role of the words in the structure), and (c) feedback (received no instruction about the structure but got auditory feedback about whether their response was correct or not). Results showed that L2 learning of grammar and vocabulary are affected differently under the provision of feedback: while vocabulary learning benefited from feedback, 'syntax learning was better without feedback' (p.261). Another study by Majid Ghorbani was on 'Interactions between Type of Form-Focused Instruction, Type of Morphosyntactic Form, and Type of Language Knowledge' (*IRAL* 59[2021] 121-52). The author examined the efficacy of different types of FFI on EFL/ESL learners' use of easy and difficult morphosyntactic forms at early stages of development. Findings showed that varying types of form-focused instruction are beneficial for L2 development.

Some studies also dealt with the L2 skills of reading and writing. When it comes to L2 writing, Ehsaan Rassaei conducted a study investigating the 'Effects of Dynamic and Non-dynamic Corrective Feedback on EFL Writing Accuracy During Dyadic and Small Group Interactions' (*IRAL* 59[2021] 233-65). Results from a writing task and an error identification task showed that dynamic feedback benefited EFL learners' writing accuracy more than explicit instruction. Also, dynamic feedback is more effective with a group of learners than with individual learners. As for argumentative L2 writing, Jessie Barrow and Mari Karen Gabinete examined 1870 essays in terms of 'Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency in The Argumentative Writing of ESL and EFL Learners' (*IRAL* 59[2021] 209-23). The analysis revealed 'different patterns in various measures' of complexity, accuracy, and fluency 'in the written outputs of both the ESL and EFL groups' (p. 209). While the ESL writings were more complex and accurate, the EFL writings were more fluent. On L2 reading, it is also worth mentioning the study by Shingo Nahatame on 'Text Readability and Processing Effort in Second Language Reading: A Computational and Eye-Tracking Investigation' (*LL* 71[2021] 1004-43).

When it comes to L2 pragmatics, there is one study on 'correction' as a speech act by Ming-Fang Lin, Miao-Hsia Chang, and Yu-Fang Wang in "How Dare You Have Another

Relationship!": An Analysis of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Corrections' (*IRAL* 59[2021] 449-89). The study examined Chinese, American, and Chinese EFL learners. Elicited data were based on a scaled response questionnaire and discourse completion task. Results suggested that L2 learners' interlanguage development is affected by L1 socio-cultural pragmatics. Another study is 'A Gendered Study of Refusal of Request Speech Act in the Three Languages of Persian, English and Balouchi: A Within Language Study' (*IRAL* 59[2021] 55-85) by Moafian Fatemeh, Yazdi Naji, and Sarani Abdulah. The authors focused on the speaker's gender (male vs female) in three languages (Persian, English, and Balouchi). Using a discourse completion task, they showed that there were some similarities and differences between male and female speakers in the three languages. A new area of L2 research is email pragmatics. Maria Economidou-Kogetsidis, Milica Savić, and Nicola Halenko edited a volume entitled *Email Pragmatics and Second Language Learners* (2021). The book presents a collection of nine articles and is divided into two parts: the first part is about 'email literacy and pragmatic development', and the second part is about 'relational practices in email communication'. Overall, the book contributes to the question how L2 learners 'engage with the process of email writing' and how intercultural differences are manifested in the interpretation and writing process of emails; for a more detailed discussion, see section 13 (p. 134). From an intercultural perspective, Matthew E. Poehner and Michelle L. Pasterick's study, taking 'A Vygotskian Approach to Mediating Learner Intercultural Competence During Study Abroad' (*IRAL* 59[2021] 517-41), examined the effectiveness of an online course designed according to the principles of Vygotskian theory (see Vygotsky, L.S.2012, *Thought and language*, Revised and expanded edition. MITP. [2012]) in prompting intercultural competence.

A study by Cylcia Bolibaugh and Pauline Foster, 'Implicit Statistical Learning in Naturalistic and Instructed Morphosyntactic Attainment: An Aptitude-Treatment Interaction Design' (*LL* 71[2021] 959-1003), dealt with the effects of age of onset (AoO) and context of exposure. The authors examined 'implicit statistical learning in naturalistic and instructed' settings on English morphosyntactic attainment. Their participants were 71 Polish-English long-term bilinguals, with their AoO ranging between one and thirty-five years. The results suggested that implicit learning is not involved in instructed contexts of exposure. On the other hand, in a naturalistic context of exposure, implicit learning declines with older AoO.

Reflecting the growing attention given to learner corpora and L2 acquisition are two edited volumes. One is *Learner Corpus Research Meets Second Language Acquisition* (2021), edited by Bert Le Bruyn and Magali Paguot. The volume includes twelve chapters on cross-collaborative research between learner corpora and various aspect of L2 acquisition, such as, tense and aspect, cross-linguistic influence and universality, and variability. The opening chapter, written by the editors, discusses the importance of 'Learner Corpus Research and Second Language Acquisition: An Attempt at Bridging the Gap' (pp. 1-9). Then follow nine chapters written by experts in the field. Two chapters on specific linguistic properties, such as article use and lexical diversity, are singled out here: 'Article Use in Russian and Spanish Learner Writing at CEFR B1 and B2 Levels: Effects of Proficiency, Native Language, and Specificity' (pp. 10-38) by Tania Ionin and María Belén Díez-Bedmar, and 'Understanding the Long-Term Evolution of L2 Lexical Diversity: The Contribution of a Longitudinal Learner Corpus' (pp. 148-71) by Nicole Tracy-Ventura, Amanda Huensch, and

Rosamond Mitchell. The edited volume concludes with two commentary chapters: One written by Sylviane Granger entitled ‘Commentary: Have Learner Corpus Research and Second Language Acquisition Finally Met?’ (pp. 243-257), and ‘Commentary: An SLA Perspective on Learner Corpus Research’ (pp. 258-273), written by Florence Myles. Another collective volume, edited by Robert Fuchs and Valentin Werner, is entitled *Tense and Aspect in Second Language Acquisition and Learner Corpus Research* (2020). It is a republication of articles originally published in a special journal issue (*IJLCR* 4[2018] 143-300). (Note that this volume was already published in 2020, but was not included in *YWES* 101[2021].) The volume brings together six empirical studies on the L2 acquisition of tense and aspect, drawing on learner corpora. Consolidating influential research, it is a fruitful resource for interested researchers. Also using corpus data is the study entitled ‘Universals and Transfer in the Acquisition of the Progressive Aspect: Evidence From L1 Chinese, German, and Spanish Learners’ Use of the Progressive -ing in Spoken English’ (*IRAL* 59[2021] 267-92), by Xiaoyan Zeng, Yasuhiro Shirai, and Xiaoxiang Chen, which examines the effects of L1 transfer, lexical aspect, and proficiency levels on the L2 acquisition of progressive aspect (-ing) in spoken English. Drawing on data from L1 Chinese, German, and Spanish English L2 learners, they found an L1 effect interacting with the L2 proficiency level in the overuse of stative progressive forms, but not with activity progressive forms. Accordingly, they concluded that ‘L1 effect, lexical aspect of verbs, and proficiency levels jointly drive tense-aspect acquisition’ (p. 267).

## 12. English as a Lingua Franca

This year's review on ELF discusses a small selection of articles and two edited volumes. Consistent with previous years, much ELF research engages with the use of English (as a lingua franca) in education, ELF-awareness in teacher education, the use of pragmatic strategies and various resources in different types of spoken ELF interaction, and multilingual practices in ELF communication. But there are also studies which have developed from rather 'young' ELF research areas like aviation and video-mediated ELF interactions. Further, there are a few 'firsts' of ELF research included in this year's review. These scholarly works exhibit how ELF researchers from different disciplines and/or with different interests have extended the scope of the field. To begin this section, articles relating to the conceptualization of ELF and its impact on teaching and learning, especially in the pan-Asian region, are presented.

In 'Global Englishes and "Japanese English"' (*AEnglishes* 23[2021] 15-29), Tomokazu Ishikawa provides a detailed account of the conceptualization and ontology of ELF, and especially how the notion of English as a Multilingua Franca relates to translanguaging, transculturality, and transmodality. By way of conclusion, Ishikawa discusses how, through the lens of complexity theory, the ELF approach can contribute to English learning and teaching in Japan. 'Understanding CLIL from an ELF Perspective: Language in Taiwanese Primary Bilingual Education' (*JELF* 10[2021] 209-33) by Inmaculada Pineda and Wenli Tsou details the design and implementation of an observation rubric which was used to assess the effectiveness of Taiwanese schools involved in a pilot 'CLIL + ELF' programme, and the training needs of the teachers involved. Based on a qualitative meta-analysis of the CLIL and ELF literature, ten assessing criteria were developed. Using these criteria, the authors identified many positive responses from teachers. They add, however, that to further enhance the rubric, translanguaging and multimodal scaffolding should be included.

In 'Pronunciation in Course Books: English as a Lingua Franca Perspective' (*ELTJ* 75[2021] 55-66), Marek Kiczkowiak observes that features of the Lingua Franca Core appear only to a small extent in the pronunciation syllabi of six global ELT course books. A survey conducted with the course book authors shows that they do so because they do not recognize the importance of the Lingua Franca Core, or because they were following publishers' demand. Kiczkowiak calls for a greater incorporation of the Lingua Franca Core features in ELT course books because of their positive effect on intelligibility in international contexts. Turning from pronunciation to speaking in general, Danni Xia conducted the study 'Teaching Communication Strategies in China: A Textbook Analysis from an ELF Perspective' (*AP* 3[2021] 84-106). In light of the absence of an appropriate analytical model, Xia adapted a pedagogy-oriented model for her research centring on the 'problem-solving' aspect of communication strategies (p. 102). Xia illustrates in four aspects the overall inadequacy of the instruction of communication strategies in college English textbooks published in China, which hence fail to fulfil learners' needs. Methodologically, the author also highlights the current lack of a pedagogically oriented framework 'valid enough' to analyse communication strategies in education research from an ELF perspective (p. 102).

Concerning the use of ELF in spoken classroom interactions, in ‘Cooperative Accomplishment of Multilingual Language Tutorial: An Intercultural Pragmatics Study’ (*MLJ* 105[2021] 655-678), Daisuke Kimura examines a video-recorded tutorial between four Japanese exchange students learning English with a Thai tutor in Thailand. Conversational analytic methods combined with a socio-cognitive approach are employed to detect the coordinated use of multilingual and multimodal resources in support of sequential routines in language learning activities. Kimura observes that students solved contingent misalignment using diverse non-verbal resources (e.g. paralinguistic, gesture, eye gaze, and smile, etc.). They also applied multilingual resources even without specific instructions to do so. Academically, the study responds to the call for more dialogic studies of multilingual interactions; pedagogically, it displays the significance of conversation-for-learning for ELT. Expanding to other languages, Etsuko Yamada presents her research ‘Investigating the Roles of First Language (L1) Speakers in [co-constructing] Lingua Franca Communication in Multicultural Classrooms’ with ‘A Case Study of Japanese as a Lingua Franca (JLF)’ (*JELF* 10[2021] 285-311). Yamada observed and interviewed Japanese and international students taking multicultural courses using either English or Japanese as the medium of instruction. She finds that the role of L1 speakers did not lead to more active participation in lingua franca communication; in contrast, one’s negative attitude about one’s own language use discouraged participation. She thus suggests that pedagogy for lingua franca communication should focus on developing the mindset of the users rather than on linguistic and pragmatic skills alone. Yamada also proposes that multicultural courses with both L2- and L1-speaking participants should be conducive to foreign language education.

Shifting to language learning in relation to assessment and testing, Jim Yee Him Chan investigates Hong Kong students’ pragmatic production in ‘Bridging the Gap Between ELF and L2 Learners’ Use of Communication Strategies: Rethinking Current L2 Assessment and Teaching Practices’ (*System* 101[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102609](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102609)). Analysing oral interaction tasks in high-stakes English language public examinations and semi-structured focus group interviews conducted with the students, Chan finds that due to assessment task design, students produced discursive patterns that would be ineffective in naturalistic ELF interactions. Chan concludes by giving suggestions to implement an ELF informed pedagogy preparing students for real-life communicative tasks and challenges. Also by Chan is ‘Examining Authenticity from an ELF Perspective: The Development of Listening Test Papers in Hong Kong (1986–2018)’ (*JELF* 10[2021] 141-65), in which he assesses situational authenticity – locally/globally relevant language-use contexts – and interactional authenticity – the speaker’s use of communicative strategies – in the audio samples used in the school-exit public examination. Chan finds that although local accents are included, speech samples are dominated by British and American accents; and whereas explicitness strategies are observed, they are there only to help candidates retrieve key information for the exam. NS ideology still persists in the assessment, which could be alleviated by ELF-aware teacher education and the incorporation of non-NS-specific communication and cooperative strategies. In the European context, David Newbold’s study ‘English Lingua Franca: New Parameters for the Teaching (and Testing) of English Pronunciation?’ (*EL.LE* 10[2021] 393-410) details the revisions that the Common European Framework has gone through since 2001, especially regarding pronunciation and related

concepts such as intelligibility and nativeness. Newbold concludes that the recent revision in 2018 is shown to be more open to the ELF framework and is moving away from native-speakerism. Yet, it still needs modifications to cater for the functions a language, e.g. English, serves, hence how a language should be taught and learnt, and how language users should be assessed.

Turning to teacher education, Alessia Cogo, Fan Fang, Stefania Kordia, Nicos Sifakis, and Sávio Siqueira call for ‘Developing ELF Research for Critical Language Education’ (*AILA Review* 34[2021] 187-211). The authors discuss both discourse-oriented and pedagogic-oriented ELF research and connect it to the perspective of Critical Language Education. Pivotal in the proposed post-normative ELF-aware approach for teacher training is that syllabi and class practices should be devised with reference to critical transformative theory, providing evidence of global speakers’ multilingual, multimodal, and semiotic repertoires in action. Ultimately, the article advocates a decolonizing pattern for teacher education, teaching practice, and language assessment that would bring forth social change. For empirical research, in ‘ELF and Multilingual Justice in English Language Teaching Practices’, Irham, Miftahul Huda, Rina Sari, and Zainur Rofiq present ‘Voices from [four] Indonesian English Lecturers’ (*AEnglishes* [2021] [doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1949779](https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2021.1949779)) about how they may resist, support, or negotiate ELF in ELT practice. Data from semi-structured interviews, course outline, and teaching materials show an ambivalent attitude towards ELF from the lecturers. The authors conclude that linguistic justice should be fostered granting multilingual learners’ further freedom in negotiating their understanding, appreciation, and criticism of Anglo-American linguaculture and literature. Unfortunately, the institutional policy guidelines are still monolingual-centric and do not support the teachers’ existing positive perception of ELF. In ‘English as a Lingua Franca Defined by Pre-Service Teachers: Insights from Theory and Practice’ (*JELF* 10[2021] 235-39), Elif Kemaloglu-Er and Yasemin Bayyurt report on a three-phrase ELF-aware teacher education programme that they implemented in Turkey. The authors describe how participating teachers’ understanding and conceptualization of ELF evolved from before the training, to after the theoretical training, and after the practice-based training. With reference to the transformative learning theory, Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt discuss how the tripartite theory-action-evaluation model helped transform the teachers’ perception of themselves as language users and educators, thus displaying the value of such approach. Also in Turkey and responding to a need for ‘Inspiring Pre-service English Language Teachers to Become ELF-aware’ (*RELCJ* [2021] [doi.org/10.1177/00336882211001966](https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211001966)), Adem Soruç and Carol Griffiths implemented an ELF-awareness-raising elective course and investigated what participating teachers considered qualities of ELF-aware teachers during and after the course. Seven qualities were identified. The findings demonstrate not only the effectiveness of the course, but also the significance of increasing ELF-awareness among pre-service teachers and other stakeholders such as parents and policymakers. Soruç and Griffiths also give recommendations about what to do to further strengthen and continue investigating pre-service teachers ELF-awareness.

As for the use of ELF in higher education, the study ‘Discursive Ripple Effects in Language Policy and Practice: Multilingualism and English as an Academic Lingua Franca in Transnational Higher Education’ (*ARAP* 44[2021] 154-79) reveals tensions and negotiations

between English and other coexisting languages in China's internationalized higher education system. For this critical sociolinguistic ethnography project, Wanyu Amy Ou, Mingyue Michelle Gu, and Francis M. Hult employ nexus analysis with observations, in-depth interviews, and policy documents. Findings show that a policymaking mechanism with stakeholder engagement may foster the implementation of a new language curriculum that can better satisfy students' diverse learning needs.

Continuing with the education context, there are two studies that examine students' attitudes towards English and (an underlying) multilingualism. In 'English as a Lingua Franca in Japan: Multilingual Postgraduate Students' Attitudes Towards English Accents' (*JMMD* [2021] [doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1909053](https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1909053)), Sugene Kim presents the findings of a factor analysis of survey data involving 34 different nationalities. Generally, there is a wish among participants to attain native-like English accents for themselves, thus implying an endorsement of an Anglophone-centric linguistic hierarchy. Yet, in the follow-up interviews, participants displayed relatively indifferent attitudes towards other ELF users' accents. These different attitudes appear to be triggered by pragmatic considerations and context specificities in ELF encounters. In another East Asian country, Jaewon Jane Ra uses ethnographic methods to investigate 'The Perceptions of Translanguaging Through English as a Lingua Franca among International Students in Korean Higher Education' (*JELF* 10[2021] 59-87). Conflicting views were observed. On the one hand, underlying ideologies such as native-speakerism and the use of traditional EFL models in teaching lead to negative attitudes towards translanguaging. On the other hand, participating students also view translanguaging as cosmopolitan, entertaining, and a daily practice of theirs. Ra maintains that the inevitable use of multilingual resources among contemporary international students proves its value for more future research.

The value of researching multilingualism in relation to context, as mentioned in the two articles above, is displayed in 'The Influence of Context on Language Alternation Practices in English as a Lingua Franca' (*JELF* 10[2021] 1-30) by Kaisa S. Pietikäinen. The author highlights that translanguaging in ELF interactions is influenced by a thick network of contextual factors situated on the 'individual', 'interpersonal', 'group', and 'discourse environmental' levels. Adopting a sociopragmatic/interactional approach to context, Pietikäinen contends that the four contextual levels are always dynamic and interwoven with each other; ELF interactants are aware of these contextual factors, which in turn affect the interactants' multilingual practices.

Other elements in spoken ELF communication have also received research interest. To begin with, George O'Neal produces a first ELF study which uses a quantitative method to answer the question 'What Is the Effect of Successive Segmental Repair on the Mutual Intelligibility of ELF users?' (*System* 103[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102683](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102683)). Adopting a quasi-experimental design which required participants to conduct a phonemic discrimination task once a week for three weeks, O'Neal finds that participants in the interaction condition, which allowed them to perform segmental repair, maintain a higher level of mutual intelligibility than the participants in the no-interaction condition. However, successive segmental repair does not lead to a cumulative effect on mutual intelligibility. Moving away from the phonological level to the lexical level, Caroline Collet, Stefan Diemer, and Marie-Louise Brunner examine the use of the discourse marker 'So in Video-

Mediated Communication in the Expanding Circle' (*WEn* 40[2021] 594-610), recorded in the Corpus of Video-Mediated English as a Lingua Franca Conversations (ViMELF).

Quantitatively, *so* is the discourse marker most frequently used, but this does not differ significantly from first-language English data. Qualitatively, there are mainly nine uses of *so*, which associate closely with other paralinguistic and non-verbal features. The authors conclude that this highly flexible use of discourse markers seems to be an important difference between ELF and other World Englishes and warrants more research. Then, in 'Let's say' Ying Wang and Henrik Kaatari explore 'Phraseological Patterns of SAY in [spoken] Academic ELF Communication' (*JEAP* 54[2021]

[doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101046)) recorded in the ELFA corpus. Overall, formulaic sequences with a more literal and transparent meaning are more frequently used than those with idiomatic meaning. Although some expressions are used verbatim, they vary in function and evince ELF-users' creativity in fulfilling their communicative needs of the moment. To further examine formulaicity in academic ELF communication, Wang and Kaatari call for future research to compare data produced by L1- and L2-speakers of English and to consider disciplinary influence on the use of formulaic sequences.

In terms of pragmatics, 'Intercultural Pragmatics in English as a Lingua Franca' by Naoko Taguchi and Shota Yamaguchi (in Zia Tajeddin and Mino Alemi, eds., *Pragmatics Pedagogy in English as an International Language*, pp. 60-76) raise the question how interlocutors with diverse linguacultural backgrounds achieve common ground. Building on a rich review of intercultural pragmatics and ELF literature, the authors present a case study of how two participants created an intercultural bridge with various pragmatic strategies, especially 'smile voice'. Taguchi and Yamaguchi call for more research of discursive pragmatics in a socio-cognitive perspective, specifically addressing whether participants suspend their L1-pragmatic norms in intercultural meetings to support mutual intelligibility. In 'Processing Implicatures in English as a Lingua Franca Communication' (*Lingua* 256[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103067](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103067)), Istvan Kecskes argues that, in ELF contexts, it is not conventionalization, stereotyped expectations, and idiomaticity that determine the production and understanding of implicatures. Instead, ELF users rely on linguistic, conceptual, and encyclopaedic knowledge to co-construct a certain contextual effect. Kecskes proposes the notion 'simplicature' to illustrate this tendency of multilingual speakers to express meaning denotatively in intercultural interactions. He further advances that ELF implicature production should not be assessed according to idiomatized L1 production, for the latter relies on existing norms and conventions that are shared by L1 English speakers but not by ELF speakers. In 'Adjustments as Strategies for Successful Communication' (in *Discovering Intercultural Communication*, pp. 27-45), Hyejeong Kim and Cara Penry Williams propose to use Communication Accommodation Theory as a basis for the analysis of intercultural communication in ELF contexts. Kim and Williams reject viewing communication strategies from the perspective of second language acquisition, according to which non-standard forms are interpreted as deficient. Instead, using data from VOICE, the authors analyse communication strategies along the dimensions of convergence, divergence, and maintenance. Taking a broader perspective, they conclude that combining research in intercultural communication, Communication Accommodation Theory, and ELF, with discourse analysis as a methodological tool, can contribute to a deeper understanding of

the role of language in intercultural interactions; for a discussion of Hyejeong and Williams' textbook as a whole, see section 13 (p. 136).

There are other studies that attend to the use of pragmatic strategies, but in more specific professional contexts. Noriko Ishihara and Malila Carvalho De Almeida Prado investigate 'The Negotiation of Meaning in Aviation English as a Lingua Franca' using 'A Corpus-Informed Discursive Approach' (*MLJ* 105[2021] 639-54). Exploiting data from the Radiotelephony Plain English Corpus (RTPEC), Ishihara and Prado contrast pragmatic strategies adopted in radiotelephony communications between aviators and air traffic controllers to other contexts in extant ELF research. The authors argue that, academically, it is worthwhile to develop Aviation English as a specific ELF research domain; practically, the Aviation industry ought to incorporate an ELF perspective for its language policy and develop a repository of contextualized training activities based on the ELF framework for aviation professionals. In 'Communicative Effectiveness in BELF (English as a Business Lingua Franca) Meetings', Jagdish Kaur and Seval Birlik investigate how business ELF users deploy "'Explaining" as a Pragmatic Strategy' (*MLJ* 105[2021] 623-38) to enhance communicative effectiveness. Observing naturally occurring formal business meetings, Kaur and Birlik find that participants endeavoured to attain clarity and knowledge sharing even when explication was not openly requested. Based on these findings, the authors suggest incorporating ELT and business communication training courses with pragmatic awareness-raising activities and roleplays appropriate to the specific professional contexts. Aiming at providing English students and language instructors with an effective approach to accomplishing communicative competence through the use of 'Global English in the Workplace', Hyeseung Jeong '[Introduces] the Concepts of "Workplace English as a Lingua Franca" (WELF), and "Successful WELF Users"' (in Alastair Henry and Åke Persson, eds., *Engaging with Work in English Studies*, pp. 197-220). According to Jeong, WELF involves deploying skills and multilingual resources in a broader context of language use than BELF; and successful WELF users would attain five qualities, which involve attainment of intelligibility as both speakers and listeners, mastery of field-specific jargons, and strategic use of grammar structures, pragmatic strategies, and multilingual resources to achieve clarity, rapport, and efficiency.

Going beyond the verbal level to non-verbal elements and multimodality, in 'Localized Globalization', Tetyana Sydorenko, Steven L. Thorne, John Hellermann, Amber Sanchez, and Vanessa Howe analyse the use of verbal and non-verbal 'Directives in Augmented Reality Game Interaction' in ELF scenarios (*MLJ* 105[2021] 720-39). They find that, e.g., embodied interactions (involving gestures, facial expressions, and movements), which are essential to directing others in augmented reality games, offer new opportunities for learning pragmatics not found in traditional classrooms. Another finding is that there is a low use of conventionally indirect strategies in the augmented reality game adopted in the study, contrasting with interlanguage pragmatics research. Based on their findings, the authors put forth three implications for teaching pragmatics in ELF contexts. With 'A Case Study' focusing on one conversation in ViMELF, Francisco Javier Fernández Polo conducts the first ELF investigation dedicated to 'Backchannels in Video-Mediated ELF Conversations' (*JELF* 10[2021] 113-40). Polo identifies a number of backchanneling features that appear to be specific to multimodal computer-mediated communication, such as

the frequent combination of verbal and gestural backchannels, smiles, and nods. He also discerns three problematic uses of backchannels that impede understanding and rapport. Given the small scale of the study, Polo calls for more extensive, contrastive, and quantitative research on backchannels in both computer-mediated and face-to-face communication, especially if we keep in mind that video-mediated ELF interaction will only become more typical in post-Covid times. In ‘TED Talks: Multimodal Communicative Affordances for EPS [English Public Speaking]/ELF Dissemination’ (*JELF* 10[2021] 261-84), Soraya García-Sánchez identifies the multimodal communicative techniques most frequently used in the ten most popular TED talks, with an aim to providing pedagogical implications on EPS learning strategies. Her analysis shows that when disseminating knowledge to an ELF-speaking, international audience, speakers need to consider not just how to translate but also how to mediate the information with non-verbal material and body language. Learners’ cultural awareness should thus be incorporated in the EPS curriculum, especially regarding the use of multimodal communicative strategies connecting with the audience. Lastly, unprecedented in ELF research, Lisa Bierbaumer spotlights visual-gestural modality in ‘A Comparison of Spoken and Signed Lingua Franca Communication: The Case of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and International Sign (IS)’ (*JELF* 10[2021]) 183-208). Bierbaumer expounds how traditional linguistic nomenclatures associated with stability are inadequate to describe both IS and ELF. She illustrates how research in IS, beyond ELF research, specifically investigates semiotic repertoires as part of signers’ multilingual-multimodal resources. Finally, Bierbaumer presents how the frameworks of Communities of Practice and Transient International Groups are applicable to both ELF and IS research, and justifies how cross-modal collaboration between ELF and IS will bring mutual benefits to both fields.

his year’s review of the ELF section includes two edited volumes. The first one focuses on *ELF Research Methods and Approaches to Data and Analyses: Theoretical and Methodological Underpinnings*. Edited by Kumiko Murata, the book aims not just to introduce ELF to students and scholars who are fresh in the field, but also to provide ELF researchers with ideas to advance their work by exploring novel angles and methodological approaches. The first chapter ‘ELF Research Methods and Different Approaches to Data and Analyses: Introduction’ (pp. 1-18) is written by the editor. She gives a background to the book specifying three strands of research that dominate the study of ELF – corpus-based methods, conversation analysis, and narrative enquiry; these are also the foci of Parts II, III, and IV of the volume, to be reviewed below.

Part I focuses on the theoretical underpinnings and recent developments in the study of ELF. It begins with ‘Research Perspectives on ELF: Linguistic Usage and Communicative Use’ (pp. 21-8) by Henry Widdowson, who conceptualizes ‘usage’ as focusing on linguistic forms, and ‘use’ as the communicative functions of those forms. Reiterating that applied linguistics research is about investigating real-world problems, Widdowson contends that ELF research should shift from examining the language forms of ELF (‘usage’) to how (forms of) ELF function(s) as a resource by its users to solve problems in language contact situations (‘use’), especially in high-stakes encounters where interlocutors are in significantly asymmetrical relationships. This chapter links seamlessly to the chapter by Barbara Seidlhofer, who maintains that academics ‘Researching ELF Communication’ should ‘Focus on High-Stakes Encounters’ (pp. 29-37) where participant relationships are highly

asymmetrical in power. Seidlhofer first addresses the observation that data from previous empirical ELF research mostly come from rather consensual contexts. She then uses three contexts – asylum-seeking, academic publishing, and assessments of English as a foreign or other language – to exemplify why it is critical for future ELF research to investigate gate-keeping encounters. In the next chapter, Alessia Cogo presents an ethnographic study, illustrating the close relationships between ‘ELF and Translanguaging’ by discussing the ‘Covert and Overt Resources [observed] in a Transnational Workplace’ (pp. 38-54). Aligning with the multilingual turn in applied linguistics, Cogo elaborates through naturally occurring data how essential it is to emphasize ELF as a multilingual, if not translanguaging, practice, especially when the participating ELF-users employed their multilingual resources covertly, rather than in the conventional overt manner as in code-switching.

At the centre-stage of Part II is the use of spoken and written corpora in ELF research. It starts with Anna Mauranen’s chapter ‘Good Texts in Non-Standard English: ELF and Academic Writing’ (pp. 57-80). Making use of the WrELFA (Written English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings) corpus, Mauranen presents her chapter as a demonstration of examining academic texts in ELF from three perspectives: (1) using the macro-social perspective to examine language phenomena taking place in the wider context of research writing, (2) using the micro-social perspective to examine textual effectiveness, for which a professional’s expertise in the conventions of the discipline would be more relevant than their L1 status, and (3) using the individual cognitive perspective to examine morphological and syntactic phenomena observed among ELF-writers, such as what Mauranen describes as approximation and fixing. Then, in ‘Exploring Diachronic Changes in Research Articles from an ELF Perspective: A Small Corpus Study’ (pp. 81-96), Sayako Maswana utilizes a corpus of published research articles in medicine and economics in 1995 and 2015 to investigate how the titles and the introductory sections have evolved across the years. Overall, whereas there are changes, the usage of English is observed to be similar to Standard English. At the same time, Maswana also observes that academics in medicine seem to have been developing their own norms that are not constrained by native speaker norms.

Turning to the spoken medium, in ‘Tracing the Emergence of Situational Multilingual Practices in a BELF Meeting: Diachronic Analysis and Implications of Corpus Design’ (pp. 97-125), Marie-Luise Pitzl uses one BELF meeting in VOICE to introduce what she calls ‘Micro-Diachronic Analysis’. She showcases how this analysis integrates both quantitative and qualitative approaches when examining multilingual practices in an ELF encounter, and especially how it offers visualizations that trace how multilingual practices unfold and are taken up by the interlocutors in the process of a conversation. In the next chapter ‘Asian Corpus of English (ACE): Features and Applications’ (pp. 126-42), Lixun Wang first explains the methodological aspects of ACE, from data collection to archive and transcription. He then introduces how ACE can be freely accessed all over the world, before presenting a comparative study of ACE and VOICE data, illustrating features common to both corpora and features specific to ACE in the Asian context. The comparison also demonstrates how future researchers can make use of ACE to investigate linguistic features of ELF in Asia. Lastly, in ‘Interpersonal Formulaic Sequences in ELF Academic Lectures: Methodological Challenges’ (pp. 143-57), Ying Wang presents an investigation of formulaic sequences associated with four interpersonal functions – ‘modality’, ‘evaluation’,

‘commitment’, ‘engagement’ – across three disciplines – social sciences, natural sciences, and medicine. Through the chapter, Wang demonstrates how a manual approach can alleviate some of the limitations of using a frequency-based approach when studying formulaicity in spoken ELFA.

The theme of Part III of the book is captured in ‘Applying Conversation Analysis to ELF Interaction Data’ (pp. 161-78) by Jagdish Kaur. Kaur first delineates major features and developments of Conversation Analysis in relation to (E)LF data. Against the background of notable empirical studies conducted in various contexts, Kaur affirms how the CA-approach is not just compatible with, but has also contributed significantly to examining, ELF interaction. Kaur concludes that further CA-informed ELF research can only be conducive to the development of the two disciplines. In ‘Analysing Multilingual/Lingua Franca Interactions Using Conversation Analysis: Notes on Transcription and Representability’ (pp. 179-96), Kaisa S. Pietikäinen elucidates how the use of eye dialect is inadequate for transcribing English interactions, especially multilingual ELF interactions. Focusing on enhancing readers’ comprehensibility of the transcripts, Pietikäinen suggests that researchers, instead, adopt a simplified version of the International Phonetic Alphabet consisting of the most common symbols, thus rendering a clear pronunciation of the words that may cause comprehension difficulties or that bear a special meaning in the local context. Alan Thompson then offers a chapter ‘Accounting for Asymmetries in ELF Interactions’ in ‘Three Disparate Asian Settings’ (pp. 197-218). Thompson applies a combination of Conversation Analysis, Systemic Functional Grammar, and a corpus-based, quantitative analysis to assess different language practices that participants in the study deployed to tackle a range of asymmetries in their interactions. These asymmetries show up in participants’ language proficiency, their roles and membership categories in each individual setting, and attitudes towards social expectations and goals. The different language practices pertain to the use of laughter, address practices, and modality markers, as well as the simplification and repetition of ideational content.

Moving on to Part IV which investigates attitudes and identities in ELF interactions through narrative approaches, Masuko Miyahara propounds to use “Place-reflexivity” as an Imaginary Kaleidoscope to Explore Methodological Issues in ELF Research’ (pp. 221-40). Complementing the typical way of practicing reflexivity, which emphasizes the social relationship between researcher and participant(s), Miyahara explicates the significance of being reflexive about the (change of) research sites when interpreting participants’ narratives. Using data from a past study, Miyahara exemplifies the impact of place-reflexivity by illustrating how her analysis was revised after she became reflexive about the notion of place. Then, Yoko Nogami discusses ‘Understanding the ELF Phenomenon Through Narrative Inquiry’ with ‘A [longitudinal] Diary Study on Identities of Japanese ELF users’ (pp. 241-57). Using a single case, Nogami shows that narrative approaches enable researchers to capture participants’ thinking process in a way that interactional approaches cannot achieve. In particular, diary studies allow participants to record nuanced events that the participants might later forget (if data were to be collected through interviews). Finally, for the participants, diary-writing also helps developing mindfulness, which stimulates further identity construction. The volume ends with Tomokazu Ishikawa’s ‘Rigour in ELF Language Attitude Research: An Example of a Conversational Interview Study’ (pp. 258-75) with

Japanese university students. After unpacking what language attitudes are, Ishikawa illustrates how using conversational interviews, together with the speech functions analysis framework, could be conducive to studying language attitudes. In particular, the casual style of the interviews allows participants, in the short course of the interviews, to develop their ELF-awareness and even a change in attitude. This article sheds light not just on data collection methods, but also on language pedagogy.

The second edited volume in this year's review takes a broader perspective: *Language Change: The Impact of English as a Lingua Franca*, edited by Anna Mauranen and Svetlana Vetchinnikova, reconceptualizes the dynamics of language change with reference to both internal and external triggers. Whereas the focus of the book is on English and related contemporary language phenomena, examples from other languages and historical developmental stages have also been purposely included for more comprehensive discussion. In addition, the analyses presented stretch from the individual user's cognitive perspective to a macro-social one, providing a global viewpoint on the investigation of ELF.

The volume is divided into two sections. The first section, which includes six chapters, groups together studies that address possible causes of language progress and change. In the chapter 'Calling Englishes as Complex Dynamic Systems: Diffusion and Restructuring (pp. 15-43), Edgar W. Schneider proposes to view evolution in Englishes not from a reductionist and segmenting perspective but from a processual and holistic perspective involving the theory of Complex Dynamic Systems – a theory that has a background in complexity theory and chaos theory in sciences and mathematics. Attending particularly to two select mechanisms, lexicosemantic diffusion – relating to word-meaning frequencies – and restructuring – relating to conventions of form-meaning mappings, Schneider explicates that evolution in language is incremental, and that the Complex Dynamic Systems theory would be a suitable meta-theory in the analysis of variation and change. Another perspective is presented by William Croft in 'English as a Lingua Franca in the Context of a Sociolinguistic Typology of Contact Languages' (pp. 44-74). The article highlights the prominence of social circumstances in language contact. Croft identifies three types of interaction: (i) esoteric, when interactions occur within a speech community; (ii) exoteric, referring to encounters happening across communities; and (iii) neogenic, when a new societal unit emerges from contact. According to Croft, ELF has emerged as the primary exoteric means of global communication in the key domains of contemporary communication, namely business, pop culture, and science. The next chapter, by Ewa Dąbrowska, concerns 'How Writing Changes Language' (pp. 75-94). Dąbrowska shows that literacy has implications in language change with regard to, for example, register, vocabulary, and morphosyntax. In particular, communicative explicitness is required in written interactions among interlocutors who do not belong to the same speech community. Dąbrowska ends her chapter by calling for future research to further verify which specific language aspects are influenced by writing. Then, Anna Mauranen in 'ELF and Translation as Language Contact' (pp. 95-122) combines the nature of ELF as a second-order contact system with translation. She argues that both of them affect language users' attitudes towards language in multilingual encounters. Moreover, she states that ELF, as a kind of emerging bottom-up interactional system, instigates interactants to apply communicative patterns according to interactional needs rather than language systems norms. For this reason, ELF

should be considered a complex dynamic system whose exploration can cast a light on other kinds of contacts in the global linguistic landscape.

Based on the premise that code fixation is a process that is never complete and definitive, Terttu Nevalainen in 'Present-Day Standard English: Whose Language Was It Anyway?' (pp. 123-51) draws a diachronic time trajectory of the development of Standard English in the UK and compares it with the synchronic variation and syntactic simplification of ELF idiosyncrasies. Combining the micro- and macro-analytical perspectives, the author shows how mobility and permeability between societal strata are especially significant to the adoption or rejection of language forms. Taking a historical sociolinguistic perspective, Nevalainen further shows that, at the micro level of the individual, variation is the norm rather than the exception. Lastly, Janus Mortensen's study 'Beyond Language Change: ELF and the Study of Sociolinguistic Change' (pp. 152-74) focuses on a broadened conceptualization of change, namely sociolinguistic change – which puts equal weight on social change and language change – in relation to the ELF paradigm. Not only does Mortensen explicate how English has changed, but he also shows how ELF communication in international communication has altered social practices. In his concluding remarks on the innovative impact of ELF studies on Applied Linguistics, Mortensen calls for a comprehensive agenda for future ELF research that would involve discursive, social, ideological, and technological change.

The second part of the book, which includes seven chapters, provides evidence on how ELF impacts language change from either a macro-social perspective or a micro-social perspective on interactional encounters. To start with, Mikko Laitinen and Jonas Lundberg provide evidence that multilingual ELF speakers are leading adopters of innovations and agents in diffusion in 'ELF, Language Change, and Social Networks: Evidence from Real-Time Social Media Data' (pp.179-204). Taking the perspective of digital humanities, which combines expertise in computer science and sociolinguistics to analyse online open data, the authors examined over five million tweets geolocated to Sweden from over 110,000 user accounts, and found that those who tweet in languages other than Swedish tend to adopt unconventional forms of communication. Taking another perspective focusing on 'ELF and Language Change at the Individual Level' (pp. 205-33), Svetlana Vetchinnikova and Turo Hiltunen examined the use of *it's* and *it is* in ten native and non-native individual corpora and one communal corpus taken from one blog. They found that cognitive idiosyncrasies are interwoven with macro-social variability of forms. In other terms, personal repertoires of 'chunking' and 'priming' of both native and non-native speakers can have a long-term effect on, and implications for, language change. More clearly, the communal level has to be considered emergent and qualitatively different from standard individual language practices. Therefore, both dimensions are worth investigating.

Further, Peter Siemund and Jessica Terese Mueller answer 'Are Multilinguals the Better Academic ELF Users?' with 'Evidence from a [large-scale] Questionnaire Study Measuring Self-Assessed Proficiencies' (pp. 234-67) of 1795 students and instructors at a German university. The authors find that multilingualism is advantageous to language learning. Specifically for domains related to academic language competence, namely spoken production, reading comprehension, and written production, self-assessed proficiencies of academic ELF users raised with multilingual backgrounds are reported to be much higher

than those of ELF users with monolingual backgrounds. In the next chapter, Veronika Thir concentrates on ‘The Role of Co-Textual and Contextual Cues for Intelligibility in ELF Interactions’ (pp. 267-90). Focusing on the phonological level, findings from Thir’s experiments show that extra-linguistic cues support understanding. In other words, additional communicative resources like the purpose of the interaction and contextual and co-textual cues also trigger meaning-making in diverse multilingual contexts beyond the acoustic signal.

The final three chapters feature the theme of multilingualism. Aiming at ‘Exploring the Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated English as a Lingua Franca Communication’, Rino Bosso examines the application of ‘Multimodal and [covert] Multilingual Practices’ (pp.291-310) by university students in Vienna. Boss finds that, firstly, images are used to support understanding of specific low-frequency lexicon, with the purpose to either pre-empt or fill lexical gaps in intercultural ELF interactions; secondly, emojis are used to enhance clarity and explicitness. Based on his findings, Boss calls for longitudinal research observing the impact of such strategies on processes of language variation and change. The value of longitudinal research can be seen in Aki Siegel’s chapter ‘Development of Shared Multilingual Resources in ELF Dyadic Interaction: A Longitudinal Case Study’ (pp. 311-36). Siegel investigates instances of code-switching in word-search gaps in spoken conversations video recorded over a half-year period, where she observed the participants’ evolving attitudes towards their shared multilingual resources. Although code-switching was flagged and glossed by direct translation in the early stage, it was later no longer highlighted as foreign when participants became acquainted with each other’s first languages. Lastly, Alessia Cogo shows how multilingualism manifests itself differently in formal and informal, but high-stakes, interactions in ‘The Role of Translanguaging in ELF Advice Sessions for Asylum Seekers’ (pp.336-54) at a charity in London. Taking a linguistic ethnographic approach, Cogo finds that, for example, formal interactions are restricted by ideological benchmarks and participants tend to use multilingual resources covertly. In contrast, informal environments allow more flexible, overt application of multilingual practices. Cogo calls for future research exploring language choices and multilingual practices across broader time and space scales to better understand the complexity of ELF interactions and multilingual resources.

The two books and the articles reviewed highlight, first, the functional variability of ELF in diverse interactional contexts; second, how ELF users apply multilingual practices, other verbal strategies, and multimodal resources to cope with their communicative exigencies; and third and ultimately, the theoretical, pedagogical, and practical implications of these applications.

### 13. Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis

This section looks at publications which are representative of larger research trends in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis and largely focuses on monographs, edited volumes, and special issues. In the case of collections where languages other than English are studied, I only make reference to work with a focus on English.

One year into the realities of living with COVID-19, the pragmatics and discourses of the pandemic were studied from a variety of perspectives. The special issue ‘Language and Covid-19’ of the *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, edited by Michaela Mahlberg and Gavin Brookes, contains an introduction by the editors (‘Language and Covid-19: Corpus Linguistics and the Social Reality of the Pandemic’, *IJCL* 26[2021] 441-43), five original research articles, and a short paper. Ken Hyland and Feng (Kevin) Jiang on ‘The Covid Infodemic: Competition and the Hying of Virus Research’ papers (*IJCL* 26[2021] 444-68) are concerned with the ways authors use hyperbolic language to promote their studies in a collection of 200 most highly cited scientific papers. In ‘Stance Nouns in COVID-19 Related Blog Posts: A Contrastive Analysis of Blog Posts Published in The Conversation in Spain and the UK’ (*IJCL* 26[2021] 469-97), Niall Curry and Pascual Pérez-Paredes explore cross-cultural differences in the framing of COVID-19 in online discourse. Marcus Müller, Sabine Bartsch, and Jens O. Zinn present a cross-cultural study on a corpus of British and German newspaper articles in ‘Communicating the Unknown: An Interdisciplinary Annotation Study of Uncertainty in the Coronavirus Pandemic’ (*IJCL* 26[2021] 498-531). Based on the COVID-19 Corpus and the Coronavirus Corpus, Jihua Dong, Louisa Buckingham, and Hao Wu present ‘A Discourse Dynamics Exploration of Attitudinal Responses Towards COVID-19 in Academia and Media’ (*IJCL* 26 [2021] 532-56). Taking a Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies perspective, Mark McGlashan analyses ‘Networked Discourses of Bereavement in Online COVID-19 Memorials’ (*IJCL* 26 [2021] 557-82). In a short paper, Mark Davies offers a description of ‘The Coronavirus Corpus: Design, Construction, and Use’. (*IJCL* 26 [2021] 583-98). The special issue of *Discourse, Context & Media (DCM)*, ‘COVID-19 and the Discursive Practices of Political Leadership’, edited by Camilla Vasquez and Sylvia Jaworska, largely shares this corpus-linguistic perspective on language use during the pandemic. The volume brings together six original research articles on political discourse during the times of the pandemic in New Zealand, South Africa, Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and India. ‘The “Team of 5 Million”: The Joint Construction of Leadership Discourse During the Covid-19 Pandemic in New Zealand’ by Christoph A. Hafner and Tongle Sun (*DCM* 43[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100523](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100523)) examines, from an interactional sociolinguistic perspective, Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern’s press briefing speeches and the subsequent question and answer sessions with the press. Using corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis, Sally Hunt’s contribution ‘COVID and the South African Family: Cyril Ramaphosa, President or Father?’ (*DCM* 44[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100541](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100541)) shows how unity, trust, and compliance are evoked in a collection of Cyril Ramaphosa’s speeches from 2020 . ‘The Wounded Leader: The Illness Narratives of Boris Johnson and Donald Trump’ (*DCM* 41[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100499](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100499)) by Rodney H. Jones examines, at the interface of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics, how the COVID-19 illnesses are exploited by the two

politicians to serve their political agendas. ‘Leading with Stories: Andrew Cuomo, Family Narratives and Authentic Leadership’ (*DCM* 41[2021] [doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100507](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100507)) by Camilla Vásquez analyses story-telling as a resource for positioning and identity construction in the political arena.

A topic that has recently seen a rapid increase in interest is digital discourse. The publications of 2021 not only continue the trend to investigate relatively new arenas of digital discourse. i.e. social media and the interaction with non-human agents, but also revisit longstanding modes of computer-mediated communication (e.g. email correspondence) The monograph *Language, Identity Online and Running* by Nur Kurtoğlu-Hooton presents an in-depth, lucid study of how runners (including the author herself) construct their identities during their interaction in social media groups conceptualized as communities of practice. The book is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 offers a literature review on running, sporting embodiment, social media, and the discourse of runners, as well as laying out the theoretical and methodological framework of the book. Chapters 2 and 3 present the first study, a digital ethnographic analysis of an ultrarunning group on Facebook, analysing the organization and the topics addressed within this community. Chapter 4 to 6 comprise the second study on running blogs on Instagram (*instarunnerblogs*), informed by digital ethnography, existential phenomenology, and embodied research. In chapter 7, then, the author presents an auto-ethnographic account of her own experience as a runner and member of the running community on Instagram. Mimi Li’s *Researching and Teaching Second Language Writing in the Digital Age* represents a well-structured, clearly written monograph which aims to provide ‘an accessible and comprehensive guide for L2 researchers and teachers as they pursue research and pedagogical inquiries on writing in the digital age’ (p. 2). Divided into ten chapters, the book discusses six major areas of research studying L2 text production in computer-mediated discourse: computer-mediated teacher feedback, computer-mediated peer response, digital multimodal composing, computer-mediated collaborative writing, automated writing evaluation, and corpus analysis and corpus-based writing instruction.

The edited volume *Analyzing Digital Discourses: Between Convergence and Controversy*, edited by Marjut Johansson, Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen, and Jan Chovanec, presents a selection of refreshing studies on a highly relevant but not always easy topic. It is organized in terms of three sections and comprises an introduction by the editors (‘Practices of Convergence and Controversy in Digital Discourses’) and twelve original papers on English, Italian, Swedish, and French data. Section 1 ‘Practices of Convergence’ begins with Tuija Virtanen’s contribution ‘Enhancing Social Presence Through Textual Action: Virtual Performatives as a Relatability Strategy’ in English tweets (pp. 27-48). Addie Sayers China’s paper ‘“And on the Seventh day God Created Beyoncé”: Digital Discourse Practices and (Racialized) Gender Ideologies in Twitter, Tumblr, and Pinterest’ offers a multimodal analysis of social networking sites (pp. 49-75). In ‘Talking with a Chatbot: Simulated Understanding of Human–Chatbot Communication?’, Marjut Johansson studies verbal discussions between human users and three different online chatbots (pp. 105-31). In section 2, ‘Practices of Metapragmatic Negotiation’, Sonja Kleinke and Julia Landmann present ‘Cross-Cultural Observations on English and German Wikipedia Entries at the Interface of Convergence and Controversy’ (p. 135-62). Patricia Bou-Franch is concerned with

‘Evaluation, Conflict and Prescriptive Metapragmatic Comments: (Re)constructing Transmedia Stories’, drawing on a self-compiled corpus of newspaper comments by English-speaking internet users (pp. 189-217). Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen’s paper ‘“Stop Arguing”: Interventions as Metapragmatic Acts in Discussion Forum Interaction’ studies data from British (and Finnish) discussion forums (pp. 219-44). In section 3, ‘Practices of Controversy’, Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich study on ‘Getting into the Mob: A Netnographic, Case Study Approach to Online Public Shaming’ examines user comments in response to video posts on Facebook (pp. 247-74). The edited volume *Email Pragmatics and Second Language Learners*, edited by Maria Economidou-Kogetsidis, Milica Savić, and Nicola Halenko, showcases the latest research on a topic which represents a classic in the field of computer mediated communication and never grows old (see also section 11, p. 118). The volume contains an introduction by the editors and nine original papers which – with one exception addressing L2 Greek – focus on L2 English language use. In Part I ‘Email Literacy and Pragmatic Development’, Yuan-shan Chen and Chin-Ting Liu are concerned with ‘Reformulation on Chinese EFL learners’ Email Literacy: A Preliminary Exploration’ (pp. 15–40). Thi Thuy Minh Nguyen and Thi Thanh Thuy Pham study ‘L2 Emails of Complaints: Strategy Use by Low And High Proficiency Learners of English as a Foreign Language’ and with a L1 background in Vietnamese (pp. 41–70). Esther Usó-Juan explores the ‘Long-term Instructional Effects on Learners’ Use of Email Request Modifiers’ in a group of Spanish learners of English (pp. 71–100). In ‘Experts and Novices: Examining Academic Email Requests to Faculty and Developmental Change during Study Abroad’, Nicola Halenko and Lisa Winder compare the language use by Chinese speakers of L2 English and British students (pp. 101–26). Sharing this interest in L2 English language use by Chinese students, Wei Ren and Wenjie Liu study ‘Phatic Communion in Chinese students’ Gratitude Emails in English: Production and Perception’ (pp. 129–50) in the first contribution of Part II ‘Relational Practices in Email Communication’. Maria Economidou-Kogetsidis on ‘The Effect of First Language Pragmatics on Second Language Email Performance’ investigates ‘The Case of Greek students’ Email Requests’ (pp. 151–78). Gila Schauer compares ‘Email Communication in English and in German: A Contrastive Pragmatic Investigation of German University Students’ Emails Sent to University Staff in their Native and Foreign Language’ (pp. 179–202). In ‘“You are the best!”’, Milica Savić and Miodrag Đorđević study ‘Relational Practices in Emails in English at a Norwegian University’.

A longstanding topic in pragmatics and discourse analysis is pragmatic markers and discourse particles across languages and varieties. The monograph *The Rise of Discourse Markers* by Bernd Heine, Gunther Kaltenböck, and Tania Kuteva is a must-read for everybody interested in the topic from a historical perspective. The book introduces a methodological framework informed by functional, usage-based linguistics, arguing that the evolution of discourse markers is due to two types of grammatical change: grammaticalization and cooptation. At the core of the book is in-depth analysis of discourse markers in four languages (English, French, Japanese, and Korean), to each of which a chapter is dedicated. The chapter on ‘Discourse Markers in Language Contact’ shows more general cross-linguistic observations. Another plus is a thorough review of the vast literature on the topic (The list of references is twenty-six pages long.). Divided into five thematic sections, the edited volume *Pragmatic Markers and Peripheries* by Daniël Van Olmen and

Jolanta Šinkūnienė brings together fifteen original papers on a vast variety of well- and little-studied languages (Ainu, Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Norwegian, and Spanish). In Part III ‘Left Versus Right Periphery’, Daniël Van Olmen presents a case study on *see*, *you see*, and *do you see* in ‘Second Person Parentheticals of Unintentional Visual Perception in British English’ (pp. 251–76). Part IV has a focus on ‘Peripheries Across Time’. Yinchun Bai analyses the English discourse marker *speaking of X* in ‘Functional Asymmetry and Left-to-Right Movement: Speaking of Peripheries’ (pp. 303–26). Daniela Kolbe-Hanna and Natalia Filatkina discuss ‘The Diachronic Origin of English *I Mean* and German *Ich meine*’ in light of processes of constructionalization (pp. 327–50). In another diachronic contribution, Diana M. Lewis studies ‘Pragmatic Markers at the Periphery and Discourse Prominence: The Case of English *of course*’ (pp. 351–82). In Part V ‘Peripheries Across Languages’, Kaja Borthen and Elena Karagjosova investigate ‘The Norwegian tag *da* in comparison to English *then*’ (pp. 385–414). In the final paper in the volume, Anna Ruskan and Marta Carretero take ‘A Cross-Linguistic Look at the Right Periphery’ in their study of ‘Utterance-Final Pragmatic Markers in English, Spanish and Lithuanian’ (pp. 415–48). The special issue of *Corpus Pragmatics*, ‘Methodological Approaches to Studying Discourse Particles in L2’, edited by Margarita Borreguero Zuloaga, Kathrin Siebold, and Britta Thörle, contains contributions – published between 2019 and 2021 – on English as a foreign language, L2 French, L2 Italian, and L1 and L2 Spanish. The introductory paper by the editors highlights ‘Methodological Approaches to Studying Discourse Particles in L2’ (*CorpPrag* 5[2021] 1-5). Based on an analysis of the Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage, Christoph Wolk, Sandra Götz, and Katja Jäschke investigate the ‘Possibilities and Drawbacks of Using an Online Application for Semi-automatic Corpus Analysis to Investigate Discourse Markers and Alternative Fluency Variables’ (*CorpPrag* 5[2021] 7-36).

The study on language in social interaction witnesses the development of a new promising research strand which investigates the evolution of linguistic and interactional practices over time. The special issue ‘Longitudinal CA: How interactional practices change over time’ of the journal *Research on Language and Social Interaction (ROLSI)*, edited by Arnulf Deppermann and Simona Pekarek Doehler, comprises an introduction and five original research papers on spoken German, English, and L2 French and English. According to the editors, Longitudinal Conversation Analysis takes ‘an interest in change both on an individual and on a societal level’ (p. 127). Simona Pekarek Doehler and Ufuk Balaman in ‘The Routinization of Grammar as a Social Action Format: A Longitudinal Study of Video-Mediated Interactions’ (*ROLSI* 54[2021] 183-202) investigate the linguistic evolution of the social action format *let me (check)* by an individual L2 speaker of English over four years. The paper ‘How Shared Meanings and Uses Emerge Over an Interactional History: Wabi Sabi in a Series of Theater Rehearsals’ by Arnulf Deppermann and Axel Schmidt (*ROLSI* 54[2021] 203-24) examines how common ground over the meaning of *wabi sabi* is created during twenty days of theater rehearsals conducted in German and English. In ‘Conversation Analysis and the Study of Sociohistorical Change’ (*ROLSI* 54[2021] 225-40), Steven E. Clayman and John Heritage offer a critical discussion of methodological issues involved in the historical analysis of spoken interaction in the institutions, exemplifying their case with data taken from presidential press conferences at the U.S. American White House and

broadcast news interviews. The monograph *Quoting in Parliamentary Question Time: Exploring Recent Change* by Elisabeth Reber studies the evolution of reported speech indexed by the quotative marker *say* in the question-answer sequences during British Prime Minister's Questions. Drawing on two sets of authentic recordings from between 1978 and 1988 as well as from 2003 to 2013, the book demonstrates changes in the forms and functions of the reporting clause and the reported clause, i.e. the quotation, as well as in the rhetorical structures and courses of action for which reported speech is shown to be constitutive. These findings are interpreted in terms of usage-based grammar theories and evidentiality, and against the backdrop of changes in the participation framework of the House of Commons and the transformation of Prime Minister's Questions from a radio broadcast to a televised/online news event. Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen on 'Language Over Time: Some Old and New Uses of OKAY in American English' (*IL* 1[2021] 33-63) analyses American everyday interaction, showing that *okay* undergoes functional change in between the 1960s and the 1990s/2000s.

Kim, Hyejeong and Cara P. Williams' textbook *Discovering Intercultural Communication: From Language Users to Language Use* takes a fresh look at the intercultural experience from the perspective of international English-as-a-lingua franca communication. In the first three of the seven chapters, the authors define the notion of ELF and introduce Communication Accommodation Theory as a theoretical framework before discussing the basic notions and concepts relevant to intercultural communication. In the remainder of the book, the notion of community of practice is used to provide an understanding of so-called 'writing cultures', 'speaking and embodying cultures', 'learning and goals in education', and 'communication in the workplace' (see also section 12, pp. 125). The monograph constitutes a powerful teaching resource, containing short overviews of each chapter, multiple figures and tables, as well as activities and references for further reading. The special issue 'Conversation Analytic Insights from English as a Lingua Franca', edited by Kaisa S. Pietikäinen presents five original papers from a little-studied strand which combines longstanding analytic interests of Conversation Analysis with the study of ELF. Although the original papers were all published in 2020, the special issue appeared in its entirety 2021. I therefore include it in this year's review. Following the introduction, Jagdish Kaur investigates 'Other-Correction in Next Position: The Case of Lexical Replacement in ELF Interactions in An Academic Setting' between a Thai tutor and three Japanese tutees (*JPrag* 169[2020] 1-12). Examining the same setting, Daisuke Kimura studies 'Enacting and Expanding Multilingual Repertoires in a Peer Language Tutorial: Routinized Sequences as a Vehicle for Learning' (*JPrag* 169[2020] 13-25). Kaisa S. Pietikäinen's contribution 'On Second Language/Nonnative Speakerism in Conversation Analysis' argues for 'A Study of Emic Orientations to Language in Multilingual/Lingua Franca Couple Interactions' (*JPrag* 169[2020] 136-50). Similarly, Mayu Konakahara analyses mundane talk in 'Single Case Analyses of Two Overlap Sequences in Casual ELF Conversations from a Multimodal Perspective: Toward the Consideration of Mutual Benefits of ELF and CA' (*JPrag* 170[2020] 301-16). Yumi Matsumoto and Suresh Canagarajah study 'The Use of Gesture, Gesture Hold, and Gaze in Trouble-in-Talk among Multilingual Interlocutors in an English as a Lingua Franca Context', drawing on video recordings of a dinner table conversation at an international graduate student dormitory in the United States. (*JPrag* 169[2020] 245-67).

To conclude, 2021 has shown that research in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis has continued the trend of interdisciplinary approaches and is going strong as ever.