

I

English Language

VIKTORIJA KOSTADINOVA, MARCO WIEMANN,
GEA DRESCHLER, SUNE GREGERSEN, BEÁTA GYURIS,
AI ZHONG, LIESELOTTE ANDERWALD, BEKE HANSEN,
SVEN LEUCKERT, TIHANA KRAŠ, SHAWNEA SUM POK TING,
IDA PARISE, ALESSIA COGO, ELISABETH REBER

This chapter has the following sections: 1. General; 2. History of English Linguistics; 3. Phonetics and Phonology; 4. Morphology; 5. Syntax; 6. Semantics; 7. Lexicography, Lexicology, and Lexical Semantics; 8. Onomastics (not present this year); 9. Dialectology and Sociolinguistics; 10. New Englishes and Creolistics; 11. Second Language Acquisition; 12. English as a Lingua Franca; 13. Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis; 14. Stylistics (not present this year). Sections 1 and 2 are by Viktorija Kostadinova; section 3 is by Marco Wiemann; sections 4 and 5 are by Gea Dreschler and Sune Gregersen; section 6 is by Beáta Gyuris; section 7 is by Ai Zhong; section 9 is by Lieselotte Anderwald; section 10 is by Beke Hansen and Sven Leuckert; section 11 is by Tihana Kraš; section 12 is by Shawnea Sum Pok Ting, Ida Parise and Alessia Cogo; section 13 is by Elisabeth Reber.

1. General

This section covering works in English linguistics of general interest begins with the impressive *Oxford Handbook of English Grammar*, edited by Baas Aarts, Jill Bowie, and Gergana Popova. The handbook consists of thirty-one chapters on a range of areas and topics related to grammatical description in English, written by established scholars, organized into five parts. The first part deals with ‘Grammar Writing and Methodology’, covering topics such as the history of grammar writing, syntactic argumentation, the use of data in grammar, and the place of corpus methodology in grammatical description. Part II features chapters documenting ‘Approaches to English Grammar’, including cognitive linguistic, constructional, generative, and functional approaches, as well as descriptive

approaches. In Part III, ten chapters cover a range of ‘Subdomains of Grammar’, while Part IV includes four chapters in ‘Grammar and Other Fields of Enquiry’. Finally, Part V offers chapters on ‘Grammatical Variation and Change’. The handbook covers many specific areas of grammatical analysis. While the focus in the majority of these is syntax, and, to an extent, morphology, the handbook as a whole is of interest to scholars of the English language in general in that it provides an overview of relevant aspects of grammatical analysis and description, as well as going beyond these and into the area of the study of grammar, and of grammatical variation and change. While the detailed coverage of all these chapters is beyond the scope of this section, I specifically mention two chapters with a more general-interest orientation. These are found in the first part of the handbook, under the topic of ‘Grammar Writing and Methodology’. The first of these is ‘Grammar and the Use of Data’ (pp. 40–58) by Jon Sprouse and Carson T. Schütze. The authors start by pointing out the advantages and limitations of using corpus data in the study of grammaticality but devote their chapter on a discussion of other sources of data in grammatical analysis: acceptability judgements, reading time measures, electro-physiology data, and functional magnetic resonance imaging. For each of these, the chapter covers the basics of data collection and how this data is used in developing grammatical theories. Another chapter of general interest is ‘Grammar and Corpus Methodology’ (pp. 59–83) by Sean Wallis, in which the author provides an overview of the state-of-the-art uses of corpus data in grammatical studies. Points addressed include the nature of the evidence afforded by natural language corpora, the two main approaches to corpus linguistic research referred to as ‘corpus-driven’ and ‘theory-driven linguistics’ as well as how to go beyond this dichotomy, and practices in the use of corpora for the study of grammar. The final section addresses the approach of experimental corpus linguistics, outlining the steps involved in this specific method of using corpus data.

Another handbook relevant for the area of English studies published in 2020 is *The Routledge Handbook of English Language and Digital Humanities*, edited by Svenja Adolphs and Dawn Knight. The topics covered in the thirty chapters included in the handbook illustrate the richly diverse and multi-disciplinary character of the developing field of digital humanities, and the importance of English-language studies in this context. Though the handbook is not explicitly organized into separate sub-themes, a look at the individual chapters reveals specific thematic areas around which contributions are organized. As the editors explain in the introductory chapter, the first group of chapters discusses digital sources and data used in digital humanities research on the English language, covering both corpus data and multi-modal sources, including speech and gestures, as well as text and image. Another group of chapters is concerned with a number of core areas of linguistic analysis in terms of approaches to linguistic analysis, such as metaphor, grammar, and lexis, as well as to linguistic research subfields, such as discourse analysis, conversation analysis, historical linguistics, forensic linguistics, etc. The third group of chapters addresses issues of relevance to the field of digital humanities more generally, but each of these chapters also focuses on the importance of the English language in this context. Illustrative examples of issues discussed include the relationship between English language and philosophy, English literature, digital health humanities, and digital cultural

heritage. The strength of the volume is the multiplicity of perspectives provided to the interdisciplinary study of digital humanities contexts, as well as the wide-ranging discussion of English-language studies in these contexts.

In the area of introductory textbooks, there is *Historical Linguistics: A Cognitive Grammar Introduction*, by Margaret E. Winters. This book is a welcome contribution to the list of introductory texts in linguistics in that it provides a state-of-the-art entry into the study of language change from a cognitive linguistic point of view. In chapter 1, Winters starts out by distinguishing properties of language that do not change from aspects of language that do, and introduces the basic premises and assumptions of the Cognitive Grammar framework. Chapter 2 introduces the study of language change from the perspective of establishing connections between languages in terms of genetic relationships, as well as language contact. The author describes the two widely used models of genetic relationships between languages, i.e. the tree model and the wave model. In the area of language contact, the chapter explains different types of stratal influence, as well as the creation of pidgins and creoles. Lexical change is introduced in chapter 3, covering both changes to the lexicon through coinage and lexical loss as well as changes in the meaning of lexical items. In the second part of this chapter, the author first discusses fundamental notions related to the nature of meaning, such as prototypicality, followed by an overview of semantic change processes, such as generalization, narrowing, pejoration and shift, as well as metaphor and metonymy. Chapters 4 and 5 deal with phonetic and phonological change, respectively. After introducing briefly the scope of phonetics, chapter 4 explains unconditioned changes, distinguishing between simple changes and chain shifts, and conditioned changes, including syncope, assimilation, dissimilation, metathesis, lengthening and diphthongization, and monophthongization and reduction, ending with a brief consideration of the social conditioning of phonetic change. On the topic of phonological change, chapter 5 introduces mergers and splits as processes of phonemic change, and it also looks at changes such as recategorization. Chapter 6 is on morphological change, following the usual approach of first introducing fundamental notions in morphological description and then describing changes relevant to morphology, such as grammaticalization, analogy, and paradigmatic changes. Syntactic change follows next, through an introduction and exemplification of word-order changes, iconicity, reanalysis, and grammaticalization. The chapter also rounds off the description of changes at the different levels of linguistic structure. The last three chapters of the textbook discuss aspects of language change, such as actuation and spread (chapter 8), as well as key notions and issues in the study of language change, such as methodological concerns (chapter 9) and making generalizations and predictions on the basis of commonalities between the different types of changes described in the textbook. In this way, Winters brings the topics of the separate chapters together, providing more than a simple summary of the material and consolidating it with a view towards explanations of language change in general. The textbook thus manages to provide a solid introduction to the study of language change from a cognitive perspective in a manner that is suitable for beginners but not at the cost of a detailed and nuanced description and analysis. Beyond its usefulness as an introductory text, the textbook can also be beneficial to scholars

looking for an informed introduction to the study of language change from a cognitive linguistic perspective.

A final title covered in this section is *You Talkin' to Me? The Unruly History of New York English* by E.J. White, an account of the rich linguistic history and diversity of New York English aimed at a general audience. The book is a fine example of popular scientific writing in sociolinguistics, seamlessly incorporating scholarly research findings into an energetic and enlightening narrative about the language of the New York speech community. The book starts out with a brief sketch of the characteristics of New York English, discussing linguistic, pragmatic, and non-verbal aspects of the interactional norms characterizing the variety. White then moves to the development of New York English from a historical perspective, discussing non-rhoticity, New York English, and other varieties of American English, as well as the different types of attitudes associated with what is perceived as the New York accent. The next chapter, 'On and Off the Map', continues the story with an interesting and entertaining discussion of history from another perspective, that of the origins of New York place names. In the following three chapters, the author discusses the New York language variety associated with aspects of life in the speech community, such as cultural activities or the structure of the population. The book ends with a chapter on the use of language in department stores, building on Labov's research in the 1960s, as well as on more recent research. Readers familiar with the sociolinguistic scholarly literature will encounter evidence of a solid grounding in research throughout the book, yet this is never foregrounded or dry—rather, the discussion and explanation of aspects of New York English remains dynamic and interactive. The book provides not only a pleasurable read for the general reader and the sociolinguist alike, but also a wealth of information about aspects of New York English that can be used as a resource in linguistic and sociolinguistic classes (see also Section 9).

2. History of English Linguistics

A major ground-breaking publication in the area of the history of linguistics in 2020 is *Women in the History of Linguistics*, edited by Wendy Ayres-Bennett and Helena Sanson. The volume contains nineteen chapters, each covering the contribution of women in a specific area of linguistic scholarship and in specific languages, and, as the editors explain in the introductory chapter, 'throughout the centuries and across different linguistic and cultural traditions, both European and non-European' (p. 1). Here I focus on one chapter in the volume specifically, discussing the contribution of women to English linguistics in the British context. Carol Percy's chapter 'British Women's Roles in the Standardization and Study of English' (pp. 279–303) traces the role of women in the history and historiography of English from the medieval period to the present day. The chapter first looks at the role of elite women as an important factor in encouraging linguistic work by males, citing two examples in which translation of poetry into English was inspired by and done for specific women. Despite these cases of women influencing linguistic activity in English, Percy also notes that some elite women

at the time engaged in translation into French, as well as promoting the study of Latin; these translations by women can be understood in the context of the socio-linguistic prestige of French. The earliest translations of a French text into English by women can be dated back to the fifteenth century, and this period also saw the emergence of access to education for elite women, with Mary Tudor being the first royal woman to receive instruction in Latin. The chapter next covers the conditions for learning in the early modern period, when, amid the growth of early modern vernaculars, some women could engage in writing and publishing with a husband's support. The author notes two women who wrote and published in the area of philosophy: Margaret Cavendish, the Duchess of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (1623?–73) and Viscountess Anne Conway (1631–79). Finally, the section discusses in rich detail the role of women in education in the eighteenth century. In the next section, Percy turns to the role of women in '[t]eaching and codifying proper English in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries' (p. 284), focusing on the role of women in spreading literacy. Drawing on the work of four women in this area—Jane Johnson (1706–59), the poet and educator Anna Laetitia Barbauld (1743–1825) and her successor Honora Edgeworth (1751–80), and Lady Ellenor Fenn (1744–1813)—all of whom produced important texts for the development and spread of literacy, texts which show these women's applied linguistic understanding and knowledge. The chapter next discusses the role of women in the context of the expansion of normative grammars in the eighteenth century, citing, for example, the case of Ann Fisher as an influential figure in the codification process and the formation of Standard language ideology. This section also covers women's activities and contributions in the area of writing conduct books and lexicographic works intended for use in domestic context in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The next section discusses women philologists in the nineteenth century, as well as the development of work in dialect literature and lexicography. The chapter rounds off this rich historical account with a look at female professional historical linguists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and their place in the development of phonetics and phonology at various universities. The chapter thus provides a broad yet detailed account of the variety of ways in which women contributed to the history of linguistics and English language study.

Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade's *Describing Prescriptivism* presents a systematic investigation of *Usage Guides and Usage Problems in British and American English*, from the eighteenth century to the present day. The introductory chapter defines usage guides and usage problems, and contextualizes these guides within the framework of studying prescriptivism and standardization processes. The following chapter traces the origins of the usage-guide tradition in eighteenth-century Britain, and the separate, though related, development of the American usage-guide tradition in the course of the nineteenth century. The chapter looks at how usage guides developed as an alternative to a language academy, providing authority on linguistic matters to the general public, and it considers the influence of the eighteenth-century normative grammar tradition. It further discusses the rise of prescriptivism at the time in Britain, continuing with a rich analysis of the origins of the tradition on the other side of the Atlantic through a discussion of examples of the earliest American usage guides, their content, and their intended audience. Chapter 3 then moves to a further definition of the

usage-guide genre, through describing the typical linguistic features treated in usage guides, the distinction between usage guides and style manuals. Next, Tiekens-Boon van Ostade offers a detailed analysis of the intended readership of usage guides on the basis of explicit references to their intended audience, showing that usage-guide writers wrote their books for anyone in need of advice on questions of linguistic correctness, and not just for educated laypeople. The remainder of the chapter introduces in detail the Hyper Usage Guide of English (HUGE) database, created in 2014 in the context of the research project Bridging the Unbridgeable: Linguists, Prescriptivists and the General Public, directed by Tiekens-Boon van Ostade at Leiden University. Points addressed include the process of selecting usage guides for inclusion in the database, a detailed description of the titles included, as well as the usage guides selected. Chapter 4 then moves on to a detailed exploration of the typical usage-guide writers and publishers in terms of age and profession, and the usage-guide writers' credentials. Another important dimension covered in this chapter is the analysis of the motivations for publishing a usage guide, the most commonly identified being publishing opportunity, professional linguistic interest, or interest in language. Another item dealt with in this chapter is the factors included in usage-guide writers' criteria for selecting usage problems, focusing on the approach of crowd-sourcing people's linguistic pet peeves, or eliciting attitudes to problematic usage features from speakers of the language. What follows is an analysis of specific usage problems: *could of*, *likely*, the placement of *only*, flat adverbs, and *try and*. The approach taken to the analysis of these usage problems exemplifies the general approach taken to describing prescriptivism, which typifies Tiekens-Boon van Ostade's own approach, i.e. a three-pronged approach incorporating evidence from usage guides, natural language corpora, and speakers' attitudes. Chapter 6 delves into the language used to describe linguistic pet peeves, providing a multitude of perspectives on the matter. The analysis is first contextualized in the more general approaches usage-guide writers may take to presenting their judgements (i.e. the *ipse dixit*, the panel-study and the corpus-data approach), which is followed by a detailed look into the metalinguistic expressions used in usage guides, again on the basis of a sample of usage-guide entries from the HUGE database. This detailed view is supplemented with an analysis of metalinguistic expressions used by speakers in attitude surveys, as well as metalinguistic expressions used by panellists. The author concludes this analysis with the observation that the metalanguage of usage guides suggests a continuous tradition of use, though certain differences also arise in relation to the changing social, political, or cultural context. In the next chapter, the discussion turns towards the place of prescriptive commentary in popular culture, covering a range of contexts in which prescriptive issues come to the fore, such as on popular television and the internet, as well as in novels and in letters to the editor. The final chapter brings together all these findings with a view towards the future developments in prescriptivism and the usage-guide tradition, concluding that despite changes and variation, the need for such publications will likely remain. In all, the study represents a rich and encompassing analysis of prescriptivism, both historically and in the present-day context, and supplies this area of study with much valuable new empirical data about the development of the usage guide genre.

The next important contribution to the history of English linguistics is Margaret Thomas's chapter in the *Oxford Handbook of English Grammar*, edited by Baas Aarts, Jill Bowie and Gergana Popova. The chapter, titled 'Conceptualisations of Grammar in the History of English Grammaticology' (pp. 3–20), investigates the principles of English grammar-writing through the focus on a set of five grammarians: Lindley Murray (1745–1826), Henry Sweet (1845–1912), Otto Jespersen (1860–1943), Randolph Quirk (1920–2017), and Noam Chomsky (b. 1928). The main focus of the chapter is on exploring variations across history in how grammarians conceive of the kind of data that is relevant to English grammar-writing; the author does so by comparing the grammarians' treatment of the 'double negative', as well as by providing a descriptive analysis of the grammars consulted, thus giving a richer context for the discussion of the double negatives. As for the first grammarian discussed, Lindley Murray, the author observes that the data used by Murray were mainly self-constructed examples of 'false grammar', many of which did not appear to be frequent usage patterns, concluding that Murray's conceptualization of relevant data for grammatical description was removed from patterns of actual use. Henry Sweet, on the other hand, is shown to have supplied his grammatical description with scientific observations and 'cogent examples from everyday speech' (p. 9). Unlike Murray, who treated double negatives as not being part of the grammar of English, Sweet contextualizes double negatives in the historical development of the construction, also describing their suppression from ModE. There is also similarity between the two grammarians, however, in that they both use constructed examples. Otto Jespersen's approach to grammatical analysis is discussed next. His treatment of double negation is representative of his approach to grammar, which consists of not only studying the development of a language's grammar and its usage by speakers in different contexts, but also what that study reveals about human language in general. The next section provides an overview of Randolph Quirk's activities and his contribution to the advancement of English grammar. Specifically focusing on the *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* [1985], written by Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik, the author observes that this grammar marks a turn in the approach to grammar, which she describes as 'assiduously descriptive' (p. 15), departing from previous approaches in that it draws on actual spontaneous speech as a source of data. Finally, Noam Chomsky's approach to grammar is considered. The author first discusses the main assumptions underlying Generative Grammar and the conceptualization that what counts as data is not observable linguistic behaviour or patterns of usage, but experimental data and introspection. In the discussion specifically of the treatment of double negatives, the author draws on Zeijlstra's [2004] generative description of this phenomenon, arguing that, even though Zeijlstra uses examples derived from a corpus in conjunction with self-constructed examples, the grammatical description of the construction centres on the identification of abstract relationships and features. The chapter thus provides a general overview in terms of the shifting conceptualizations of data in grammar-writing through the selection of a small number of representative grammarians. Though necessarily limited in scope, it gives a useful snapshot of the shift from the normative, or prescriptive, to the descriptive approach to grammar-writing.

Examining the more recent history of the prescriptive approach to English grammar and usage is the volume edited by Don Chapman and Jacob D. Rawlins, *Language Prescription: Values, Ideologies and Identity*. The studies featured in this collection deal with language prescription in a range of contexts, perspectives, and languages. I will limit my discussion here to chapters on English. The volume is divided into four parts, the first of which consists of two contributions on English (and one on Hobogon) exploring the descriptive-prescriptive binary in English. First, John E. Joseph (in 'Is/Ought: Hume's Guillotine, Linguistics and Standards of Language', pp. 15–31) discusses this binary, starting with a short but important characterization of the importance of descriptivism to the identity of being a linguist, and then proceeding to 'offer six propositions as to why tempering our anti-prescriptive reflexes would be beneficial to us in resolving various paradoxes into which those reflexes have drawn us' (p. 18). The first proposition is that even a descriptive account contains a dose of evaluation; for example, a descriptive term like 'pied-piping' implies an evaluative judgement about where the preposition really belongs. The second is that pure descriptivism is not possible since even in a descriptive approach to language one must inevitably select the source of evidence; additionally, in describing how language *is* in one context, implies some sort of value that language *ought to be* that way. The third proposition is that prescriptivism is manifested in the use of a statement or an observation about language; in other words, Joseph argues that even descriptive statements can sometimes be used for prescriptive purposes. Fourth, Joseph proposes that the anti-prescriptive stance views language as detached from its users. The fifth proposition is that anti-prescriptivism often fails to engage with the variability of languages in their social contexts. Finally, Joseph argues that anti-prescriptivism goes against linguists' work and against intervention on endangered languages or racial equality. He ends with a call for embracing hybridity. In the fourth chapter of the volume, 'Are You a Descriptivist or a Prescriptivist? The Meaning of the Term Descriptivism and the Values of Those Who Use It' (pp. 46–71), Don Chapman revisits and questions the prescriptive-descriptive binary by investigating the meaning and use of the term 'descriptivism', showing that it is used with more meanings and implications than the simple binary suggests. Through a careful analysis of the activities, goals, and ideology of 'describing' in linguistics, Chapman shows that 'descriptivism' tends to be used to describe both a more extreme and a more mild position of descriptivism, and that this polysemy deserves to be recognized in order to be understood and used more effectively.

The second part of the volume, called 'Prescriptivism vs Linguistics: An Unnecessary Binary', contains four contributions, two of which directly cover prescriptivism in relation to the study of English. Lieselotte Anderwald considers 'The Linguistic Value of Investigating Historical Prescriptivism' (pp. 73–94) through a detailed analysis of nineteenth-century American normative grammars. She illustrates the value of studying historical prescriptivism for illuminating historical sociolinguistic processes such as language change, enregisterment, and stigmatization. In the other relevant chapter in this part, Viktorija Kostadinova presents 'Examining the Split Infinitive: Prescriptivism as a Constraint in Language Variation and Change' (pp. 95–120), showing how the examination of the influence of prescriptive ideology on language use is complicated both by

language variation and change factors, as well as by variation and change in prescriptive ideologies. Based on analyses of precept and corpus data, the study shows that prescriptivism as a factor does not operate in isolation of other language-use factors, and that, often, under the influence of usage, prescriptive ideologies change as well.

The three chapters on English-language prescriptivism included in the fourth part of the volume cover ‘Responding to Correctness: Personal Values and Identity’. In ‘“Good Guys” vs “Bad Guys”: Constructing Linguistic Identities on the Basis of Usage Problems’ (pp. 173–93), Carmen Ebner presents the result of a study of attitudes by the general public to the use of two usage problems, *to burglarize* vs *to burgle* and multiple negation, specifically focusing on how BrE respondents of the survey perceive speakers who use these expressions, and how this relates to linguistic identities. Next, Alyssa A. Severin and Kate Burridge discuss ‘What Do “Little Aussie Sticklers” Value Most?’ (pp. 194–211), exploring a dataset consisting of 880 pieces of ‘personal letters, emails and general feedback received during Burridge’s more than twenty years’ involvement with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation’s (ABC) radio and television’ (p. 194). They find that some linguistic areas tend to be more salient as subjects of prescriptive commentary; pronunciation and orthography are most commonly complained about, followed by morphosyntax, with semantics and lexis coming last. They end with an important discussion of the need for a more constructive dialogue between linguists and language users. The last two chapters included in this part of the volume cover prescriptivism in relation to religious beliefs, one of which focuses specifically on English. Nola Stephens-Hecker discusses ‘Grammar Next to Godliness: Prescriptivism and the Tower of Babel’ (pp. 212–30), exploring the question of ‘whether Christian interpretations of the Tower of Babel narrative found in Genesis 11 might influence Christians’ attitudes towards prescriptive grammar rules’ (p. 213). She first presents two interpretations of the Tower of Babel narrative, one aligning with the position for linguistic uniformity and the other with linguistic diversity. Testing how these two interpretations of the Tower of Babel narrative may relate to individual Christians’ language attitudes, Stephens-Hecker analyses data collected from a survey with 125 Christian respondents, looking at how each respondent’s interpretation of the narrative relates to their attitudes to language, and finds that the survey participants who aligned with the interpretation that the diversification of languages is a curse also appeared to have a stricter view of grammar rules.

In the fourth and final part of the volume, there are three chapters on the theme of ‘Judging Correctness: Practitioner Values and Variation’. In the first of these, Giuliana Russo discusses ‘Fowler’s Values: Ideology and *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (1926)’ (pp. 251–63), focusing specifically on Fowler’s treatment of idiomatic expression and the values he assigned to this category. The author concludes that though Fowler valued idiomatic expression positively, he could not escape associating his descriptions of what is idiomatic with specific ideological assumptions, which in turn reflected his background as a speaker. Next, Linda Pillière looks at ‘US Copy Editors, Style Guides and Usage Guides and Their Impact on British Novels’ (pp. 264–91), exploring the practices of copy editors in the process of the publication of novels, specifically in the context of British ones published in the USA. Pillière starts by discussing the

treatment of the four linguistic features she focuses on: pronoun case after comparative *than*, the use of *one another* and *each other*, the passive voice, and existential *there*, and then moves on to a discussion of the results of a survey of copy-editing practices conducted with British and American copy editors. The survey questionnaire was aimed at investigating the differences between these two groups, and the extent to which their practices align with style and usage guides. The results showed variation in responses with a general tendency for British copy editors to be 'less categorical and more cautious', while US copy editors are more frequently prescriptive and seem to be influenced by style and usage-guide pronouncements. The results also show that, in general, editorial changes to British novels cannot be explained by one factor straightforwardly. Finally, Jonathon Owen discusses 'Practicing Prescriptivism: How Copy Editors Treat Prescriptive Rules' (pp. 292–306) on the basis of an analysis of a corpus of twenty-two edited manuscripts obtained from the Faculty Editing Services at Brigham Young University. These were first edited by students, followed by professional editors, and subsequently a number of the manuscripts were also edited by volunteer editors, whom the author recruited for this purpose. What follows is a rich and careful analysis of editing changes, which enables the author to provide an overview of linguistic features that are edited, the frequency with which they are edited, as well as a comparison between student editors and volunteers. The high level of detail provided in the analysis comes with a difficulty of establishing clear patterns. As Owens observes, 'the changes are essentially a grab-bag of orthography, usage and grammar' (p. 301). However, certain general tendencies are observable with respect to specific features (e.g. *impact*, *only*, *that* vs *which*). This leads Owens to conclude that though editors play a standardizing role, their practices are much more heterogeneous and perhaps difficult to describe in terms of straightforwardly prescriptive terms. Overall, this volume contributes to the ongoing study of English prescriptivism with a range of new insights and evidence, pushing the conceptual and methodological boundaries of studying prescriptivism, as well as providing up-to-date perspectives on the importance of prescriptive attitudes and their role in public debates about language.

3. Phonetics and Phonology

In the present section on phonetics and phonology, I would like to start with two introductory works, namely the third edition of Philip Carr's *English Phonetics and Phonology: An Introduction* and the second edition of April McMahon's *An Introduction to English Phonology*. As for the former, its previous edition has definitely proven useful for phonetics and phonology courses at an undergraduate level. A third edition was therefore eagerly awaited. As concerns the contents of this introductory book, Carr essentially covers English phonetics (chapters 1–4), segmental phonology (chapters 5–6), suprasegmental phonology such as syllable structure, stress, rhythm, and intonation (chapters 7–10), and accent variation (chapters 12–13). What is new in the third edition is that there are two chapters on language acquisition (chapters 14–15). In the first of these two new additions, the author walks us through the early stages of L1 acquisition, with subchapters

like 'The First Six Months', 'The Second Six Months', and 'The Second Year of Life', amongst others. Interestingly, Carr briefly looks at bilingual children (in the fifth subchapter); however, he mainly focuses on what he calls OPOL 'one person one language' (p. 189) contexts. The second new chapter deals with acquiring English as a second language, which he narrows down to 'acquisition in which L2 is taught in classroom situations' (p. 193). Here he touches on issues related to speakers of different first languages such as French, Arabic, Dutch, German, Greek, Italian, and Spanish and draws on his own experiences from teaching at the Université Montpellier. Generally, the book contains helpful illustrations and exercises, and an accompanying website with sound files.

McMahon's introductory book comprises ten chapters. She begins the book with chapters on 'Sounds, Spellings and Symbols' and 'The Phoneme: The Same but Different' (chapters 1–2) before turning to the description of English consonants and consonant allophony (chapters 3–4). In the fifth chapter, McMahon discusses 'Criteria for Contrast: The Phoneme System'. Two chapters on vowels follow, namely 'Describing Vowels' (chapter 6) and 'Vowel Phonemes' (chapter 7). In chapter 8, McMahon introduces her readers to 'Variation between Accents', including sections such as 'The Importance of Accents'. In this chapter, she also discusses a three-way distinction between accent differences (in the sections on systemic differences, realizational differences, and distributional differences). The final two chapters focus on syllables (chapter 9) and 'The Word and Above', the latter of which concerns stress, intonation, and segmental phonology of the phrase and word, amongst others. Every chapter concludes with 'Exercises and Topics for Discussion' and 'Recommendations for Reading'. Two innovations to the second edition are that the first chapter 'Sounds, Spellings and Symbols' now includes exercises and that McMahon added the subchapter 'New Accents—Language Contact and World Englishes' to her chapter 'Variation between Accents'. Another difference from the first edition is that McMahon provides the student with a twenty-six-page-long glossary of important terms from, for instance, 'accent' over 'Onset Maximalism' to 'uptalk', which I believe can be very helpful for students new to the field English phonetics and phonology. Additionally, the occurrences of any of these central terms are now printed in bold in the running text of the chapters so that students can easily memorize key terms and look them up in the glossary.

The next book that deserves a mention was written by the British phonetician Jane Setter. According to her, *It's Not What You Say But How You Say It*, as she points out in *Your Voice Speaks Volumes*. This is a book that is a little different to the previous two, as it is designed to appeal to non-academic readers as well. As such, Setter's book features a great number of anecdotes and references to personal experiences. However, these are always underpinned by academic studies or interviews conducted by her. For me personally, it was the ideal book to read while embarking on my 30-minute bus-ride from east Kiel to my university. The book has seven chapters, with the first one introducing the reader to 'the speech chain' and how speech works. Moreover, in the first chapter, Setter talks about which sounds we acquire first as children, and she introduces her readers to the sounds of RP and then to stress and intonation. She ends the chapter with a brief anecdote about how we decode linguistic messages and what sometimes happens when we encounter a variety we are not familiar with. The second

chapter kicks off with the Romans and provides a very brief history of accent features and their distribution in the British Isles and shows that many salient regional markers go back to earlier changes in the history of English. Setter then turns to accentism, covering the problem of accent prejudice and accent perception in general. The next chapter considers questions of gender and accent, also touching on how we sometimes expect features such as pitch to resemble physical appearance. The following chapters are concerned with professional and performance voices and linguists' role in criminal investigations (chapters 4–5). I would consider chapter 6 one of the most important chapters in the book as it brings two topics to the table that are still not sufficiently discussed, either in academia or in popular discourse, namely the speech of transmasculine and transfeminine speakers and of people who depend on voice synthesizers (for instance Stephen Hawking). In the final chapter, 'English Voices, Global Voices', Setter touches on English as a global language and briefly looks at this topic from the angle of power relations and politics. Setter's book contains QR codes and links providing further illustration of some of the topics she discusses. If you are looking for a casual read that is nonetheless insightful, this could be your go-to.

A noteworthy monograph addresses *Sign Language Phonology*, an area of English phonology that has remained underrepresented in research and definitely in teaching; for many scholars and students alike, BSL and ASL still seem unfamiliar indeed. Fortunately, this is exactly where Diane Brentari's book picks us up as she announces in her introduction: 'we will start out from a different place, based on conversations I have had over the years with those who have doubts about whether sign language has phonology at all. The answer is "yes, it does," but this question lingers because the medium is so unfamiliar' (p. 2). *Sign Language Phonology* contains eight very detailed chapters, the first of which introduces the reader to the topic and specifies the object of study by discussing the similarities and differences between sign language and gesture, and sign language and speech. It does so in a way that is suitable for readers without any prior knowledge of the field. In the next three chapters, Brentari walks us through modality, iconicity, and interfaces. Chapters 6 and 7 deal with phonological processing and the acquisition of Sign Language. The final chapter, then, concerns variation and change in Sign Language phonology. Additionally, the book features a glossary and, for those interested in pursuing the matter further, every chapter concludes with suggestions for further reading. In sum, the book provides an overview of Sign Language phonology, but it will also cater to readers who do have prior knowledge and want to read up on certain points in more detail.

Anne Przewozny, Cécile Viollain, and Sylvain Navarro present the edited volume *The Corpus Phonology of English: Multifocal Analyses of Variation*, which 'materialises the many exchanges that took place during the PAC (Phonologie de l'Anglais Contemporain/Phonology of Contemporary English) international conference entitled "Variation, Change and Spoken Corpora: Advances in the Phonology and Phonetics of Contemporary English"' (p. 1) as they state in their 'Introduction' (pp. 1–8). However, this volume does not constitute proceedings of the conference, but 'is evidence to the open-ended nature of the research endeavour and to the beneficial role of the exchanges between researchers in fashioning and furthering the debate on many different issues' (p. 1). As such it

features a variety of foci on different regions and phonological features and contains different theoretical approaches. I will discuss several chapters from this volume in more depth throughout the remainder of this section, whose focus will mainly be on the phonological features of various geographical regions. Please note that some of the following studies under discussion here may very well be discussed from a sociolinguistics point of view as well. However, in the present section on phonetics and phonology, I will concentrate on pronunciation features and changes rather than sociolinguistic implications. I will at times refer to Section 9, 'Dialectology and Sociolinguistics'.

As regards contemporary features that are not exclusive to a specific region, Olivier Glain is interested in 'The Phonological Fuzziness of Palatalisation in Contemporary English: A Case of Near-Phonemes?' (pp. 50–73). Two experiments with British and American speakers inform us about what he calls 'contemporary palatalisation', which is a phenomenon that is observable in many varieties of English on the British Isles, in North America, and in the southern hemisphere. Examples include yod coalescence after /t, d/ and /s, z/ (as in *tune, dune, assume, presume*), palatalization of /stj, str/ and /st, sk/ clusters (as in *street, student*) and palatalization of /s/ by /r/ (as in *grocery*). Glain argues that this phenomenon is 'an example of a synchronic process that is in fact the manifestation of systematic, diachronic ones' (p. 70) and that 'it is only an interaction between internal and external factors of change that can account for the actuation of contemporary palatalisation' (p. 70).

Let us turn to pronunciation in GA. With 'Diva Diction: Hollywood's Leading Ladies and the Rise of General American English' (*AS* 95[2020] 441–84), Charles Boberg has—to borrow an expression from cinema jargon—written a sequel to his 2018 analysis of New York English in film (see *YWES* 99[2020] 80–113). In order to obtain a better picture of the phonological development in the whole of the country, Boberg—in the present article—directs his focus to forty actresses, all of whom are native speakers of North American English originating from various locations throughout the US. He presents a diachronic overview of mainly vowels in data ranging from 1930 to 2010 for actresses like Emma Stone, Julia Roberts, and Marilyn Monroe, to name only a few. As regards the phonological features in question, Boberg has a closer look at the vocalization of post-vocalic /r/, LOT-THOUGHT mergers, differences in the realization of the TRAP vowel before nasals, the centralization and lowering of THOUGHT and TRAP, and GOOSE-fronting. Boberg reveals that there has been a gradual change from New York variants to variants used more frequently on the West Coast in the Los Angeles area.

For another study of GA pronunciation, we remain with the media but slightly shift our attention from film to broadcast speech. On the basis of corpus data, Bente Hannisdal gives us information on the flapping of /t/ in AmE broadcasts in 'A Corpus-Based Study of /t/ Flapping in American English Broadcast Speech' (in Przewozny et al., eds., pp. 256–76). While there have been several studies discussing this phenomenon in AmE, Hannisdal zooms in on three phonological environments 'that have been little investigated from a quantitative perspective' (p. 257). These include /t/ after nasals (e.g. *county*), after lateral approximants (e.g. *guilty*), and /t/ occurring between two unstressed syllables (e.g. *negative*). In the data gathered from numerous broadcasting channels, we

can see /t/-flapping before nasals and in what Hannisdal calls *-tive* environments in all speakers, whereas this variant is employed only occasionally after /l/. Her study shows that the distribution of /t/-flapping in AmE is far more complex than we might have been inclined to believe given how well known this feature is.

After these two studies on GA pronunciation, I turn to the east of Canada with Julie Rouaud's discussion of 'French and English Phonologies in Contact: The Case of Montreal English' (*Anglophonia* 30[2020] <https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.3624>). The data of this study are taken from the PAC Montreal survey, which was carried out in 2016 and 2017 and is also part of the PAC programme (see above). In this article, Rouaud sets out to investigate the influence of French on Canadian English in Montreal—a question that has not been addressed in many studies so far. Potential features providing insights into the francization of Montreal English that are discussed in the article are the following: assibilation of /t/ and /d/, /r/-realizations (traditional Montreal French [r] and innovative [ʁ]), nasalization of vowels, and /y/ realizations. Reading tasks as well as spontaneous conversations show that francization rates for these four features are significantly higher for French–English bilingual speakers than for monolingual speakers.

Another publication takes us to New England. James N. Stanford's monograph *New England English: Large-Scale Acoustic Sociophonetics and Dialectology* presents the results of an eight-year-long project which initially started with student research at Dartmouth University and involved over eighty students doing fieldwork across New England. This detailed monograph comprises five parts, namely 'Setting the Stage' (chapters 1–3), 'Bird's Eye View—The Mechanical Turk Online Projects' (chapters 4–5), 'Exploring the Hub-Fieldwork Results from Eastern Massachusetts' (chapters 6–7), 'Exploring Northern New England—Fieldwork Results' (chapters 8–9), and 'Summary and Discussion' (chapters 10–11). The first part introduces the overall project, discusses the New England variables under scrutiny, and provides background information on the settlement of New England. As for the variables treated in this book, Stanford investigates the absence of rhoticity and front realizations of the START and PALM sets. Moreover, he looks at the LOT-THOUGHT merger, the potential maintenance of distinct NORTH and FORCE sets, the MARY/MARRY/MERRY merger, BAN versus BAT realizations, and Canadian raising. The goal was to answer questions such as 'What is the current state of these traditional New England features?' and 'Are these traditional features being transmitted to the next generation of speakers?' (p. 4), thus contributing to 'understanding language variation and change in general' (p. 5). The second part concerns the Mechanical Turk online projects, which comprise online audio recordings and written questionnaires on lexical and phonological features conducted with New England English speakers. In chapters 6 and 7, Stanford then turns to the face-to-face fieldwork done in eastern Massachusetts, shifting, as he says, 'from a more dialectology-focused approach to a more quantitative, variationist sociolinguistics approach' (p. 141). Chapters 8 and 9 are concerned with recordings made in main and central New Hampshire. The considerably shorter chapter 10 presents a neatly arranged overview (in bullet points) of the results per feature and region. In the final chapter of the book, Stanford brings together the three projects of the book discussed in Parts II–IV. The chapter features discussions on dialect levelling and touches upon a number

of perspectives for further research, such as the role of television, the internet, and social media. While it is of course hard to do justice to a 351-page-long monograph within the space allotted here, I would definitely recommend any linguist interested in New England English or variation and change to have a closer look at this book (for more information see also Section 9).

Further research on New England is presented by Sylvain Navarro with ‘A Study of Rhoticity in Boston: Results from a PAC Survey’ (in Przewozny et al., eds., pp. 238–55). Amongst other things, he re-evaluates the frequency of post-vocalic /r/ in the traditionally non-rhotic area of Boston. Navarro’s auditory analysis shows that rhoticity has indeed become variable in Boston and displays considerable inter- and intra-speaker variation. Style effects are also observed, as wordlist tasks elicit more post-vocalic /r/ realizations than recordings of spontaneous speech. In addition, stress and phonological context play a role as the data ‘confirms that coda-/r/ realisation increases proportionally with the degree of stress of the syllable’ (p. 248), and as pre-consonantal /r/ is realized less frequently than final /r/.

Moving slightly westward from the New England area, we now turn to Madeline Travelet and Franck Zumstein’s ‘The Northern Cities Vowel Shift in Northern Michigan’ (in Przewozny et al., eds., pp. 200–20). In the 1960s, this chain shift, which involves the KIT, DRESS, STRUT, THOUGHT, LOT, and TRAP vowels, was absent in the north of Michigan, while it was present in the south. Comparing recordings from the 1960s with those made in the last twenty years in the area, the authors find that a north/south split can no longer be observed in Michigan. Indeed, the shift has started to occur in the northern parts as well, with the city of Alpena displaying the most advanced shift. However, this change is not categorical, and it is only the initial stages of the chain shift, i.e. the raising of TRAP, the fronting of LOT, and movement towards a lower CAUGHT vowel, that can be observed in speakers further north from the isogloss.

Still on the Northern Cities Vowel Shift, Annette D’Onofrio and Jaime Benheim aim at ‘Contextualizing Reversal: Local Dynamics of the Northern Cities Shift in a Chicago Community’ (*JSoc* 24[2020] 469–91). They find that the TRAP and LOT stages of the chain shift are currently reversing, which is a change revealed by their apparent time data for two Chicago communities, viz. White Beverly and Morgan Park. For more information on the sociolinguistic interpretation of this reversal see Section 9.

Pierre Habasque addresses another vowel shift that is happening much further west in the US, namely in California. In the article ‘Sociolinguistic Evaluations of Performances of the California Vowel Shift: A Matched-Guise Study’ (*Anglophonia* 30[2020] <https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.3556>), Habasque presents a perceptual study of 123 students at California State University, Northridge. He finds that the California Vowel Shift (CVS), which is an anti-clockwise shift involving nearly all AmE vowels, is to a certain extent stigmatized, in that speech displaying GA vowels is rated more friendly, pleasant, educated, and competent than CVS-influenced speech.

A study that looks at how intonational variation, rather than vowels shifts, is perceived and judged is ‘Intonational Variation and Incrementality in Listener Judgments of Ethnicity’ (*LabPhon* 11:i[2020] <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.229>) by Nicole Holliday and Dan Villarreal. The authors investigate how pitch

patterns—fall-rise versus simple high tone—are evaluated with respect to the ‘blackness’ of speech samples of Barack Obama. Their results suggest that greater fall-rise patterns (meaning more extreme differences between the maximum and minimum F0) are rated as ‘more black’ by listeners.

The next two studies consider glottalization and /t/-glottalling in North American varieties of English. In one article, Scott Seyfarth and Marc Garellek analyse the ‘Physical and Phonological Causes of Coda /t/ Glottalization in the Mainstream American English of Central Ohio’ (*LabPhon* 11:i[2020] <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.213>) and find that ‘[c]oda /t/ glottalization is found near-categorically before sonorants, often phrase-medially before labial and velar obstruents, often phrase-finally, and occasionally elsewhere’ (p. 1). As regards the causes behind this distribution, they propose that it ‘can be understood primarily as a consequence of conditioned variability in the alignment and magnitude of simultaneous oral and glottal constriction gestures’ (p. 23). In the other article, Kamil Kaźmierski looks at ‘Prevocalic T-Glottalling Across Word Boundaries in Midland American English’ (*LabPhon* 11:i[2020] <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.271>). He points out that glottal forms occur at a higher frequency in /t/-final words ‘that typically occur before consonant initial words’ (p. 15). Moreover, young female speakers show a positive correlation with glottal forms, while amongst older speakers, gender does not seem to play a significant role in the distribution of /t/-glottalling across word boundaries.

Other studies that discuss phonological features in North America will only be briefly mentioned here, as they are discussed in Section 9. So, Aaron J. Dinkin’s ‘The Foot of the Lake: A Sharp Dialect Boundary in Rural Northern New York’ (*AS* 95[2020] 321–55) takes a closer look at the reported dialect boundary between Ogdensburg and Canton. Stuart Davis, Kelly Berkson, and Alyssa Strickler discuss the raising of /aɪ/ as they work towards ‘Unlocking the Mystery of Dialect B: A Note on Incipient /aɪ/-Raising in Fort Wayne, Indiana’ (*AS* 95[2020] 149–72). For Vancouver and Seattle, Julia Thomas Swan investigated the lexical set BAG in ‘*Bag* Across the Border: Sociocultural Background, Ideological Stance, and *Bag* Raising in Seattle and Vancouver’ (*AS* 95[2020] 46–81). Phillip M. Carter, Lydda López Valdez, and Nandi Sims, then, have a look at Miami English and discuss ‘New Dialect Formation through Language Contact: Vocalic and Prosodic Developments in Miami English’ (*AS* 95[2020] 119–48). Finally, Rachel Steindel Burdin scrutinizes ‘The Perception of Macro-Rhythm in Jewish English Intonation’ (*AS* 95[2020] 263–96).

A notable publication on the phonetics and phonology of English spoken in Ireland and Scotland is Warren Maguire’s *Language and Dialect Contact in Ireland: The Phonological Origins of Mid-Ulster English*. In this monograph, Maguire ‘presents an investigation into the phonological origins of Mid-Ulster English, one of the primary dialects of English on the island of Ireland’ (p. 1). After an introduction and a chapter on the background of Mid-Ulster English, Maguire turns to consonants. The more detailed sections in this chapter concern features such as velar palatalization, dental fricatives, rhoticity, /r/-realization and post-/r/ retraction, the distribution and realization of /l/, and consonant cluster simplification. As for the vowels, which he treats next, Maguire divides the chapter into sections on quality and quantity. In the former, he treats features such as the lowering of DRESS, TRAP/BATH-backing, and GOOSE-fronting. In the latter, vowel

quantity and, along with that, SVLR (Scottish Vowel Length Rule) conditioning are discussed. These two sections are followed by a section on the lexical distribution of vowels. To finish, Maguire touches on contact with Irish, and the English and Scots inputs to Mid-Ulster English (more information can be found in Section 9).

Scrutinizing data from a working-class community in Glasgow recorded in the 1980s, Florent Chevalier discusses ‘Intra-Speaker Phonetic Micro-Variation, and Its Relationship to Phonetic and Phonological Change’ (*Anglophonia* 30[2020] <https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.3611>). The study hypothesizes that ‘if and when two speakers converge in their pronunciation while interacting with each other, the direction of the variation within minutes may be expected to be similar to the direction of a community-level sound change’ (p. 3). Specifically, this would mean fronting of FLEECE and lowering of the BOOT sets as well as shortening in SVLR contexts. None of these hypotheses could be confirmed in the data.

Focusing on Scottish Standard English in speakers from Glasgow and Standard Southern British English (SSBE), Rachel Smith and Tamara Rathcke investigate how ‘Dialectal Phonology Constrains the Phonetics of Prominence’ (*JPhon* 78[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2019.100934>). They reveal that ‘within a language, there can be quite substantial divergence across varieties in the way accentual prominence is expressed’ (p. 15). To take only one example, in contrast to SSBE, Glasgow data only show sporadic vowel lengthening. They state that there are ‘robust cross-dialect differences across a number of measures’ (p. 12). At the same time, they also point to the fact that larger-scale studies would be beneficial.

Emmanuel Ferragne’s goal in ‘The Production and Perception of Derived Phonological Contrasts [DPCs] in Selected Varieties of English’ (in Przewozny et al., eds., pp. 30–49) is ‘to examine acoustic and perceptual data from various locations in the British Isles—Enniskillen (Ulster), Glasgow, and Hull—in order to better understand the production and perception of certain DPCs found in English’ (p. 30). Instances of DPCs Ferragne looked at are (i) the difference in vowel length between *tide* and *tied* or between *brood* and *brewed* in many Scottish accents, including Glasgow and Eniskillen in Northern Ireland, and (ii) the differences between the TRAP and START sets in Hull. He demonstrates that ‘the boundary between TRAP and START is somewhat better defined than that between GOOSE and BREWED’ (p. 47) and explains these results in terms of ‘the role of token (and/or type) frequency in shaping mental categories’ (p. 47). We now turn to phonological features observed in England.

In ‘On “Because” Phonological Variants and Their Pragmatic Functions in a Corpus of Bolton (Lancashire) English’ (in Przewozny et al., eds., pp. 147–76), Daniel Huber looks at the phonological variation in one particular word that has important discourse functions in English. Huber demonstrates that monosyllabic realizations such as *cos* are not exclusive to informal speech—neither is it the case that these forms are only used by younger speakers (as we might expect). While they employ monosyllabic *because* most often, in fact, ‘both disyllabic and monosyllabic variants occur in both formal and informal situations for virtually all speakers in the corpus’ (p. 147).

The issue of dialect-levelling is considered by Hugo Chatellier in his study on ‘Levelling in a Northern English Variety: The Case of FACE and GOAT in Greater

Manchester' (in Przewozny et al., eds., pp. 221–37). Chatellier's results show that the majority of realizations for FACE and GOAT, surprisingly, are diphthongs; hence there does not appear to be levelling towards the supraregional northern variants [e:] and [o:]. Any FACE monophthongs are restricted to 'a small number of contexts, for example "make"' (p. 232) in reading tasks, while for GOAT regular use of monophthongs is mainly confined to speakers over the age of 30. It should be noted that while the author mainly focuses on FACE and GOAT, these are not the only features discussed in the chapter, in that his analysis also comprises FOOT and STRUT, TRAP and BATH, GOOSE, and FORCE and NORTH.

Another feature of British English is the vocalization of /l/, a classic example being the pronunciation [miʊk] for *milk*. Patrycja Strycharczuk and James M Scobbie analyse 'Gestural Delay and Gestural Reduction: Articulatory Variation in /l/-Vocalisation in Southern British English [SBE]' (in Przewozny et al., eds., pp. 9–29), utilizing 'a corpus of articulatory (ultrasound) data to tease apart the relative contribution of delay and reduction in ongoing /l/-vocalisation in SBE' (p. 9). They are thus looking at the relationship of vocalized /l/ and delayed or reduced gestures of the tongue tip (TT). Their data show that 'a whole spectrum of degree of vocalization is attested: from a full gesture resulting in contact between the tongue tip and the palate to complete deletion of the TT gesture' (p. 24). They also find that /l/-vocalization is mostly attested in word-final pre-consonantal environments.

In 'Labiodentals /r/ Here to Stay: Deep Learning Shows Us Why' (*Anglophonia* 30[2020] <https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.3424>), Hannah King and Emmanuel Ferragne start out from the fact that [v] realizations of /r/ are well known and becoming more widely used in Britain. King and Ferragne contend that an articulatory analysis of the lip positions of speakers that still use lingual variants of /r/ 'may allow us to provide a phonetic account as to how and why non-lingual labiodental variants are becoming increasingly widespread in England' (p. 5). Accordingly, they examine 'whether lingual productions of the approximant /r/ are accompanied by a labiodental-like lip posture by analysing lip camera data of /r/ and /w/ from Anglo-English speakers who still produce lingual /r/' (p. 5). Their results reveal that the lip position of /w/ and lingual /r/ are indeed different: 'the lips are wider and higher for /r/ than they are for /w/ productions' (p. 13).

Matthias Heyne, Xuan Wang, Donald Derrick, Kieran Dorreen, and Kevin Watson also discuss the realization of /r/. In 'The Articulation of /ɹ/ in New Zealand English' (*JIPA* 50[2020] 366–88), these authors examine the distribution of different tongue-tip gestures in the production of /r/ in NZE, the two categories used by them being tongue tip up, and tongue tip down. Their results show that '[t]wenty five NZE speakers produced tip-down /ɹ/ exclusively, 12 tip-up /ɹ/ exclusively, and 25 produced both, partially depending on context' (p. 366). It was found that the phonetic environment determining the variation involved the position of the vowel on the front-back dimension. Front vowel environments favoured tip-down variants, while back vowel contexts showed the most tip-up forms.

One more study on NZE that deserves mentioning is 'On the New Zealand Short Front Vowel Shift' by Cécile Viollain and Jacques Durand (in Przewozny et al., eds., pp. 177–99). Using acoustic data from the PAC programme, they investigate the NZE vowels KIT, DRESS, TRAP, FLEECE, START, and STRUT. In accounting

for the NZE short vowel shift, the authors make a case for a Dependency Phonology-inspired approach rather than the Exemplar Theory framework often used. Moreover, they argue ‘that NZE, while it inherited deepsea trends from southern British systems in the nineteenth century, has taken an autonomous route’ (p. 196).

Two chapters in Przewozny et al., eds., feature contrastive approaches, namely, Małgorzata Kul and Paulina Zydorowicz’s ‘A Corpora-Based Study of Vowel Reduction in Two Speech Styles: A Comparison between English and Polish (pp. 127–46) and Cécile Viollain, Sylvain Navarro, and Jacques Durand’s ‘R-sandhi in English and Liaison in French: Two Phenomenologies in the Light of the PAC and PFC Data’ (pp. 98–126). In the former article, Kul and Zydorowicz ‘compare vowel reduction in read and fully spontaneous speech in English and Polish’ (p. 127) and demonstrate that English shows an extent of reduction that is markedly greater than what they observed in Polish. However, neither in Polish nor in English could they find a correlation between speech rate and reduction. In the latter article, Viollain et al. argue that while the phenomena of French liaison and English r-sandhi ‘may seem similar at first glance’ (p. 120), their data suggest ‘that liaison and r-sandhi are in fact conditioned by constraints of a different nature’ (p. 120). For instance, liaison seems to be influenced considerably stronger by orthography than r-sandhi.

For the final three articles in this section on phonetics and phonology, I will have a look at suprasegmental phonology. In ‘Phonetic Effects of Onset Complexity on the English Syllable’ (*LabPhon* 11:i[2020] <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.148>) Anna Mai ‘investigates the phonetic motivations for onsets’ contribution to syllable weight in English’ (p. 1) in monosyllabic words. She shows that ‘onset weight effects in English are most likely attributable to acoustic correlates of the p-center [perceptual centre], like the timing of the intensity peak, rather than to correlates of categorical weight, like integrated intensity’ (p. 22). Claire Moore-Cantwell looks into ‘Weight and Final Vowels in the English Stress System’ (*Phonology* 37[2020] 657–95). On the basis of experimental data and that obtained from dictionaries, Moore-Cantwell finds evidence that ‘the quality of a word’s final vowel plays a role in assigning main stress in English’ (p. 690). The vowel [i] in final position causes the main stress to move to the left, meaning that ‘stress has a strong tendency to be antepenultimate’ (p. 690) in words with three syllables. Employing dictionary data, Quentin Dabouis provides us with an overview of ‘Secondary Stress in Contemporary British English’ (*Anglophonia* 30[2020] <https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.3476>). His survey shows that ‘[s]tress preservation has been found to be a major force in secondary stress assignment in stress-shifted derivatives’ (p. 28).

4. Morphology

We begin this section with works dealing with inflectional morphology, after which we turn to derivation. On OE nominal inflection, there is Julia Fernández-Cuesta and Nieves Rodríguez-Ledesma’s ‘Reduced Forms in the Nominal Morphology of the Lindisfarne Gospel Gloss: A Case of Accusative/Dative

Syncretism?’ (*FLH* 41[2020] 37–65). The reduced forms in questions are nouns (mainly *a*-stems) which have distinct accusative and dative forms in the West Saxon texts but often lack their expected *DAT* suffix *-e* in the Lindisfarne gloss. The authors find a clear difference between John, which generally preserves *DAT* *-e* after prepositions, and the three synoptic gospels, which frequently lose it, supporting the hypothesis that the gloss in John was based on a different exemplar. In indirect objects, this syncretism between the old *ACC* and *DAT* forms is less frequent.

Raffaella Baechler investigates eME (Early Middle English) nominal morphology in ‘Analogy, Reanalysis and Exaptation in Early Middle English: The Emergence of a New Inflectional System’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 123–52). Focusing on a single textual witness, the ‘A’ group of the Lambeth Homilies (c.1200), Baechler uses the LAEME to make a comprehensive survey of the nominal inflection in this scribal dialect. Although there are differences between this and the OE system, the general picture is one of comparative stability: the eME scribe retained the inherited case and gender distinctions, although some markers were repurposed. Significant changes include the extension of *-s* to strong neuter plurals and the apparent reanalysis of final *-e* (schwa) as a feminine marker. On PDE nominal inflection, there is ‘English Plurals in Construction Morphology’ (*LangS* 77[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2019.101240>) by Andrew van der Spuy. This paper discusses the status of English plural nouns in CxG, showing how the various pluralization patterns may be formalized within this framework. Van der Spuy then compares his CxG account to earlier treatments in Distributed Morphology and Word-and-Paradigm morphology.

The History of the Present English Subjunctive by Lilo Moessner presents *A Corpus-Based Study of Mood and Modality*. In this book, Moessner uses the Helsinki Corpus to trace the development of the present subjunctive from OE to eModE. After a critical survey of earlier studies in the introductory chapter, the following four chapters present Moessner’s findings on the use of the subjunctive and ‘competing’ constructions, such as the imperative in main clauses, the indicative in subordinate clauses, and modal verbs (which are regrettably not listed individually in Moessner’s tables). Each chapter deals with a different clause type: main clauses, adnominal relative clauses, ‘noun clauses’ (i.e. complement and free relative clauses), and adverbial clauses. The final chapter presents ‘A Birds-Eye View of the English Subjunctive’, summing up the findings. Throughout the book, Moessner compares the relative frequencies of subjunctives and competing constructions according to various parameters, such as person, text type, and date of composition of the text. While some individual examples are discussed at length, the overall approach is quantitative—the book contains more than 120 frequency tables—though no statistical tests are performed. The semantic analysis rarely goes beyond a few rather impressionistic distinctions (e.g. ‘strong’ vs ‘weak’ deontic modality) and is occasionally quite idiosyncratic; we were surprised, for instance, to see eModE *be about to*, *be able to*, and *be wont* to classified as expressions of epistemic modality. However, the book’s observations on developments in different clause types, e.g. object complement clauses of different matrix verbs (listed in three appendices), will provide a good starting point for future investigations in a larger corpus. It is interesting to compare Moessner’s quantitative approach to that of Howard Jones and Morgan Macleod.

In ‘Semantics and Syntax in Old English Mood Selection’ (TPS 118[2020] 304–39), they focus on the choice between indicative and subjunctive in a single OE text, Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*. The factors influencing mood selection include the reality status of the proposition, clause type, and mood choice in the Latin original. Mood selection in the OE version is found to differ systematically from the Latin, ‘suggesting that it is good evidence for native Old English usage’ (p. 312) even though the text is a translation. The authors identify a number of clause types where mood selection is automatic, such as result and cause clauses (indicative) and purpose and concessive clauses (subjunctive). In other types, such as complement clauses, a choice exists between the two moods. Another contribution on verbal inflection is Lieselotte Anderwald’s ‘The Myth of American English *Gotten* as a Historical Retention’ (in Merja Kytö and Erik Smitterberg, eds., *Late Modern English*, pp. 67–90). After noting that *gotten* was rare in AmE before 1900, Anderwald presents material showing that grammars and style guides in the nineteenth century also generally preferred the form *got*. The idea that *gotten* is an example of ‘colonial lag’, i.e. of AmE linguistic conservatism, thus appears to be a myth, which only entered public discourse in the mid-twentieth century.

We now turn to publications dealing with various types of derivation. Hendrik De Smet’s ‘What Predicts Productivity? Theory Meets Individuals’ (*CogLing* 31[2020] 251–78) investigates the productivity of *-ly* adverbs and *-ness* nominalizations in material extracted from two corpora, the New York Times Annotated Corpus and the Hansard Corpus of British parliamentary debates. The aim is to identify the factors predicting the productivity of these derivations in the language of individual speakers and writers. In line with previous research, type frequency is found to be the best predictor of productivity (defined as the number of hapaxes in an individual’s language occurring less than 0.1 times per million words in the total material), though the effect differs depending on the overall frequency of tokens. Individual and genre-related differences are also discussed. Another paper on the derivation of adverbs is Ruth Möhlig-Falke’s ‘Contextualizing Dual-Form Adverbs in the Old Bailey Corpus: An Assessment of Semantic, Pragmatic, and Sociolinguistic Factors’ (in Kristin Bech and Ruth Möhlig-Falke, eds., *Grammar—Discourse—Context: Grammar and Usage in Language Variation and Change*, pp. 157–90). Möhlig-Falke looks at fourteen ‘dual-form’ adverbs in lModE, i.e. adverbs with or without *-ly* such as *sharp(ly)* and *high(ly)*. Using the OBC, she notes an increase in the use of *-ly* in the nineteenth century; this is constrained by linguistic context, however, *-ly* being more frequent in more prototypically adverbial uses. Möhlig-Falke also considers the possible effects of gender, social class, and standardization on this development.

Matthias Eitelmann, Kari E. Haugland, and Dagmar Haumann’s paper ‘From *engl-isc* to *whatever-ish*: A Corpus-Based Investigation of *-ish* Derivation in the History of English’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 801–31) traces the history of the suffix *-ish* from OE to PDE in a range of corpora. The authors focus on increased productivity—based on, for instance, the base forms it attaches to and hapaxes—and an extension of the meaning. They also review three theoretical accounts (inverse grammaticalization, constructionalization, and Distributed Morphology), which all seem equally likely based on their data.

Marios Andreou and Rochelle Lieber look at the ‘Aspectual and Quantificational Properties of Deverbal Conversion and *-ing* Nominalizations: The Power of Context’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 333–63). Using the COCA and the BNC, the authors investigate the nominalization patterns of 106 verbs, specifically the difference between conversion (e.g. *blend*, *worry*) and *-ing* forms (*blending*, *worrying*) with respect to features like Aktionsart, referentiality, and countability. They challenge a number of received views, e.g. the idea that conversion is generally used for referential nouns and *-ing* forms for events. Rather, ‘most conversion and *-ing* nominalizations have the potential for either interpretation’ (p. 360), the correct reading being supplied by the context. Dorota Gorzycka’s *Diminutive Constructions in English* is a CxG-based study of diminutive constructions, a type of expression which is sometimes thought to be rare or non-existent in English. This view is clearly mistaken according to the author, who analyses a number of different diminutive formations (e.g. derivations with *-let*, *-ling*, and *-ette*) in material from the *OED* and the BNC. She adheres to a prototype view of linguistic categories, meaning that a great variety of expressions are subsumed under the heading ‘diminutive’, including pet names and some adjective + noun combinations (‘analytic diminutives’). The first three chapters of the book contain lengthy discussions of possible definitions of ‘diminutive’, earlier literature on diminutives in English and other languages, and the basics of CxG. The fourth chapter then presents the author’s study and classification of a number of diminutive formations in PDE. This is followed by a brief summary and an appendix of surveyed forms with frequency data from the BNC and dates of first attestation from the *OED*. Another contribution on nominal derivation, Piotr Twardzisz’s ‘Degrees of Decomposability of *-ism* Nouns and Their Sanctioning Construction Schemas’ (*NJES* 19[2020] 299–321), provides frequency data on *-ism* nouns from the COHA and a somewhat meandering discussion of their derivation within CxG.

Gergana Popova’s ‘Derivational Networks in English’ (in Livia Körtvélyessy, Alexandra Bagasheva, and Pavol Štekauer, eds., *Derivational Networks Across Languages*, 147–55) is part of a collaborative volume on derivational processes in European languages. The ‘networks’ in the title consist of the links between derived forms, such as *cut* > *cuttable* > *uncuttable*, etc. English is characterized as having a comparatively ‘shallow’ derivational network with few affixes (but relatively frequent conversion and compounding). In the final chapter of the book, ‘Derivational Networks in European Languages: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective’ (pp. 485–607), the editors, along with Salvador Valera and Ján Genči, contrast the findings from the different languages, thereby putting English more explicitly into a comparative perspective.

Another PDE contribution is Ewelina Prażmo’s ‘The Post-Fact World in a Post-Truth Era: The Productivity and Emergent Meanings of the Prefix *post-* in Contemporary English’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 393–412). She reviews some recent examples of the use of the prefix *post-*, focusing on *post-truth* and *post-fact*, and stresses its productivity and a new meaning ‘a revised version of X’, which she conceptualizes in a radial model of categorization, i.e. based on similarity to a prototype.

Finally, on compounding, there is Christine Günther, Sven Kotowski, and Ingo Plag’s ‘Phrasal Compounds Can Have Adjectival Heads: Evidence from English’

(ELL 24[2020] 75–95). On the basis of a corpus study of the COCA, the authors show that, contrary to earlier claims, adjectives can be the head of a phrasal compound (*eat-off-the-floor clean*). They describe the type of phrases attested as well as the relation between the head and the phrase. In contrast to noun-headed compounds, adjective-headed compounds mostly have an intensifying character, which the authors argue stems from the properties of the head itself.

5. Syntax

(a) Modern English

The Factive–Reported Distinction in English by Caroline Gentens is a study of factives in English, i.e. predicates like *regret*, *love*, or *realize* whose complement is presupposed to be true. This rich and thought-provoking book proposes a cognitive-functional account of factives and presents a number of case studies illustrating how such an approach may work. After a brief introduction, chapter 2 provides an extensive overview of earlier (philosophical, generative, cognitive) approaches to presupposition and factive clauses. In chapters 3 and 4, Gentens then presents her own account. Chapter 3 proposes a three-way typology of complementation constructions, distinguishing between factive, manipulative, and reporting complementation. These types are defined by the relation of the complement clause to the matrix predicate: the propositional content of a factive construction is unaffected by the matrix predicate (e.g. *realize*), whereas the contents of manipulative (e.g. *deny*) and reporting (e.g. *say*) constructions are affected (‘transformed or re-created’) and effected (‘created in a speech or thought act’), respectively. Various formal and functional aspects between these types are discussed. One aspect, their behaviour with respect to ‘speaker-related’ modality, is explored in more detail in chapter 4, where Gentens shows among other things that factive complements may contain epistemic and other speaker-related modals (*I hate that this must have been a problem for aaages!*, p. 109), contrary to what has been claimed in the literature. The remainder of the book presents three case studies. Chapter 5 is devoted to object extraposition of the type *He hated it that everyone was looking at him*. Chapter 6 (partly based on a study discussed in YWES 100[2021] 35) looks at the historical development of clauses with *the fact that* from lModE to PDE. Chapter 7, also on a diachronic topic, investigates the development of *I regret (to say)*, which according to Gentens has developed a use as a parenthetical reporting construction in addition to its factive uses. She locates this innovation in the lModE period. The concluding chapter 8 reiterates the main points and proposes some avenues for future work on PDE, the history of English, and other languages. An important point made in the later chapters is that some constructions which have been used in the literature to test for factivity are not always factive, underscoring the need for solid empirical investigations like the present book.

English Resultatives: A Force-Recipient Account by Seizi Iwata is a very comprehensive CxG-based treatment of resultative constructions in PDE, i.e. expressions such as *He wiped the dishes dry*, where the object complement is not subcategorized by the verb (cf. *He wiped the dishes*), or *He laughed himself sick*, where neither the object nor the object complement is subcategorized (cf. *He*

laughed). Iwata sets out to answer two main research questions, namely why some resultatives allow non-subcategorized objects, and how one can account for the acceptability of some resultatives while others do not occur. The book, which runs to more than 500 pages, is divided into nine parts. After an introduction outlining the research questions and discussing earlier (generative and CxG) accounts of resultatives, Part I proposes ‘A Force-Recipient Account’ according to which the semantic role of the object is the main factor determining the acceptability of a resultative. Part II discusses a number of ‘So-Called Idiomatic Cases’, such as *laugh one’s head off*, and Part III explores ‘Resultatives and Domains’, in particular verbs of eating and drinking and resultatives with ‘short-lived result states’ (e.g. *shout oneself silly* or *eat oneself sick*). In Part IV, Iwata discusses ‘“Change Verb” Resultatives and How to Accommodate Them’, i.e. resultative constructions where the verb already entails a change of state, such as *freeze the ice cream solid*. The nature of the resultative complement is further explored in Part V, ‘On the Result Component’, and Part VI, ‘Still Further Issues Surrounding Adjectival Result Phrases’. Part VII discusses ‘Resultatives That Are Not Based on Force-Transmission’, a crucial phenomenon because it seems to provide a challenge to the author’s force-recipient analysis. Iwata argues that there is indeed a subclass of resultatives where the object is not a force recipient, but that these always involve a metaphorical motion event (e.g. *ride a horse to victory*). Parts VIII and IX deal with ‘Putative Resultatives’ and ‘Still Another Putative Constraint’, i.e. constructions which have been treated as resultatives in the literature, but which according to Iwata are better treated as examples of other phenomena, such as verbs of sound emission used as motion expressions (as in the well-known example *The trolley rumbled through the tunnel*). The final chapter summarizes and concludes the investigation, explaining in more detail how the force-recipient analysis helps answer the two initial research questions. A very attractive aspect of the book is its empirical scope (more than 1,200 numbered examples) and its critical but always fair engagement with the relevant literature. This book will be of interest not just to scholars working on resultatives and/or CxG, but to anyone interested in complementation in English.

A number of papers deal with ellipsis and related phenomena in Modern English (ModE). Eva-Maria Bauer and Thomas Hoffmann are the authors of ‘Turns Out Is Not Ellipsis? A Usage-Based Construction Grammar View on Reduced Constructions’ (*ALH* 52[2020] 240–59), which argues against the traditional subject-ellipsis analysis of clauses like *Turns out, I was right*. Instead, the authors suggest, *turns out* and *it turns out* are really two separate constructions with different discourse functions. They use the UCLA Library Broadcast NewsScape, a large spoken-language corpus, and check the complexity of all clauses beginning with *(it) turns out* along with the presence or absence of various emotives. The two patterns turn out to differ both with respect to complexity, with *turns out* favouring less complex complements than *it turns out*, and emotive content, with *turns out* somewhat unexpectedly having more neutral complements. The authors take this as evidence that the two patterns have developed into two separate constructions. In another paper in the same special issue, Evelyn Gandón-Chapela presents ‘A Corpus-Based Analysis of Post-Auxiliary Ellipsis Voice Mismatches in Late Modern English’ (*ALH* 52[2020] 201–16). The mismatches in question occur when an elided complement has another voice

than the corresponding overt complement, as in *The ice cream should be taken out* [passive] *of the freezer, if you can* [i.e. *take it out*, active]. Unfortunately, Gandón-Chapela's material from the PPCMBE contains only very few examples of the phenomenon—seven in total—so we agree with her conclusion (p. 214) that the phenomenon requires further research. Finally, 'Revisiting the Syntactic Derivation of English Split Questions' (*AJL* 40[2020] 475–91) by Chengdong Wang and Jinquan Han proposes a generative analysis of 'split questions' of the type *Who broke the window, Mary?* The authors suggest that the NP or clause tagged onto the question is best analysed as a reduced *it*-cleft with the non-focused information elided (i.e. *Who broke the window, ~~was it~~ Mary?*).

Günter Rohdenburg's unwieldily titled 'The Replacement of Direct Objects and Directly Linked Gerunds by Prepositional Ones after *Shirk*, *Refrain* and *Lack* in Modern English, with Special Reference to Clause Negation' (*Anglia* 138[2020] 561–85) looks at variation in the complements of three ModE verbs. Rohdenburg shows that *shirk* and *lack* more frequently occur with prepositional objects in negated contexts in a PDE newspaper corpus, especially in AmE. The verb *refrain*, which always takes a prepositional object in PDE, is argued to have shown a similar tendency in eModE, direct objects being the more usual pattern (*I refreyned thy company*), but prepositional objects being particularly frequent in negated contexts (*She could not refraine from teares*). The author links this phenomenon to a general crosslinguistic tendency whereby clausal negation promotes the use of less transitive structures. Other contributions on changing complementation patterns in recent English are Laura García-Castro's 'The Diachronic Evolution of the Complementation Profile of REMEMBER from Late Modern to Present-Day British English' (*NM* 121[2020] 144–80) and Mark Kaunisto and Juhani Rudanko's '*Advise Against -ing*: An Emerging Class of Exceptions to Bach's Generalization' (in Viola Wiegand and Michaela Mahlberg, eds., *Corpus Linguistics, Context and Culture*, pp. 253–74), which focuses on the use of *advise* + gerund without an overt NP object.

Alon Fishman argues that 'English Similarity Predicates Construe Particular Dimensions of Similarity' (*CogLing* 31[2020] 453–84), focusing on predicates *like*, *similar*, and *resemble*. Using both corpus and experimental evidence, he shows that these ostensibly synonymous predicates are in fact used in quite different ways; for instance, *like* is more commonly used for metaphorical comparison, whereas *resemble* is frequently used in the visual domain. Fishman also discusses the historical development of the forms, suggesting that the use of *resemble* has been narrowed since ME. Another paper adopting a usage-based perspective is Günter Rohdenburg's 'The Complexity Principle at Work with Rival Prepositions' (*ELL* 24[2020] 769–800). Rohdenburg suggests that the Complexity Principle, i.e. the idea that more explicit expressions are preferred in more cognitively complex environments (cf. *YWES* 99[2020] 38), can often account for the choice between English rival prepositions like *on* and *upon*. Using a large ModE corpus, he carries out a number of case studies guided by this principle. Among other environments investigated, the passive is found to favour more 'explicit' prepositions (e.g. *into*, *onto*, *upon*) when alternatives are available.

Two papers deal with negation. Morgan Macleod's 'Postverbal Negation and the Lexical Split of *Not*' (*ELL* 24[2020] 667–85) looks at *not* occurring after lexical verbs in the twentieth-century section of the Hansard Corpus (i.e.

parliamentary texts). The results show a decrease in the first half of the century, and in the second half, an increase (whose importance we feel is somewhat overstated by the author). Macleod claims that this use is productive and proposes it is due to a lexical split between the negator *not* and an adverb *not*. Susagna Tubau's 'The Assymetric Behavior of English Negative Quantifiers in Negative Sentences' (*JL* 56[2020] 775–806) provides a Minimalist analysis to explain the unexpected behaviour of negative objects in several semantic tests; for instance, negative objects occur with a negative tag question instead of an expected positive one (*John read nothing, didn't he?*). She proposes that there are two grammars, corresponding to two positions for sentential negation; in one grammar, negation is inside the domain relevant for tag questions; in the other it is not, resulting in an unexpected negative tag.

In the verbal domain, Astrid De Wit, Peter Petré, and Frank Brisard explain the idea of 'Standing Out with the Progressive' (*JL* 56[2020] 479–514). The authors argue, on the basis of several corpus investigations, that the progressive, most notably in English, Dutch, and French, is used to express 'extravagance'. They argue that the use of the progressive in order 'to stand out' is not new, but that this notion of expressing something non-obvious is at the core of the semantics of the progressive (see also Section 6). Elena Martínez Caro and Jorge Arús-Hita consider the use of 'Give as a Light Verb' (*FuL* 27[2020] 280–306). Their BNC case study describes frequencies, as well as semantic and syntactic characteristics (e.g. the dominance of past tense, types of modification). They also discuss discourse and interactional factors that may influence the use of *give*, such as placing a nominal element in focus position and creating a hedging effect. Thomas Berg, Tim Zingler, and Arne Lohmann, in 'The Range of Linguistic Units: Distance Effects in English Mandative Subjunctive Constructions' (*JL* 56[2020] 231–68), analyse the variation between *demand* *that he resign*, *demand* *that he should resign*, and *demand* *that he resigns* in COCA, with the subjunctive and indicative described as morphological options and the modal as a syntactic option. Their case study shows that the subjunctive is the most frequent option overall, but they find that larger distance (the range) between the trigger (such as *demand*) and the verb in the complement clause increases the choice of the modal over both the subjunctive and indicative, and that it increases the choice of indicative over subjunctive. They relate the notion of range to a hierarchical organization of language (focusing on language production), where the syntactic domain is at a higher level and so has a wider range than, for instance, morphology.

A monograph by Charlotte Maekelberghe, entitled *The Present-Day English Gerund System: A Cognitive-Constructionist Account*, aims to present a comprehensive account of the gerund by including both nominal and verbal gerunds and analysing both formal and functional aspects. After a short introduction, chapter 2 highlights relevant earlier studies and presents the theoretical underpinnings, combining Cognitive Grammar and CxG. Chapter 3 describes the dataset of 1,600 gerunds compiled from BNC and COCA. In chapter 4, the author proposes a model of referentiality which considers specificity, definiteness, and event conceptualization as independent layers. On the basis of this model, her corpus study provides a fine-grained referential analysis of English gerunds (although without a separate investigation of interaction between the factors), resulting in a cline

from nominal to verbal gerunds. An important finding is that two subtypes of verbal gerunds show nominal features. Chapter 5 presents another fine-grained analysis, of aspect, including both Aktionsart (all types occur, although states are rare) and viewpoint (most gerunds are neutral rather than (un)bounded). The data also show that aspect is largely determined by the lexico-grammatical context rather than the *-ing* form. Chapter 6 looks at indefinite nominal gerunds, both diachronically and synchronically, suggesting that the indefinite is best seen as a particularization. The study in chapter 7, a collocational analysis of the semantics of the gerund, has been discussed previously (YWES 100[2021] 25). In chapter 8, the author combines all findings in two statistical models, one of which shows nominal gerunds as a clearly defined group and verbal gerunds as more heterogeneous, while the other shows that control by the matrix clause—but not aspect—is an important factor in determining the choice between nominal and verbal gerunds. The book ends with a rather short conclusion. It may be difficult in such a well-researched area to provide new insights, but this book critically engages with the previous literature to test previous hypotheses and unresolved questions, while also refining the methodological tools.

In the following, we will discuss contributions about nouns and noun phrases. Grzegorz Drożdż's 'New Insights into English Count and Mass Nouns—the Cognitive Grammar Perspective' (ELL 24[2020] 833–54) investigates count-to-mass and mass-to-noun changes of sixty nouns in COCA. Working within a Cognitive Grammar framework, the author finds regularities in the nouns' basic and extended senses and formulates patterns at different levels of schematicity. Junyan Lu and Haitao Liu ask 'Do English Noun Phrases Tend to Minimize Dependency Distance?' (AJL 40[2020] 246–62); the goal of their study is to adapt a measure for calculating dependency distance at the clause level to a measure for calculating dependency at the phrase level. Their results, based on examples from *The Washington Post*, show that pre-modifiers are closer to the head noun than post-modifiers.

Ayano Watanabe and Yoko Iyeiri are the authors of 'Explaining the Variability of Adjective Comparatives and Superlatives: Entering the Twenty-First Century' (WORD 66[2020] 71–97). Using a corpus of articles from the *Daily Mail* and the *Independent*, they study variation in the comparative and superlative forms of seventeen disyllabic adjectives, such as *costly*, *bitter*, *robust*, and *simple*. The variables investigated include final segment, syntactic function (attributive, predicative, postmodifying), and the presence of *than* in the case of comparatives. The authors' findings largely confirm those of earlier studies, but several differences between the individual lexical items are noted. Kelli Hesseltine and Joseph Davis examine 'The Communicative Function of Adjective-Noun Order in English' (WORD 66[2020] 166–93). The authors hypothesize that Adjective-Noun order (*long hair*) is semantically different from Noun-Adjective order (*hair long*), with the former expressing expected information and the latter being used for emphasis. They describe different types of examples of what they call weaker and stronger characterization, but do not specify the dataset that they use, nor do they provide any frequency counts. Due to this somewhat impressionistic approach, they disregard many basic grammatical factors; at the same time, they do discuss various random factors in their discussion of individual examples.

On articles, there is Heidi Klockmann's Minimalist account of 'The Article *a(n)* in English Quantifying Expressions: A Default Marker of Cardinality' (*Glossa* 5:i[2020] <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1151>). The quantifying expressions with *a(n)* she examines are pseudopartitives (*a bunch of*), article-requiring (*a few*) expressions, and article-free ones which do take *a(n)* when they are modified (a surprising thirty). She discusses their properties, backed up by examples from COCA and native-speaker judgements. The key point in her analysis is that quantifying *a(n)* is not truly an article, but a default marker of cardinality which has little further semantic content.

The topic of Yolanda Fernández-Pena's monograph *Reconciling Synchrony, Diachrony and Usage in Verb Number Agreement with Complex Collective Subjects* is the variation between singular and plural verb agreement following complex collective subjects, i.e. collective nouns followed by *of* and an 'oblique' noun. The study aims to shed light on the factors determining this variation. Following an introduction, the literature review in chapter 2 defines complex collective subjects and discusses earlier accounts of agreement from a range of perspectives. Chapter 3 provides a study of seven selected nouns in COHA (the selection of these specific nouns could have been explained more clearly); each of these nouns behaves differently in terms of agreement, frequency, and modification, but all have a quantifying meaning in addition to their original lexical meaning. While COHA is an attractive data source because of its size, one might wonder whether the period it covers is not too late for the topic investigated. Chapter 4 turns to the study of relevant collective nouns in the PDE corpora COCA and BNC, twenty-one in total. The chapter begins with a long list of variables that were annotated, both linguistic and extra-linguistic. The regression analyses show that the choice of collective noun has the strongest effect on agreement. The author discusses all other factors in quite some detail too (for instance, animacy, countability, and complexity); she also includes collostructional analyses of the collective noun, the 'oblique' noun, and the verb. The final aspect addressed is regional variation. Chapter 5 provides a brief conclusion. The author explicitly states that she wants to provide a descriptive, usage-based account instead of strictly working within the framework of one or more theoretical accounts. While this is a valid aim, the effect is that the study is mostly exploratory in nature or simply confirms earlier findings, and there are no clear conclusions—even though there is plenty of opportunity to test specific hypotheses from previous research.

A number of contributions focus on specific constructions and their use in discourse. Reijirou Shibasaki's 'From Parataxis to Amalgamation' investigates 'The Emergence of the Sentence-final *Is All* Construction in the History of American English' (in Bech and Möhlig-Falke, eds., pp. 211–47), i.e. the pattern *It's in a bad neighborhood, is all*, which appears in AmE in the early twentieth century. José Antonio Sánchez Fajardo looks at expressions of the type 'Don't you *ma'am* me!', providing 'A Construction-Based Analysis of the Schema "Don't You V Me" Expressing Disapproval in English' (*NJEL* 19[2020] 322–49). The examples for analysis were excerpted from a corpus of movie and TV dialogues. Another CxG-based study is Bert Cappelle's '*Not on My Watch* and Similar *Not-Fragments*: Stored Forms with Pragmatic Content' (*ALH* 52[2020] 217–39), which discusses various aspects of *not on my watch*, *not in a million years*, and

similar emphatic negative expressions. From a syntactic perspective, an interesting point is that these function as single units, as shown by their ability to trigger auxiliary inversion: *Not on my watch is this going to happen to me* (COCA). Finally, Ulrike Stange investigates the pattern ‘Holding Grudges Is So Last Century’ in a paper on ‘The Use of GenX *so* as a Modifier of Noun Phrases’ (JEL 48[2020] 107–36). Also using a corpus of TV dialogues, Stange looks at a recent use of *so*, which she analyses as an emphatic marker stressing the truth value of the proposition (‘definitely’). It is used more frequently by female characters in the corpus, but whether this reflects an actual gender difference or the screenwriters’ stereotypes is a topic for future research.

Three papers deal with relativization in PDE. ‘Factor Analysis on Subject Relativizer Alternation’ (ES 101[2020] 214–41) by Wonseok Kim and Seok-Chae Rhee investigates the variation between *wh*-pronouns and *that* in restrictive relative clauses in the ICE-GB corpus. Various linguistic and extralinguistic factors are considered, and the authors propose a kind of decision tree which may help EFL students choose the right relativizer. Not all analytical choices are equally clear, however; for instance, some of the examples given seem to us to be nonrestrictive relative clauses. It is also a pity that the authors do not discuss how their findings supplement those of Douglas Biber et al., *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* [1999], chapter 8, or of Lars Hinrichs et al., ‘Which-Hunting and the Standard English Relative Clause’ (*Language* 91[2015] 806–36). Another contribution on relativizers is Julia Bacskai-Atkari’s ‘Changes Affecting Relative Clauses in Late Modern English’ (in Kytö and Smitherberg, eds., pp. 91–115). This chapter compares the use of relativizers in the King James Bible (1769 version—it is unclear to us why the original was not used) and the New King James Version (1989). The findings, for instance that the language of the King James Bible (KJB) allows *which* with human antecedents, are largely in agreement with earlier scholarship. Bacskai-Atkari also discusses the use of *as* in ‘equative’ relative clauses after *such* (*all such as are appointed to destruction* ‘all those who are...’, Prov [KJB] 31:8). Sara S. Loss and Mark Wicklund, ask ‘Is English Resumption Different in Appositive Relative Clauses?’ (CJL 65[2020] 25–51) and present an experimental study in which they investigate the acceptability of resumptive pronouns in appositive (i.e. nonrestrictive) relative clauses, such as *My name is Pan, which I don’t like it so much*. Resumptive pronouns are more acceptable in appositive than in restrictive relative clauses, but less acceptable than gaps. The authors also comment on a second use of *which*, not as a relative pronoun but a type of connective, which they argue to be an ongoing change, illustrated with examples from COCA.

Several papers address specific types of clauses, providing an analysis within a particular theoretical framework. Jos Tellings, in ‘An Analysis of *All*-Clefts’ (*Glossa* 5:i[2020] <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1092>), describes the semantic and syntactic properties of *all*-clefts (e.g. *All I ate for dinner was a salad*), with one typical characteristic being the expression of ‘smallness’. He then presents a generative analysis, comprising three key points: the *all*-clause is headed by *all* (i.e. it is not a free relative), the *all*-clause involves syntactic movement, and the cleft is derived from a main clause with *only*. Another paper on a specific type of clause is ‘On the Status of *wh*-Exclamatives in English’ (*FuL* 27[2020] 207–33) by Bernd Heine, Gunther Kaltenböck, and Tania Kuteva. After describing the

properties of *wh*-exclamatives with *how* and *what* (e.g. *How wonderful this journey is*) and their relation to other clause types, the authors present a Discourse Grammar analysis. The central claim is that these exclamatives are the result of cooptation, where the source (complement *wh*-clauses) becomes thetical—a form of insubordination where a subordinate clause is used independently, with a specific discourse function. In “‘What and Then a Little Robot Brings it to You?’ The Reactive *What-x* Construction in Spoken Dialogue’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 307–32), Nele Pöldvere and Carita Paradis present a CxG analysis of the so-called ‘reactive *what-x*’ construction, which they claim has not been described before, on the basis of data from the London Lund Corpus–2 (LLC–2). They identify three different types of requests in the forty-five examples and argue that sequential and prosodic info should be included in a CxG analysis. Finally, Craig Sailor’s ‘Rethinking “Residual” Verb Second’ (in Rebecca Woods and Sam Wolfe, eds., *Rethinking Verb Second*, pp. 126–49) describes the properties of what he calls ‘*fuck*-inversion’, as in *They’re all wearing kilts, but will I fuck be wearing one of them*, a phenomenon specific to BrE. He argues this is a recent innovation and provides a Minimalist analysis, with the key point that it is a type of verb-second (despite its surface verb-first order) with a non-overt negative operator in initial position. The author also argues that, because of innovations like this, PDE should not be described as a residual V2 language but rather a partial V2 language.

We now turn to textbooks. *English Syntax: A Minimalist Account of Structure and Variation* by Elspeth Edelstein, which is aimed at advanced students, is written in an accessible way, explains topics clearly (for instance, the author uses interesting metaphors to explain abstract concepts), and has a logical build-up in complexity. The length of the textbook is appropriate, with an adequate range of topics and level of detail. Examples have also been chosen well, with many being thematically related. An interesting aspect is the focus on non-standard forms—each chapter considers one non-standard feature (e.g. double negation, modal doubling) which plays a role in structuring the discussion. Following an introductory chapter, chapters 2–4 focus on the Verb Phrase: chapter 2 presents the basic transitive VP, chapter 3 extends the VP in order to include ditransitive verbs, and chapter 4 presents further extensions to accounting for auxiliaries, as well as (re)considering the position of the subject. Chapter 5 introduces the CP-layer by discussing embedded complementizer clauses, main-clause questions, and relative clauses. Chapter 6 looks at negation, while chapter 7 looks at non-finite complements. Chapters 8 turns the attention to nouns and determiners and chapter 9 to adjectives and adverbs. Chapter 10 rounds the book off with a discussion of variation and how it fits into a Minimalist model. Each chapter ends with exercises and suggestions for further reading. The book also contains an elaborate glossary. Throughout the book, the author focuses on careful syntactic argumentation and explicitly compares Minimalist syntax to earlier versions of generative syntax, which allows students to relate the content to other syntactic literature (for more on this volume see Section 9).

Syntactic Constructions in English by Jong-Bok Kim and Laura A. Michaelis is a comprehensive introduction to Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCxG). This framework builds on HPSG and CxG and thus unites insights from constraint-based generative grammar with more recent constructional approaches. This is clearly reflected in this textbook, which presents SBCxG as a logical

continuation of—rather than a break with—the generative tradition (though the authors repeatedly stress how their own analyses differ from transformational approaches). The book consists of twelve chapters. The first three introduce the SBCxG approach to grammar and various core concepts, such as lexical and phrasal categories, semantic roles, and syntactic functions. Chapters 4 and 5 deal with the fundamentals of English phrase and clause structure, introducing such concepts as heads, specifiers, lexical features, argument-structure constructions, and selectional restrictions. The SBCxG formalism is gradually introduced and elaborated throughout these chapters. The remainder of the book treats various constructions: nominals and different kinds of agreement; raising and control constructions; auxiliaries and ‘related constructions’ (the analysis of the infinitive marker *to* as an auxiliary verb is adopted from HPSG); passives; interrogative constructions (including ‘indirect questions’); relative clauses; and finally cleft, extraposition, and *tough* constructions. Each chapter concludes with a short summary and a number of exercises. This is a well-written textbook, though definitely one better suited for more advanced students. (The suggestion in the blurb that it is ‘ideal’ for self-study certainly seems too optimistic to us.) It should also be noted that it works primarily as an introduction to the SBCxG framework, not a general introduction to English grammar. For this purpose, one of the other recent textbooks on the market might be better suited (see e.g. *YWES* 96[2017] 12–14; *YWES* 100[2021] 19). We also wish to mention another work arguing for a SBCxG approach, ‘Lessons from the English Auxiliary System’ (*JL* 56[2020] 87–155), which is co-authored by Ivan A. Sag, Rui P. Chaves, Anne Abeillé, Bruno Estigarribia, Dan Flickinger, Paul Kay, Laura A. Michaelis, Stefan Müller, Geoffrey K. Pullum, Frank Van Eynde, and Thomas Wasow. The paper presents a detailed constructional analysis of the English auxiliary system, which the authors argue is superior to mainstream generative approaches for several reasons, such as the absence of transformations and a more principled treatment of lexical idiosyncrasies.

Two textbooks were published in 2020 that are aimed at non-linguists, advocating that greater insight into syntactic structures will make students better writers. The first is *Exploring Grammar Through Texts: Reading and Writing the Structure of English* by Cornelia Paraskevas. This is a concise and accessible textbook, which covers a lot of ground in enough detail nonetheless. It can perhaps best be described as a ‘grammar for writing’ book: treatment of grammatical terminology and features is geared towards students being able to apply it in their own academic writing. Nevertheless, it has a strong linguistic basis in various frameworks, which not all general grammar and writing books have. It is aimed at native speakers of American English (one particularly interesting effect of this is that *which* is not listed as a possible pronoun for restrictive relative clauses); as a result, the book simply describes grammatical principles and does not address errors as such, but rather is genre-based, in that it describes which features are typical of academic texts and which are not. Although non-native speakers may need more guidance with grammar, the book would still be helpful for them. The setup of the book is straightforward: after some basic terminology in chapter 1, chapters 2–4 discuss the building blocks of sentences (function words, content words, phrases) and chapters 5–7 discuss sentence structure (dependent clauses, non-finite clauses, and types of sentences). Chapters 8 and 9 are geared

most specifically to writing, with chapter 8 discussing various aspects of information-packaging (focus, given-new, theme-rheme) and chapter 9 giving an overview of basic principles of punctuation. Each chapter ends with short exercises (to test and to apply knowledge), which use text fragments rather than isolated sentences. Although the focus is on written texts, the examples in the text also include spoken fragments; the examples themselves contain authentic material from a small range of sources, which creates a nice consistency throughout the book.

Another book whose aim is described as giving students the syntactic tools to become better writers is *Adventures in English Syntax* by Robert Freidin. The book has a less obvious structure, with each chapter focusing on the discussion of one (seemingly randomly chosen) example sentence. It unpacks each sentence and along the way addresses various aspects of syntactic structure, such as the conflict between hierarchical order and linear order and the ambiguity arising from different possible structural analyses of a sentence. The first few chapters mainly focus on aspects of phrasal structure (such as coordination) and general principles of language and syntax, while later chapters focus more on clausal structure (such as relative clauses and questions)—although identifying specific topics per chapter is difficult because of the thematic approach. In addition to the syntactic analysis, several chapters contain a discussion of prescriptivist rules about language (such as split infinitives, *that/which*), which are dissected at length and dismissed (including extensive criticism on example sentences in style guides, which we thought an odd choice). The book is strongly rooted in generative grammar (functional projections like C and T are introduced, as well as operations such as Merge; texts by Chomsky regularly feature as examples) and does not really acknowledge other theoretical frameworks, which we think is an unfortunate choice for a book aimed at non-linguists. The example sentences are discussed in extensive and technical detail, which makes the book less suitable for the audience of non-linguists it is aimed at. For us, it is unclear what the aim of the book is: it is not a textbook on syntax, systematically teaching students about syntactic analysis; neither is it a writing book, because the specific writing topics discussed do not provide the scope for more generalizable advice about or practice with writing skills (many excellent textbooks on writing already exist which do this more effectively). In that sense, the title is apt, representing the meandering nature of the book.

(b) Earlier English

Cynthia Allen's 'Case and Preposition Stranding in Old English Free Relatives' (*NOWELE* 73[2020] 193–220) studies the syntax of OE free relatives of the type & *nam þæt he on læg* 'and took what he lay on' (Luke 5:25). The investigation aims to identify the principles of case selection in the relativizers and their behaviour with respect to prepositions. Allen shows that when the matrix and relative clause require different cases, *wh*-relatives (e.g. *hwæt*, *hwylc*) receive the case required by the relative clause, whereas demonstrative relatives (*se* and its case forms) occasionally appear with the case required by the matrix clause. Both preposition stranding and 'pied piping' are attested with the two types of

relativizers, but Allen considers the possibility that some of the examples may be due to Latin influence. Also on relative clauses, Robert Truswell and Nikolas Gisborne go ‘*Which*-Hunting in Medieval England’ (*CJL* 65[2020] 326–49). They use a test from PDE formal semantics to distinguish between nonrestrictive and restrictive meanings of relative clauses in various parsed corpora from OE until eModE: nonrestrictive relatives must have a referential antecedent and cannot occur with *no*, *few*, *little*, *each*, or *every*. They show that from ME onwards *what* specializes for free relatives and *which* for headed relatives. Of this second group, bare-headed *which*-relatives can be restrictive or nonrestrictive, but headed *which*-relatives with an NP complement are always nonrestrictive.

Maciej Grabski investigates ‘Three Types of Old English Adjectival Postposition’, arguing for ‘A Corpus-Based Construction Grammar Approach’ (*JEL* 48[2020] 166–98). Using the YCOE, Grabski analyses the semantic and syntactic properties of postnominal adjectives in OE, distinguishing four (rather than three) main types: N + Adj (*an reaf ungerydelic*), N + Adj + complement (*cempa uncuð us eallum*), Adj + N + Adj (*rice men hæpne*), and Adj + N + *and* + Adj (*hefige synne & myccele*). According to Grabski’s analysis, these were separate constructions with distinct functions. For instance, the N + Adj pattern generally only occurs in the corpus with so-called stage-level adjectives, whereas the Adj + N + Adj construction is used for ‘hierarchical’ modification. Also on NP structure in OE, Kristin Bech’s ‘Contextualizing Old English Noun Phrases’ (in Bech and Möhlig-Falke, eds., pp. 15–48) focuses on NPs with two adjectives. These may show either the order Adj + N + *and* + Adj (one adjective postnominal) or the order Adj + *and* + Adj + N (both adjectives prenominal). Carrying out close readings of such complex NPs in *Cura Pastoralis* and the *West-Saxon Gospels*, Bech points out that the choice between the two patterns was less principled than previous analyses have assumed. She also briefly discusses the variation between pre- and postnominal present participles in the *Cura Pastoralis*, arguing that postnominal position was used for more ‘adverbial’ participles. Another aspect of NP structure in OE is examined by Anna Cichosz and Maciej Grabski, investigating ‘The Position of the Genitive in Old English Prose’ and focusing especially on ‘Intertextual Differences and the Role of Latin’ (*FLH* 41[2020] 1–35). They also include other well-known factors described in the literature, such as weight and animacy of the possessor. The results of their analysis of examples in YCOE, including a regression analysis, confirm the influence of modification, weight, and animacy (which are strongest if they work together), and crucially show extensive variation between individual texts. The influence of Latin is not straightforward but present; in this respect, too, individual texts behave differently.

Two papers address valency in early English. Richard Ingham demonstrates ‘How Contact with French Drove Patient-Lability in English’ (*TPS* 118[2020] 447–67). Using data from dictionaries, Ingham compares the number of labile verbs in change-of-state and change-of-location verbs in OE, Anglo-Norman, and Old Norse. He proposes that the large increase in labile verbs between OE and ME is due to French influence—this increase not only occurred in borrowed verbs, but increased lability also extended to native verbs. Luisa García García’s ‘The Basic Valency Orientation of Old English and the Causative *ja*-Formation: A Synchronic and Diachronic Approach’ (*ELL* 24 [2020] 153–77) reconsiders

the basic valency of OE, and the role of the causative *ja*-formation in assessing this basic valency. She concludes that while causative *ja*-formation is no longer productive in OE, OE nevertheless still is a transitivity language (i.e. intransitivity is basic and transitivity is coded); at the same time, some verbs have already become labile in OE, a process which is continued in later periods.

Øystein Imerslund Heggelund's 'Intertextual Variation in Old and Middle English' (*ES* 101[2020] 273–83) studies subordinate-clause word order in ten late Old English (IOE) and eME texts. As the title of the paper suggests, Heggelund observes significant differences between individual texts within each period. For instance, verb-final order is significantly more frequent in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (47 per cent) than in the *Blickling Homilies* (33 per cent). Heggelund suggests that the development from OE to ME was more gradual than is often assumed, and that the dramatic changes observed in some studies are due to overreliance on a small number of texts or editions (e.g. Ælfric's homilies) which may not be representative of the period as a whole. Zooming in on a more specific type of word-order variation in OE subordinate clauses, Tara Struik and Ans van Kemenade, in 'On the Givenness of OV Word Order: A (Re)examination of OV/VO Variation in Old English' (*ELL* 24[2020] 1–22), examine the effect of weight and information status on the variation between verb-object and object-verb order. Their regression analysis, based on annotated data from the YCOE, shows that both weight and information status predict word order to a large extent: preverbal objects are overwhelmingly given, while postverbal subjects are either given or new; in addition, longer objects are also more likely to occur postverbally. They conclude that OE word order is best analysed as underlyingly VO, with OV derived in the case of a given object. Another contribution on OE objects, but in main clauses, is Chiara De Bastiani and Roland Hinterhölzl's 'On the Syntax of Object Pronouns in Old English and Early Middle English' (*Glossa* 5:i[2020] <https://doi.org/10.5334/gigl.890>), which investigates the distribution of object pronouns in OE and eME. Focusing on three positions—left periphery, pre-verbal, and post-verbal—they examine distributional, prosodic, and information-structural (in terms of types of topic) factors. Their main argument is that the left periphery position is a derived position, with a clear information-structural profile, whereas the preverbal position is unmarked, with a more mixed information-structural profile; in eME the postverbal position starts to become the unmarked position.

Also on objects but only in clause-initial position, Eric Haeberli, Susan Pintzuk, and Ann Taylor examine 'Object Pronoun Fronting and the Nature of Verb Second in Early English' (in Woods and Wolfe, eds., 396–425). They compare OE and eME to true V2 languages such as German in terms of V2 properties, focusing on the question whether OE has a default fronting process, called Formal Movement, which true V2 languages have. They find that not all fronted object pronouns in their corpus study are contrastive, which they take as evidence that there is indeed default fronting in OE. They also point out, however, that OE object fronting can be explained without reference to default fronting. Also looking at clause-initial elements and inversion, Anna Cichosz focuses on 'Negation and Verb-Initial Order in Old English Main Clauses' (*JEngL* 48[2020] 355–81) and compares negative inversion, a verb-initial negated main clause, and so-called 'narrative inversion', a verb-initial non-negated main clause. She first

analyses the lexical, pragmatic, and textual factors that determine the choice between V1 and other word orders in negated clauses in YCOE and subsequently compares negative and narrative inversion with respect to subject and verb type; the author concludes that in CxG terms, these are two independent constructions.

A paper by Ans van Kemenade and Meta Links addresses ‘Discourse Particles in Early English’ and considers ‘Clause Structure, Pragmatics and Discourse Management’ (*Glossa* 5:i[2020] <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1020>). The authors define the discourse particles under investigation, *þa*, *þonne*, and *nu*, as grammatical, rather than lexical words, which have a fixed position in the clause. Based on data from YCOE, they argue that the discourse particles have a pragmatic meaning that is related to the clause type in which they occur, as well as a discourse-cohesive function in that they separate given from new information.

Two papers address types of subordinate clauses in earlier English. Richard Zimmermann’s paper, ‘Testing Causal Associations in Language Change’, discusses ‘The Replacement of Subordinating *Then* with *When* in Middle English’ (*JHSyn* 4[2020] Art. 4, 1–59). He first provides data on the replacement of *then* with *when* in subordinate temporal adverbial clauses, and tests two specific hypotheses in order to determine whether this change can be attributed to the loss of subject-verb inversion in main clauses after *þa*. The data confirm the plausibility of this causal factor, with the loss of inversion predating the increase in *when*, and fewer occurrences of *when* (i.e. continued use of *then*) in the presence of alternative subordinating strategies, such as correlatives, doublings, and overt complementizers. Another paper with a strong focus on methodological considerations is Maria José López-Couso and Belén Méndez-Naya’s ‘Masked by Annotation: Minor Declarative Complementizers in Parsed Corpora of Historical English’ (*RiCL* 8:ii[2020] 133–58). The authors examine how clauses in which an adverbial subordinator introduces a finite declarative complement clause are annotated in the Penn Parsed Corpora of Historical English. They point out that these complement clauses are parsed in these corpora as adverbial clauses, which makes the phenomenon of minor declarative complementizers hard to investigate.

The volume *Studies in Linguistic Variation and Change* 3, edited by Fabienne Toupin, Sylvain Gatelais, and Ileana Sasu, contains a few contributions on medieval English syntax. Raffaella Baechler’s ‘The Distribution of the Definite Article in Early Middle English: Explaining the Variation’ (pp. 41–85) investigates the syntactic contexts of different forms of the definite article in three thirteenth-century texts, the Lambeth Homilies, *Vices and Virtues* (Stowe 34), and the *Otho Brut*. In some respects the texts continue the OE system (e.g. ACC.SG.MASC *þane*), in others they show innovative developments, such as the frequent use of *þan* (< *þæm*) after prepositions but not necessarily in historical DAT contexts. Fuyo Osawa’s ‘What the Emergent DP Brought About: The Emergence of the Double Object Construction’ (pp. 89–110) proposes a causal relation between the development of the Determiner Phrase and the syntactic structure of the ModE double object construction, whereas Harumasa Miyashita and Hisao Tokizaki argue for a connection between ‘Word Order Change, Stress Shift, and Old French Loanwords in Middle English’ (pp. 111–31). Specifically, the authors suggest that OV order is more compatible with initial word stress, and that ME developed VO order because of the influx of Old French loans with final stress. While this

is an intriguing idea, we fail to see how the authors' case study of *Ancrene Wisse* and the Katherine Group proves it to be 'diachronically valid' (p. 125). (We also note in passing that the North Germanic languages developed VO order without a comparable influx of Old French loanwords.) Finally, the chapter by Yana Chankova discusses the 'Information Structural Effects on DOS [i.e. direct object scrambling] Constructions' (pp. 153–75) in OE and Old Icelandic (OIceI) from a minimalist perspective. Some of these contributions should be of interest to scholars working on the topics in question, but apart from the focus on English there is little that ties these proceedings together.

Two short contributions look at ME syntactic details. Ayumi Miura's 'Emendation of *he þis* in *York Plays* XXX 112' (*N&Q* 67[2020] 350–1) points out that the rare construction *he þis* 'this man' has been incorrectly emended to *here is* in editions of the *York Plays*, apparently because the editors were unaware of this pattern. Michiko Ogura's '"Begin + (To) + Infinitive": Additional Evidence' (*N&Q* 67[2020] 301–3) provides examples and counts of various intransitive verbs (e.g. *(be)gin* and *take to*) in three eME texts, the *Ormulum* and the two versions of *Lazamon's Brut*.

English agreement is placed in a comparative perspective in 'A Diachronic and Areal Typology of Agreement in Germanic' (*STUF* 73[2020] 219–60) by Magnus Breder Birkenes, Jürg Fleischer, and Stephanie Leser-Cronau. The authors compare the prevalence of agreement (e.g. on verbs and determiners) across parallel versions of the same gospel text in several Germanic (Gmc) languages. English is represented by the West Saxon gospels, the Wycliffite translation, the King James Version, and the New International Version [2011]. An interesting finding is that already in OE, there is less agreement than in the other medieval Gmc languages Old High German (OHG) and ON, suggesting that considerable morphological simplification had already taken place in English before contact with Scandinavian and Anglo-Norman.

The development of intensifiers continues to inspire new work. James M. Stratton presents 'A Diachronic Analysis of the Adjective Intensifier *Well* from Early Modern English to Present Day English' (*CJL* 65[2020] 216–45). *Well* as an intensifier is sometimes thought to have died out in ME and to have been 'revived' in contemporary BrE. Using a selection of 'speech-related' corpora and dialectal sources, Stratton shows that while *well* disappeared as a productive intensifier in early modern London English—the Old Bailey Corpus only has examples of fixed expressions like *well aware*—it is attested in several dialectal sources in the period (e.g. *well hard*, *well drunk*). He then discusses whether the contemporary intensifier *well* is an entirely new development or might have re-entered the standard language from more peripheral dialects. On intensifiers in ME, there is Belén Méndez-Naya's 'The Intensifier System of the *Ormulum* and the Interplay of Micro-Level and Macro-Level Contexts in Linguistic Change' (in Bech and Möhlig-Falke, eds., 93–124). Méndez-Naya presents a detailed overview of intensifiers in this important eME text, considering both the linguistic ('micro-level') context and the sociolinguistic ('macro-level') situation, i.e. language contact. The most frequent intensifiers in the text are *full*, *all*, *þwerret ut*, and *swipe*. The third of these, which is extremely rare in other ME texts, was probably an innovation in Orm's local dialect, repurposing an ON loanword on the model of OE *purhut*. Other possible ON influences are also discussed.

Tracing a longer and more recent trajectory of intensifiers, Zeltia Blanco-Suárez's '*Mortal Hurry and Mortal Fine: On the Rise of Intensifying Mortal*' (SN 92[2020] 271–92) examines the history of the intensifying use of the adjective and adverb *mortal* in various corpora and electronic sources from ME onwards, and argues that the increase in intensifying uses represents a case of grammaticalization, although the descriptive meaning continues to dominate for the adjective. In 'Grammar in Context: On the Role of Hypercharacterization in Language Variation and Change' (in Bech and Möhlig-Falke, eds., pp. 333–64), María José López-Couso explores three examples of grammatical redundancy or 'hypercharacterization' in the history of English: 'strengthened' subordinators like OE *þa þa* and ME/ModE *an(d) if* and *like as if*; resumptive pronouns in subject extraction contexts, as in *For þese þat God woot þat shal be saved...* (*Wycliffite Sermons*); and the co-occurrence of *there* and another locative expression, which according to López-Couso was a crucial factor in the development of existential *there*. She concludes that such phenomena should be taken seriously as a locus for linguistic change, even if they may appear 'redundant' from a synchronic point of view.

Three of the contributions to *Crossing Linguistic Boundaries*, edited by Paloma Núñez-Pertejo, María José López-Couso, Belén Méndez-Naya, and Javier Pérez-Guerra, deal with English historical syntax. Nikolaus Ritt, Andreas Baumann, and Christina Prömer look at 'The Fall and Rise of English *any*' (pp. 61–79), focusing on an apparent 'dip' in frequency in the eME period. They attribute this to competition between *any* and the emergent indefinite article. Kristin Davidse and An Van linden are the authors of 'Revisiting "It-Extraposition": The Historical Development of Constructions with Matrices (*It*)/(*There*) *Be* + Noun Phrase Followed by a Complement Clause' (pp. 81–103). They investigate the development of constructions like predicative *it was a wonder* + *that*-clause and existential *there was no doubt* + *that*-clause from OE to PDE, arguing (*pace* the tradition) that the two types are variants of a single overarching construction. This entails the rejection of the 'extraposition' analysis of the predicative structures. Finally, Diana M. Lewis's 'Grammaticalizing Adverbs in English: The Case of *still*' (pp. 127–49) looks at the syntactic and semantic development of *still*. This adverb has a range of related functions, including temporal (*still asleep*), comparative (*still better*), concessive (*My smart school still failed me; The Guardian* [2004]), and evaluative ones (... *but still*). Lewis traces the evolution of these functions from eModE to the present day, interpreting the developments in terms of subjectification. Another contribution on a specific adverb is 'Bridging Contexts in the Reanalysis of *naturally* as a Sentence Adverb: A Corpus Study' by Dagmar Haumann and Kristin Killie (in Bech and Möhlig-Falke, eds., pp. 191–220). The authors focus on the development of *naturally* as a sentence adverb in eModE and IModE, specifically the role of 'bridging contexts' between the older meaning ('by nature') and the innovative use ('of course'). They argue that the relevant context was copular clauses like *People are naturally shy of doing this* (p. 216), where the older meaning could easily be reinterpreted. Corpus data on the use of *naturally* in copular clauses are given, showing that it was used as a sentence adverb as early as the sixteenth century, but that this use became much more frequent in the nineteenth century.

The volume *Nodes and Networks in Diachronic Construction Grammar*, edited by Lotte Sommerer and Elena Smirnova, has a strong theoretical focus, but most of the chapters incorporate data studies of specific English phenomena; these are discussed here. As Smirnova and Sommerer explain in the substantial introductory chapter (pp. 1–42), diachronic CxG poses some specific questions to CxG, especially how change in nodes and networks should be understood and formalized. The chapter by Susanne Flach, ‘Constructionalization and the Sorites Paradox: The Emergence of the *into*-Causative’ (pp. 45–67) examines constructional change in the *into*-causative (*They talked him into complying with the rules*), most importantly based on data from the Penn Parsed Corpus of Early Modern English (PPCEME) and EEBO. Specifically, she traces related earlier patterns, such as *into* followed by NPs and nominal *-ing* forms—a stage which she calls constructional emergence—leading up to the actual constructionalization in the late seventeenth century, which she defines as the point of creation of a new form-and-meaning pair. In her chapter, Lotte Sommerer addresses ‘Constructionalization, Constructional Competition and Constructional Death’ by ‘Investigating the Demise of Old English POSS DEM Constructions’ (pp. 69–103). Her data from YCOE show that the co-occurrence of possessive and demonstrative forms within one NP (*his þone nehstan*) is already rare in OE and decreases further; an effect of Latin is not statistically relevant. She then describes the constructional family and proposes that a new construction (definite article + noun) causes this infrequent option to disappear from the language. Florent Perck, in ‘Productivity and Schematicity in Constructional Change’ (pp. 141–66) uses a case study in COHA of the *way* construction with *into* (*We pushed our way into the pub*) to examine the relation between schematicity (the level of abstraction) and productivity. The data show an increase in the types of (metaphorical) situations described by *way into*, and he argues only the lowest level of schematicity, lexical slots, is related to productivity. Michael Percillier’s chapter is titled ‘Allostructions, Homonstructions or a Constructional Family? Changes in the Network of Secondary Predicate Constructions [SPCs] in Middle English’ (pp. 213–42). He traces the development of secondary predicate constructions (e.g. *we elected him (as) president*) in the Penn Parsed Corpus of Middle English (PPCME2), showing a drop in *to*-SPCs in favour of *as*-SPCs and providing pointers that SPCs involving Anglo-Norman loan verbs represent separate constructions from SPCs involving native verbs. In his theoretical analysis, he focuses on the notions of allostructions, polysemy, and homonstructions (same form, different origin) to account for the language contact situation. David Lorenz, in ‘Converging Variations and the Emergence of Horizontal Links: *to*-Contraction in American English’ (pp. 243–74), examines the history of *gonna*, *wanna*, and *gotta* in COHA, comparing their use to other, less frequent, contracted forms and, most importantly, to their full form. He argues that the analogy between the pairs can best be captured by defining an emerging metaconstruction. Sara Budts and Peter Petré’s chapter is aimed at ‘Putting Connections Centre Stage in Diachronic Construction Grammar’ (pp. 317–51), which means they look at horizontal links between constructions at all levels of the constructional network. The authors present two case studies, based on EEBO. The first looks at the emergence of *be going to* in the seventeenth century and examines several related contexts: loss of motion, loss of control, and

increase in animate subjects. The second case study looks at how *do* became part of the modal paradigm, increasingly becoming similar to other modals. In their chapter, ‘Constructional Networks and the Development of Benefactive Ditransitives in English’ (pp. 167–211), Eva Zehentner and Elizabeth Closs Traugott investigate the benefactive alternation—i.e. with benefactive verbs of transfer (e.g. *bake, build, buy*)—in eModE using PPCEME and EEBO. They show how the systematic alternation between the double object construction (DOC) (*John baked Mary a cake*) and the prepositional object construction (*for*-POC) (*John baked a cake for Mary*) became more systematic in eModE, which is later than the dative alternation. Their theoretical analysis focuses on the existence of horizontal links in a constructional network as a way to model systematic alternations such as these.

Two further papers look at dative and benefactive ditransitives in early English. Elizabeth Closs Traugott considers ‘The Intertwining of Differentiation and Attraction as Exemplified by the History of Recipient Transfer and Benefactive Alternations’ (*CogLing* 31[2020] 549–78). She examines the role of attraction (constructions becoming more similar) and differentiation (constructions becoming less similar) by reviewing the rise of the dative alternation (e.g. *give someone something* vs *give something to someone*) in lME and the rise of the benefactive alternation (e.g. *bake someone something* vs *bake something for someone*) in eModE. Her main argument is that these developments show that differentiation is as important as attraction, while it has been considered less important in earlier work, specifically in De Smet et al. (2018) (see *YWES* 99[2020] 48–9). Christiano Broccias and Enrico Torre’s paper has a similar topic and title: ‘Attraction and Differentiation in the History of the English Dative and Benefactive Alternations’ (in Chiara Fedriani and Maria Napoli, eds. *The Diachrony of Ditransitives*, pp. 169–94). They also start from De Smet et al.’s work and apply it to the historical development of the dative and benefactive alternation. Their work is less data-driven than Traugott’s paper, and they focus more on attraction than differentiation. They propose a scenario of four stages from OE to ModE, pointing out the role of attraction (and substitution, a form of differentiation) in each stage between the DOC, the *to*-POC and the *for*-POC. In contrast to Traugott and Zehentner and Traugott, they argue that the benefactive alternation dates back to the lME period, rather than eModE.

A special issue of *CogLing* is devoted to *Constructionist Approaches to Individuality in Language*. Some of the contributions are of a more theoretical nature, while others deal directly with English historical syntax. (The paper by De Smet was discussed in Section 4.) Peter Petré and Lynn Anthonissen’s ‘Individuality in Complex Systems: A Constructionist Approach’ (*CogLing* 31[2020] 185–212) serves as an introduction to the volume but also briefly discusses two eModE case studies, namely the development of future *be going to* and the correlation between the use of the Nominative-and-Infinitive (NCI) construction and the prepositional passive. The prepositional passive (as in *They were laughed at*) is also the topic of Anthonissen’s contribution to the issue. In ‘Cognition in Construction Grammar: Connecting Individual and Community Grammars’ (*CogLing* 31[2020] 309–37), Anthonissen investigates the use of the prepositional passive in the writings of fifty eModE individuals (c. 1600–80), using material from the Early Modern Multiloquent Authors (EMMA) corpus.

While there is an overall increase in the frequency of the construction from the oldest to the youngest generation, Anthonissen also observes notable individual differences and finds indications that some authors changed their linguistic behaviour during their lifetime. Lauren Fonteyn and Andrea Nini, the authors of ‘Individuality in Syntactic Variation: An Investigation of the Seventeenth-Century Gerund Alternation’ (*CogLing* 31[2020] 279–308), also use the EMMA corpus in investigating the variation between gerund + direct object (*eating meat*) and gerund + *of*-phrase (*eating of meat*). Fonteyn and Nisi examine the writings of nineteen authors to identify the linguistic and extralinguistic factors that may explain this variation. They find that the most important predictor for all authors is the presence vs absence of a determiner, but that there are individual differences with respect to other variables, e.g. whether the gerund is itself the complement of a preposition. In another contribution to the special issue, Jakob Neels investigates a case of ‘Lifespan Change in Grammaticalisation as Frequency-Sensitive Automation: William Faulkner and the *let alone* Construction’ (*CogLing* 31[2020] 339–65). In an ‘idiolect corpus’ of Faulkner’s writings, Neels, like Anthonissen, observes changing linguistic behaviour throughout an individual’s lifetime; in particular, the *let alone* construction changes both in frequency and syntactic contexts through Faulkner’s career. Finally, another study by Lynn Anthonissen will be mentioned here, namely ‘Constructional Change Across the Lifespan: The Nominative and Infinitive in Early Modern Writers’ (in Bech and Möhlig-Falke, eds., pp. 125–56). This paper presents a longitudinal study of the use of the NCI (as in *He was believed to be involved in the crime*, p. 130) by four eModE writers. Anthonissen finds evidence that all four writers changed their linguistic behaviour during their lives, though not in the same way. For three of the four authors, the so-called evidential subtype of the NCI became increasingly common, whereas one author, Thomas Fuller, shows a different pattern, as he increasingly used the ‘modalized’ subtype of the NCI as a hedging device (e.g. *These may be said to weed the world*; Fuller, 1649).

‘The Growth of the Transitivity Reaction Object Construction’ (*C&F* 12[2020] 239–71) by Tamara Bouso investigates the history of a peculiar English construction where an otherwise intransitive verb is used with an object expressing an attitude or reaction, as in *The audience roared their approval*. Bouso identifies all the verbs that are attested in this construction in the *OED* and traces its development, which she considers part of a broader trend in English towards the transitivity of intransitive verbs. The pattern is argued to have expanded from verbs of sound emission to other verbs, such as *dance* and *breathe*, beginning in the seventeenth century. 2020 also saw the publication of Gea Dreschler’s ‘“Fifty Pounds Will Buy Me a Pair of Horses for My Carriage”: The History of Permissive Subjects in English’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 719–44). It traces the history in the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts (CLMET) and EEBO of inanimate subjects used with five verbs that generally occur with animate subjects (as in *The tent sleeps four*). While some subject-verb combinations date back to 1600, all permissive subjects show an increase from 1800 onwards, which the author connects to a growing need for subject-creating strategies in English, after the pragmatics of the clause-initial position changed in such a way that the only type of unmarked theme is the subject.

Several papers address constructions in the later periods. Mario Serrano-Losada, ‘Analogy-Driven Change: The Emergence and Development of Mirative *end up* Constructions in American English’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 97–121) traces the history of *end up*, mostly based on COHA and COCA. He discusses its increasing use in the twentieth century, its changing semantics, with subjectivization giving rise to a meaning of surprise, and its new parenthetical use, which he argues has developed by analogy with *turn out*. Jong-Bok Kim and Mark Davies address ‘English *what with* Absolute Constructions’, e.g. *what with him being a physician*, from ‘A Construction Grammar Perspective’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 637–66). Based on large dataset from COHA, EEBO, and COCA, they describe the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties of the construction (the types of complements it occurs with; its semantic characterization as ‘giving a reason’), describing its history as a process of grammaticalization; they also provide a CxG analysis of the construction and its network. Magnus Levin investigates ‘Subjective Progressives in the History of American English’ of the type ‘*He’s always telling some kind of lie*’ (in Wiegand and Mahlberg, eds., pp. 275–304). Levin shows that this pattern, where the progressive is combined with an adverb expressing constancy (*constantly*, *forever*, and the more frequent *always* are included in the study), has become more common in the period covered by the COHA (1810–2009) and attributes this to a gradual colloquialization of the written language. Teresa Fanego, in ‘On the History of the English Progressive Construction *Jane came whistling down the street*’ (*JEngL* 48[2020] 319–54) explores the features and history of this construction, which combines an intransitive motion verb, a present participle, and an oblique complement. She identifies two OE precursors, and using EEBO, BNC and CLMET, describes its historical development, discussing various aspects of its grammaticalization, such as the increase in frequency and productivity and an increasing restriction in motion verb types. She concludes that this construction shares many properties with serial verb constructions, even though English is generally said not to allow for these.

The monograph *On Invisible Language in Modern English: A Corpus-Based Approach to Ellipsis* by Evelyn Gandón-Chapela is the author’s published Ph.D. dissertation. It provides a detailed study, based on data from the PPCEME, of Post-Auxiliary Ellipsis, and focuses on two types: VP Ellipsis (*Jason is talkative but Sarah is not talkative*) and Pseudogapping (*Sheila kissed Paul, and Christina did kiss Manuel*). Two questions are central: (1) what are the differences between VP Ellipsis and Pseudogapping? and (2) how do these two types of ellipsis compare between PDE and Late Modern English? The author examines thirty-two factors, categorized as core defining variables (e.g. licensors, presence of auxiliaries, syntactic domain, type of anaphora), usage variables (mostly genre), and processing variables (distance between source and target). While the study does yield some new insights regarding the differences between the two types as well as between PDE and IModE, it also simply confirms many results from previous studies. Obviously, thoroughness and detail are aspects to strive for in an academic text, but the structure and style of the book make it difficult to see the wood for the trees, i.e. it is difficult to see what the main argument of the study is. Indicative in this respect is the concluding chapter, which does little more than repeat the findings of the previous chapters.

In ‘Diffusion of *do*’, Tomoharu Hirota looks at ‘The Acquisition of *do* Negation by *have (to)*’ (in Kytö and Smitherberg, eds., pp. 117–42). Hirota tracks the rise of *do*-support, i.e. *do not have to* rather than *have not to*, in the necessity marker *have to* in AmE (COHA) and various BrE corpora. The variant with *do* became the dominant one in AmE in the mid-nineteenth century, while this happened later in BrE. Interestingly, Hirota’s material suggests that *do*-support in *have to* did not develop by analogy with possessive *have*, as has been argued in the literature. In another contribution to the same volume, Yasuaki Ishizaki provides ‘A Diachronic Constructional Analysis of Locative Alternation in English, with Particular Attention to *load* and *spray*’ (pp. 143–63), within a CxG framework. The author investigates the history of the locative alternation in these two verbs, showing that the ‘location-as-object’ construction (*load the wagon with hay*) developed before the ‘locatum-as-object’ construction (*load hay onto the wagon*) with *load*, while the two constructions appeared simultaneously with *spray*.

In ‘Example Markers at the Intersection of Grammaticalization and Lexicalization’ (ES 101[2020] 616–39), Paula Rodríguez-Abruñeiras considers the development of *for example* and *for instance* in a corpus of ME and ModE texts, which she analyses as instances of grammaticalization. She then points to a recent lexicalization of these markers as independent nouns (with variable spelling, e.g. *a forinstance* or *a f’rinstance*). Another paper adopting a grammaticalization perspective is ‘Grammaticalisation Paths in the Rise and Development of *aside*’ (RiCL 8:ii[2020] 63–86) by Rodrigo Pérez Lorigo and Pablo Ordóñez García. The authors locate the relevant formal (*on side* > *aside*) and semantic (concrete > abstract) changes in the ME period and also look at the geographical distribution of the ME forms, which suggests a southern origin.

6. Semantics

Ariel Cohen’s monograph *Something out of Nothing: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Implicit Quantification* aims to account for the availability of quantificational readings in sentences that contain no overt quantifier, with special attention to those containing bare plurals in English. As is well known from the literature, bare plurals can have both an existential interpretation (as in *Dogs are barking outside right now*), and a generic one (as in *Dogs are intelligent*). The author assumes, building on insights in Gennaro Chierchia’s ‘Reference to Kinds across Languages’ (NLS 6[1998] 339–405) and Manfred Krifka’s ‘Bare NP’s: Kind-Referring, Indefinites, Both, or Neither?’ (SALTPR 13[2003] 180–203), that bare plurals denote properties as a default, and he argues that the quantificational readings are derived with the help of two different, but well-specified reinterpretation procedures: narrow-scope existential readings arise as a result of type-shifting, and generic readings are derived by type-shifting to a kind-denotation, followed by predicate transfer, which introduces a generic quantifier. This core account is then extended in various directions. First, the assumptions that existential readings refer to properties and generic readings denote kinds are claimed to

apply to bare plurals in other languages, as well as to definites and bare singulars. Second, generic and habitual readings are shown to arise from different reinterpretation mechanisms. Third, an explanation is proposed as to why only existential and generic quantifiers are produced by means of reinterpretation mechanisms: they are the ones that give rise to inferences that are particularly useful for the speaker and hearer.

The interpretation of generics is also addressed by Robert van Rooij and Katrin Schulz in two papers. ‘Generics and Typicality: A Bounded Rationality Approach’ (*Ling&P* 43[2020] 83–117) puts forward a uniform semantic theory of generics based on the assumption that generic statements state typical information about categories or groups, which explains why speakers accept generic statements on relatively weak evidence. ‘A Causal Semantics of IS Generics’ (*JSem* 37[2020] 269–95) accounts for the limited acceptability of generic sentences containing indefinite singulars (e.g. *A tiger has stripes*) compared to generic sentences with bare plurals (e.g. *Tigers have stripes*) by proposing a causal analysis of the former sentence type.

Iceberg Semantics for Mass Nouns and Count Nouns: A New Framework for Boolean Semantics by Fred Landman offers an alternative to the Boolean semantics for mass and (singular and plural) count nouns that stems from Godehard Link’s [1983] paper ‘The Logical Analysis of Plurals and Mass Terms: A Lattice-Theoretic Approach’ (in Rainer Bäuerle, Christoph Schwarz, and Arnim von Stechow, eds., *Meaning, Use, and Interpretation of Language*, pp. 302–24). Although Link’s theory successfully handles the semantics of singular and plural nouns, defined respectively in terms of sets of atoms and sums of sets of atoms, the treatment of mass nouns requires sorting the ‘interpretation structure into a mass domain and a count domain’ (p. 2), which Landman considers a disadvantage. The Iceberg semantics put forward in this volume has two major innovations. First, the denotation of an NP consists of a pair of sets $\langle \text{body}, \text{base} \rangle$, where the body is the same as the full interpretation of the NP in Link’s approach, and the base is the distribution set in terms of which the body is counted. Second, a semantic distinction is proposed between ‘neat mass nouns’ such as *furniture*, *pottery*, *livestock*, and *poultry*, with a base generated by a disjoint set of base-atoms (minimal elements of the base), and ‘mess mass nouns’ such as *wine* or *mud*, which lack this property. Not only does this book provide a thorough presentation of the author’s new framework, it also serves as a reference work on Boolean algebras and the Boolean semantics of mass nouns, singular count nouns, and plural count nouns that developed from the work of Godehard Link.

The interpretation of plural morphology in English by adults and pre-school-age children was tested experimentally by Lyn Tieu, Cory Bill, Jacopo Romoli, and Stephen Crain, ‘Testing Theories of Plural Meanings’ (*Cognition* 205[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104307>), who found that speakers make a distinction between positive and negative plural sentences presented in singular contexts.

Still on nominal expressions, Matthew Mandelkern and Daniel Rothschild discuss the uniqueness inference of definite noun phrases in ‘Definiteness Projection’ (*NLS* 28[2020] 77–109), while Daphna Heller gives an overview of ‘The Production and Comprehension of Referring Expressions: Definite

Description' (*L&LC* 14:v[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12370>), addressing the relevance of visual and linguistic contexts as well as of referential domains. 'The Impersonal Gets Personal: A New Pronoun in Multicultural London English' by David Hall (*NL<* 38[2020] 117–50) investigates the semantic properties of the new pronoun *man* in Multicultural London English, which can be interpreted as any person and number combination (1SG, 1PL, 2SG, 2PL, 3SG, 3PL); it appears to allow a generic impersonal reading, in spite of being generally resistant to binding. 'Proportional Readings of *many* and *few*: The Case for an Underspecified Measure Function' by Alan Bale and Bernhard Schwarz (*Ling&P* 43[2020] 673–99) argues that the reverse proportional readings of *many/few* ϕ ψ , as in *Few cooks applied*, appear to make reference to the ratio of the individuals that are in the extension of both ϕ and ψ to the individuals that are in the extension of ψ can be derived from the underspecification of the measure function underlying the meanings of the two determiners. Lisa Bylinina and Rick Nouwen provide an overview of current research on 'Numeral Semantics' (*L&LC* 14:viii[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12390>) focusing on the three main approaches to numeral semantics: numerals as modifiers, as number-denoting words, and as degree quantifiers.

Interactions of Degree and Quantification, edited by Peter Hallman, presents a collection of new studies on quantification over individuals and over degrees and the ways in which quantifiers in these domains interact. In the editor's accessible 'Introduction' (pp. 1–43), the major previous results on this topic are summarized. 'Indeterminate Numerals and Their Alternatives' by Curt Anderson (pp. 44–78) investigates an approximative construction in English involving numerals and the epistemic indefinite determiner *some*, as in *Twenty-some people arrived*. He observes that indeterminate numerals receive the structure and semantics of ordinary numerals (degree-denoting expressions), and claims that the uncertainty interpretation arises as a result of *-some* generating at least two alternatives and that the additional upper-bounded inference is due to a quantity implicature. Alan Bale in 'Compounded Scales' (pp. 205–30) analyses comparative sentences that involve a conjunction, as in *Seymour is more handsome and talented than Patrick is*; he suggests that gradable adjectives should be treated as binary relations between individuals, and not between individuals and degrees, contrary to the majority view that links the semantics of gradable adjectives directly to degrees. 'Quantifying Events and Activities' by Haley Farkas and Alexis Wellwood (pp. 304–31) reports on experiments that investigate how the evaluation of comparatives with event and activity verbs like *jump* and *move*, respectively, depend on event structure vs conceptualization, using dynamic displays that make multiple competing dimensions for comparison available. Nicholas Fleisher suggests in 'Nominal Quantifiers in *than* Clauses and Degree Questions' (pp. 364–81) that the high scope position of nominal quantifiers in comparative *than* clauses should be analysed in a manner analogous to the high scope of quantifiers in pair-list readings of embedded questions. Jessica Rett ('Separate but Equal: A Typology of Equative Constructions', pp. 163–204) reviews the typology of comparative strategies and their semantic analyses, presents an overview of previous theoretical approaches to equatives, and proposes a typology of equatives in English, claiming that it is sufficiently robust to be extended to a wide

range of languages. ‘From Possible Individuals to Scalar Segments’ by Roger Schwarzschild (pp. 231–70) argues that degree constructions involve quantification over scalar segments i.e. parts of a scale, and that gradable predicates denote relations between possible individuals.

The Semantics of Case by Olga Kagan provides an accessible overview of the most important topics concerning the semantic impact of case-marking from a cross-linguistic perspective. The introductory chapter reviews the common definitions of case, of case systems, the distinction between structural, inherent, lexical and semantic case, and the relation between case-marking and thematic roles. The following chapters are devoted to the presentation of data and theoretical studies on topics where case-marking has been shown to play a special role in semantic interpretation, including the relevance of the dative and spatial cases to theta-role assignment, the interactions between case and aspect, the semantics of differential object-marking, and the semantics of case-marked nominal and adjectival predicates.

Turning now to the semantics of verb phrases, ‘*Gather/Numerous* as a Mass/Count Opposition’ by Jeremy Kuhn (*NLS* 28[2020] 225–53) argues that the properties that distinguish categories of collective predicates of the *gather-* vs the *numerous-* type are analogous to the properties that distinguish mass from count and atelic from telic. In ‘Standing Out with the Progressive’ (*JL* 56[2020] 479–514), Astrid de Wit, Peter Petré, and Frank Brisard provide a cognitive-semantic analysis, arguing on the basis of diachronic and synchronic data that English, Dutch, and French progressives were used to describe non-canonical situations at the onset of their development, and that they have kept an intrinsic association with extravagance (see *YWES* 101[2022] ch. 1, sect. 4). ‘Future Obligations’, by Pablo Fuentes (*JL* 56[2020] 601–28) uses a dynamic account of assertion to describe sentences of the form *NP will have to VP*, which are ambiguous between readings in which the circumstances triggering a future obligation are assumed to be in force at speech time and readings in which they are predicted to arise in the future. ‘*By now*: Change of State, Epistemic Modality and Evidential Inference’ by Daniel Altshuler and Laura A. Michaelis (*JL* 56[2020] 515–39) considers the intensional and inferential meanings associated with present-tense sentences expressing a state and containing a temporal adverb headed by *by*, thereby paying particular attention to the fact that such constructions are improved by an epistemic modal (*They ??(must) live in a mansion by now*). The authors propose that sentences containing the adverb require that the onset of a resultant state ‘overlap[s] some unspecified time that precedes the time described by the adverb’ (p. 515).

Enriched Meanings: Natural Language Semantics with Category Theory, by Ash Asudeh and Gianluca Giorgolo, offers a novel approach to modelling particular phenomena at the semantics-pragmatics interface, such as multidimensionality (expressives, parentheticals), non-substitutability of coreferential terms, and conjunction fallacies. This approach is based on a theory of enriched meanings, ‘the result of mapping an input space of objects and relations to a richer space of objects and relations’ (p. 161), which rely on the notion of monads from category theory to provide ‘lexicalized, compositional analyses that *do not generalize meanings to the worst case*’ (p. 161). The analyses are complemented by exercises helping to understand the formal derivations, a website for formal

implementations, background chapters on enriched meanings and category theory. The three classes of phenomena at the centre of the discussion are presented in a truly interdisciplinary fashion, integrating findings from semantics, pragmatics, philosophy of language, psychology, and computer science.

Still at the semantics-pragmatics interface, ‘Social Meaning in Semantics and Pragmatics’ (*L&LC* 14:ix[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12398>) by Andrea Beltrama compares the notion of meaning investigated in semantics/pragmatics and that investigated in sociolinguistics, previous proposals on how semantic and social meanings mutually inform one another, and how to formalize social meanings with the tools of formal semantics and pragmatics. ‘Readings of Scalar Particles: *noch/still*’ by Sigrid Beck (*Ling&P* 43[2020] 1–67) proposes that the scalar particles *noch/still* do not influence the claim asserted by the sentence in which they occur, but introduce the presupposition that a parallel claim holds of an item lower on the scale. The large variety of possible uses of the particles is due to different choices for the scale that the particle associates with, different attachment sites in the syntax, and interaction with focus. Poppy Mankowitz, ‘Expressions in Focus’ (*S&Prag* 13[2020] <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/sp.13.13>), puts forward a theory of expression focus, which also accounts for metalinguistic phenomena such as metalinguistic negotiation, metalinguistic negation, and embedded pejorative expressions.

Turning to the semantics of sentence types, Beste Kamali and Manfred Krifka’s target article ‘Focus and Contrastive Topic in Questions and Answers, with Particular Reference to Turkish’ (*TLing* 46[2020] 1–71) presents a framework of dynamic interpretation based on the notion of Commitment Spaces (Manfred Krifka, ‘Bias in Commitment Space Semantics: Declarative Questions, Negated Questions, and Question Tags’ [2015]), illustrating that a uniform interpretation of focus and contrastive topic across sentence types is possible. Maria Biezma, ‘Non-Informative Assertions: The Case of Non-Optional *wh*-in-Situ’ (*S&Prag* 13[2020] <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/sp.13.18>), puts forward an analysis of inquisitive information-seeking utterances with non-fronted *wh*-words and declarative word order, as in *The party is where?* Biezma’s analysis is based on the assumption that utterances such as the one above are declaratives and thus constitute proposals to trivially update the common ground, their ‘inquisitive flavour’ arising from the dynamics of context update and mechanisms of discourse anaphora triggered by focus. ‘The Semantics and Pragmatics of Nouns in Concealed Questions’ (*S&Prag* 13[2020] <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/sp.13.7>) by Hana Kalpak argues for an account of the availability of Concealed Question readings of determiner phrases, as in *Kim knows the capital of Italy*, that not only considers the type (relational versus sortal) of the head noun, or its modification, but also domains of alternatives and their potential semantic sources. William B. Starr proposes ‘A Preference Semantics for Imperatives’ (*S&Prag* 13[2020] <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/sp.13.6>), a non-representational, dynamic semantics based on the idea that imperatives introduce preferences between alternatives and which is able to account for new data illustrating the integration of imperatives with representational language and connectives.

Further papers of importance on topics not mentioned above include Friederike Moltmann’s target article ‘Truthmaker Semantics for Natural Language: Attitude Verbs, Modals, and Intensional Transitive Verbs’ (*TLing*

46[2020] 159–200), which provides a concise summary of the framework of object-based truthmaker semantics. Specifically, it argues that, with regard to the treatment of modal and attitudinal expressions in natural language, it has an advantage over its well-established rival, possible worlds semantics, in that it relies on a more fine-grained notion of content. ‘Locations’ by Susan Rothstein (*JSem* 37[2020] 611–49) claims that locative phrases may make reference to individual locations and that an appropriate theory of types must thus include locations as individuals as well. Finally, Pauline Jacobson, ‘Neg Raising and Ellipsis (and Related Issues) Revisited’ (*NLS* 28[2020] 111–40), revisits arguments for a syntactic account of Neg Raising and claims that the interaction of Neg Raising with ellipsis and the behaviour of the matrix predicate *guess* casts serious doubt on it.

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 2020 saw a large number of cross-disciplinary studies; accordingly, several of the upcoming paragraphs will be devoted to the interface between the main theme of this section and other fields. The influence of the Covid-19 pandemic on the lexicon will also be touched upon at the end of this section.

An important scholarly publication by CUP is Sarah Ogilvie’s *The Cambridge Companion to English Dictionaries*, bringing together rich contributions on the topic of English dictionaries and lexicography. After a brief introduction by the editor, the volume is divided into three parts. Part I is dedicated to essential issues related to dictionary policies and practices. Before exploring ‘How a Word Gets into an English Dictionary’ (pp. 7–17), Kory Stamper discusses the role of a dictionary and lists a number of early English dictionaries. She then moves on to explore how modern lexicographers collect and sort evidence and suggests three criteria for entry into a dictionary: ‘(1) easily identifiable meaning, (2) widespread use in printed and, ideally, edited prose, and (3) sustained written use’ (pp. 9–10). Besides the lexicographers’ efforts, technology has also transformed dictionary-making in many ways. In chapter 3, Michael Rundell, Miloš Jakubiček, and Vojtěch Kovář demonstrate the interaction between ‘Technology and English Dictionaries’ (pp. 18–30), involving computer databases, corpora, Natural Language Processing (NLP), and the Word Sketch function. In chapter 4, Judy Pearsall investigates the distinction between ‘Diachronic and Synchronic English Dictionaries’ (pp. 31–44). Whereas synchronic dictionaries are generally driven by their target audience, diachronic dictionaries have ‘a mission to describe and document history’ (p. 33), and a good example is the *OED*. Another distinction is made by Edward Finegan between the descriptive and prescriptive approaches to dictionary-making in chapter 5, ‘Description and Prescription: The Roles of English Dictionaries’ (pp. 45–57). In chapter 6, ‘European Cross-

Currents in English Lexicography' (pp. 58–74), Giovanni Iamartino illustrates the art and craft of European lexicography and its traditions. English lexicography, however, was not 'at the forefront of dictionary-making' (p. 74) until the eighteenth century; since then, a range of English dictionaries have made their appearance and demonstrated great global impact. Focusing on 'English Slang Dictionaries' (pp. 75–86), Michael Adams especially highlights the value of slang dictionaries, which are always looked down on by some English speakers and even some lexicographers.

The contributions in Part II investigate the development of English dictionaries throughout four centuries, summarized as 'the age of cheap hand-press printing; the age of cheap mechanical printing; and the age of digital publication' by John Considine in his useful introduction to this four-centuries-long 'Dictionary Ecosystem' (pp. 89–100). A trend during the seventeenth century was 'the introduction of "hard words" into the English lexicon and dictionary' (p. 115). Considering the advent of printing, Roderick W. McConchie's chapter 9 (pp. 103–13) compares Cawdrey's and Coote's work, while Rebecca Shapiro in chapter 10 (pp. 114–26) discusses other prominent seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English dictionaries, mostly hard-word dictionaries. After the turn of the eighteenth century, the 'hard-word' tradition soon evolved to fit broader concerns, which are briefly and critically discussed in chapter 11 (pp. 129–41) by Allen Reddick. The lexicography of the eighteenth century, according to Reddick, reflects the concerns of 'a rapidly growing population and increasing commerce, and eventually, industrialisation' (p. 129). Focusing more narrowly on the same period, Jack Lynch's chapter (pp. 142–54) aims to answer the question whether Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* [1755] deserves to be called the 'First English Dictionary'. Moving to the nineteenth century, chapters 13 and 14 look at American and British dictionaries, respectively. Michael Adams's contribution (pp. 157–69) features a number of general dictionaries and historical dictionaries—uniquely American—that display 'an entanglement of learning, patriotism, commerce, and cultural authority' (p. 157). Sarah Ogilvie places particular focus on 'The Oxford English Dictionary' (pp. 170–80), the most comprehensive and authoritative dictionary of the English language. The author gives an overview of earlier editions, editors, and visions of the *OED* and also mentions some recent developments that make today's *OED Online*. The *OED*'s practice, application, and also its people have deeply influenced the twentieth- and twenty-first-century dictionaries. Robert E. Lewis and Antonette diPaolo Healey begin their chapter with the idea for a series of 'The English Period Dictionaries' (pp. 183–94), proposed by a former chief editor of the *OED*, William A. Craigie. For several reasons, the original plans for period dictionaries were abandoned or suspended or subsumed by the *OED*, and the final products are only two: the *Middle English Dictionary* and the *Dictionary of Old English*. The development of teaching English as a foreign language as well as 'English-as-a-Foreign-Language Lexicography' (pp. 195–206) occurred globally in the second half of the twentieth century. In this chapter, Howard Jackson presents a brief but detailed overview of a range of notable monolingual learner's dictionaries (MLDs)—including, but not limited to the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (*OALDCE*, or *OALD*), the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (*LDOCE*), the *Collins COBUILD Advanced Learner's*

Dictionary (COBUILD), the *Cambridge International Dictionary of English (CIDE)*, and the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners (MEDAL)*—and how they evolved to fit users' needs in different periods. Orin Hargraves's chapter begins with three features of 'Electronic Dictionaries' (pp. 195–206): 'the dictionary data is stored in digital format; the user interacts with the data on a screen; and use of the dictionary requires electric current' (pp. 207–18). The ongoing technological innovations make today's dictionaries, no matter how well known or 'unbranded', more accessible, interactive, and dazzling. However, Hargraves warns that dictionary makers should not overlook or go too far beyond the 'core need' of dictionary users, that is, 'to learn quickly and efficiently what [a] word means' (p. 218). Since the late 1980s, lexicography has also been closely associated with fields like corpus linguistics, computational linguistics, and natural language processing. These developments are discussed in chapters 18 and 19. Patrick Hanks deals with the interconnection between 'English Dictionaries and Corpus Linguistics' (pp. 219–39), showing how corpus evidence and corpus-driven analysis influence dictionary-making. C. Paul Cook looks at the role of 'Natural Language Processing in Lexicography' (pp. 240–51) and mentions a range of NLP methods, including 'pre-processing corpora, identifying collocations, creating distributional thesauri, and extracting good dictionary examples' (p. 251). Problems and advances in NLP are also touched upon in this chapter.

Part III is concerned with the regional nature of English lexicography, covering dictionaries of CanE (by Stefan Dollinger, pp. 255–64), AusE (by Pam Peters, pp. 265–73), NZE (by John Macalister, who draws more attention to the *Dictionary of New Zealand English*, pp. 274–81), IndE (by Traci Nagle, pp. 282–7), SAE (by Jill Wolvaardt, pp. 288–97), Caribbean English (CaribE) (by Jeannette Allsopp, pp. 298–305), American Regional English (by George Goebel, who specifically focuses on the *Dictionary of American Regional English (DARE)*, pp. 306–14), as well as Scots and Scottish English (by Maggie Scott, pp. 315–23). Taken collectively, these non-canonical English dictionaries play vital roles in seeking 'independence from the British Empire' and thus defining regional 'standardisation, prestige, power, education, literacy, and national identity' (p. 2). Rather than a formal concluding section, the volume ends with an extensive list of further readings; together with a linear chronology at the very beginning of the volume, they paint a fuller picture of the English language and the dictionaries that help to shape it across time and space. Overall, this *Cambridge Companion* is extremely useful and attractive to general readers, scholars, as well as dictionary lovers. An important fact about this volume is that most of its contributors are (or used to be) lexicographers or dictionary editors, who, as real masters of the craft of dictionary-making, know perfectly well how dictionaries work in practice.

Several articles deal with particular types of dictionaries. To begin with, Juhani Norri investigates the 'Treatment of Words for Illness and Disability in Monolingual English Dictionaries' (*IJL* 33[2020] 227–50). The twenty dictionaries analysed in this study are categorized into four groups: (1) the 'Big Five' British learners' dictionaries, (2) American collegiate dictionaries, (3) British general-purpose dictionaries, and (4) American general-purpose dictionaries. The treatment of twenty-five terms for illness and disability in each dictionary group

is presented in tabular form. Norri's findings show that some dictionaries employ more admonitory labels and usage notes than others, which is largely affected by their target audience. In 'Performing Non-Sexism via Degendering Phoric Forms in English: The Gap between Rules and Practice as Observed in the 9th Edition of *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*' (*Lexikos* 30[2020] 275–92), Nshindi-Germain Mulamba and Francis Ngoyi Crequi Tshimanga's investigation of gender-referring elements is based on the premise that non-sexism is concrete proof of the social and cultural changes in the language. Using examples from *OALD9*, the authors find a number of mismatches between rules and practice and point out that the use of phrasal or clausal structure to achieve non-sexism makes 'fluency difficult and writing cumbersome' (p. 290). Non-verbal elements in dictionaries are also worth a mention. Sylwia Wojciechowska discusses 'Access Routes to BODY PART Multiword Expressions in the "Big Five" MELD [Monolingual English Learner's Dictionaries]: Use of Hyperlinks' (*Lexikos* 30[2020] 583–608). The results reveal that all the 'Big Five' dictionaries, except *OALD*, prefer to hyperlink multiword expressions rather than to define them on the headword's page.

Following up from Lu and Wei's study (reviewed in *YWES* 100[2021]), Huaguo Lu, Ya Zhang, and Xia Hao's article, 'The Contribution of Cognitive Linguistics to the Acquisition of Polysemy: A Dictionary Entry-Based Study with Chinese Learners of English' (*IJL* 33[2020] 306–36), reports on the results of an experiment with sixty-five English majors at a Chinese university. They find that dictionary entries informed by cognitive linguistic insights (CL entries) are more effective in promoting L2 learners' comprehension and short-term retention of target senses than logically structured entries (LO entries). In their conclusion, the authors propose that dictionary compilers should 'invest more time and energy in designing a CL entry than in writing an LO one', though at first sight it may not seem worthwhile investing such lexicographic effort (p. 325). Atikhom Thienthong poses the question whether 'Bilingual Dictionary Synonyms for Paraphrasing' are 'A Solution or a Problem?' (*IJL* 33[2020] 17–39). To that effect, he examines Thai EFL learners' use of paper bilingual dictionaries when selecting synonyms for summary writing and paraphrasing. The results of his study show that bilingual dictionaries lead to many erroneous synonym choices, largely due to the ambiguous treatment of the synonym paradigms in the dictionaries studied and insufficient lexical information for disambiguating synonyms.

Moving from EFL learners to EFL teachers, Man Lai Amy Chi examines the tight bond between EFL lexicography and EFL teaching by 'Reconstructing the Lexicographical Triangle through Teaching Dictionary Literacy to Teachers of English' (*LexAsia* 7[2020] 79–95). Chi suggests that language teachers should be better equipped with the knowledge and ability termed as 'dictionary literacy' and thus more training is needed. In Lu et al.'s, Thienthong's, and Chi's studies, two disciplines—lexicography and language learning/teaching—converge and contribute to an emerging field, pedagogical lexicography. From a different angle, Tvrtko Prčić discusses 'Teaching Lexicography as a University Course: Theoretical, Practical and Critical Considerations' (*Lexikos* 30[2020] 293–320). Drawing from his fifteen-year teaching experience, various theoretical and practical issues related to the course are considered. In addition, the syllabus, course

design, and research topics presented in this paper are of great value to both language teachers and learners.

A worldwide trend in compiling and/or using dictionaries is the inevitable transition from print to online—a trend which is increasingly well represented in scientific studies. In this regard, Theo J.D. Bothma and Rufus H. Gouws explore ‘e-Dictionaries in a Network of Information Tools in the e-Environment’ (*Lexikos* 30[2020] 29–56). In an e-environment, users (especially those who are digital natives) can easily navigate between e-dictionaries and other online tools or platforms to satisfy their specific information needs. Putting the users’ needs at the centre, the authors provide a visual representation of a modular network of information tools (including e-dictionaries, Google/internet, Wikipedia, YouTube, etc.) that make up a ‘search universe’ (p. 24). Such a network compels users to make informed choices and also prompts lexicographers to reconsider the lexicographic processes. In ‘Monolingual Online Dictionaries for Learners of English and the Opportunities of the Electronic Medium: A Critical Survey’ (*IJL* 33[2020] 404–16), Reinhard Heuberger evaluates six online MLDs and their opportunities in the areas of the accessibility of data, multimedia features, customization options, hybridization, user input, and unlimited storage space. Heuberger concludes that the technological opportunities offered by online dictionaries are ‘only beginning to be fully exploited’ (p. 412). A study by Miriam Buendía-Castro, ‘Bilingual and Multilingual Online Environmental Knowledge Resources: A Comparative Study for Translation Purposes’ (*IJL* 33[2020] 40–72), surveys the headword ‘erosion’ in different online resources and lists necessary and helpful information that should be included in these resources to assist in translation.

Drawn from a roundtable discussion at the Dictionary Society of North America 2019 conference in Bloomington, Indiana, two short papers give particular attention to dictionary front matter. In ‘Dictionary Front Matter, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow: What Was It, What Is It, and What Will It Become?’ (*LexAsia* 7[2020] 97–101), Donna M.T.Cr. Farina briefly introduces the conference, and other papers on the topic. She recognizes that there is often a ‘front-matter free zone’ in online dictionaries, offering more possibilities to ‘utilize better the potential of the front matter’ in the digital era (p. 98). Moving to earlier times, Rebecca Shapiro investigates ‘Late Eighteenth-Century English Orthoepic Dictionary Front Matter’ (*LexAsia* 7[2020] 103–14), which can be regarded as ‘a site for linguistic imperialism’. Her study illustrates that via front matter, early lexicographers instilled ‘a linguistic standard’ in readers, and readers of early dictionaries at that time were given insight into ‘the ideologies and theories motivating the authors who wrote them’ (pp. 105, 111). Shapiro also worries about the loss of paratextual matter in online dictionaries and users’ lack of media literacy to read online dictionaries. She warns that those who do not know how to read online dictionaries ‘will ultimately pay with not just their privacy, but their creativity’ (p. 113). The same issue contains two other papers on front matter in Russian and Slovenian dictionaries. Though not relevant here, they also provide some inspiring ideas.

American lexicography has captured much scholarly attention this year. To begin with, in ‘A Fair Road for Stumps: Language Ideologies and the Making of the *Dictionary of American English* and the *Dictionary of Americanisms*’

(*DJDSNA* 41:ii[2020] 25–59), Michael Adams explores how Mitford M. Mathews’s unsuccessful doctoral dissertation successfully supplied the *DAE* with nearly 1,000 entries. The process of dictionary editing, such as the *DAE* and the *DA*, reveals that dictionaries are not only ‘scientific texts’, but ‘expressions of identity and cultural authority, and sites of collaboration, competition, and, on occasion, even a test of wills’ (p. 53). In ‘A Glossary of Words and Phrases “Peculiar to the United States”, Rosemarie Ostler examines ‘The Aims and Strategies of John Russell Bartlett’s *Dictionary of Americanisms*’ (*DJDSNA* 41:ii[2020] 147–76), which was compiled at a time (1848) ‘when lexicography was taking steps toward professionalization’ (p. 148). As an amateur, Bartlett employed a number of defining strategies which followed those of the standard dictionaries of that era. But still, Bartlett’s dictionary was ‘ahead of its time’ (p. 174) and collected as many ‘peculiarly American’ words and phrases as possible to present a fuller picture of vernacular English. Don Chapman, Amanda Fronk, and Mark Davies compare large monolingual dictionaries and large-scale corpora in ‘First Citations and First Occurrences: How Sensitive to Language Change Were Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century American Dictionaries?’ (*DJDSNA* 41:iii[2020] 61–86). There exists conventional wisdom in the literature that reading programs (a method employed by dictionaries to use readers to read from a wide range of sources to find new words) provide ‘breadth of coverage’, while corpora provide ‘depth’ (p. 64). Based on this view, the authors examine the first appearance of seventy-five denominal verbs (such as *contact*, *focus*, *monitor*, and *query*) in various American dictionaries and in the Corpus of Historical American English (COHA); they find that COHA outperforms dictionaries to a limited extent but cannot totally overlap and replace them—probably it will in the near future, but not now.

Looking back on the past of lexicography, a notable publication is *The Whole World in a Book: Dictionaries in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Sarah Ogilvie and Gabriella Safran. Resulting from a workshop at Stanford in 2018, the book brings together a group of scholars who look specifically at selective dictionaries and their makers in the nineteenth century, an era that gave birth to many significant dictionaries over the globe. Compared to the *Cambridge Companion to English Dictionaries* (also edited by Sarah Ogilvie, see above), this volume covers a shorter time span but has a wider geographical scope: it investigates dictionaries of Russian, Japanese, German, Frisian, Scots, Canadian French, Manchu, Chinese, Persian, Yiddish, Libras (Brazilian sign language), and naturally, English. Here I will only discuss the chapters relevant to the present section. In the very first chapter, John Considine reviews ‘The Unfinished Business of Eighteenth-Century European Lexicography’ (pp. 1–16) and touches on several dictionaries of English as well as of other European languages. Michael Adams focuses on a single work and its author in chapter 3, ‘The Lexical Object: Richardson’s *New Dictionary of the English Language* (1836–1837)’ (pp. 34–53). Though very different from Johnson’s and the *OED*’s approaches, Richardson’s dictionary is admired as ‘the pivot on which the scientific revolution of English lexicography turned’ (p. 49). In the next chapter, Sarah Ogilvie discusses ‘A Nineteenth-Century Garment Throughout’ by exploring ‘Description, Collaboration, and Thorough Coverage in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1884–1928)’ (pp. 54–72). According to Ogilvie, the *OED* bears ‘all

the hallmarks of the “modern” dictionaries’ (p. 54): (1) the application of historical principles to each entry; (2) a preference for a descriptive to a prescriptive approach; (3) a thorough coverage of the English lexicon; and (4) collaborative compilation—all these hallmarks make the dictionary a landmark of all times. Two chapters on American lexicography deal with two different editions of Noah Webster’s *An American Dictionary of the English Language* (AADEL). Edward Finegan digs into ‘Christian Nationalism in Noah Webster’s Lexicography’ (pp. 152–67)—in particular, in the 1828 edition of AADEL. It is evident that the dictionary’s etymologies, definitions, and illustrative quotations reflect Webster’s religious beliefs. In ‘The Invention of the Modern Dictionary: *Webster’s Unabridged* of 1864’ (pp. 168–89), Peter Sokolowski revisits the revisions after Webster’s death. The revision process involves the Merriam brothers’ successful business model as well as the frequently discussed topic, the ‘War of the Dictionaries’ between Joseph Worcester’s and Merriam-Webster’s dictionaries. Lindsay Rose Russell’s chapter ‘Sharper Tools’ (pp. 255–76) retells the story of women and the dictionary; it is the same as her book (reviewed in *YWES* 99[2020]) but takes a narrower focus: ‘Missionary Women’s Lexicography in Asia’. Russell finds that ‘the most striking concentration of nineteenth-century English-language lexicography by women appears in Asia’ (p. 256), with a handful of dictionaries of English and Asian languages. In sum, of the entire volume, English dictionaries and lexicographers occupy about one-third of the chapters, to a large extent showing the prevalence and prestige of English-language lexicography in the nineteenth century.

Based on a selection of talks from the 2018 ‘New Words and Linguistic Purism’ conference in Innsbruck, a special issue bearing the same title was published in *IJL* (33[2020]), edited by Pius ten Hacken and Maria Koliopoulou. The guest editors’ account ‘Dictionaries, Neologisms, and Linguistic Purism’ (*IJL* 33[2020] 127–34) gives a brief introduction to the contributions in this issue. Although four out of the five articles discuss concerns of neologisms and borrowings in languages other than English, they offer valuable insights into the relationship between new words and linguistic purism from different perspectives. The special issue also contains an article by Pius ten Hacken on the inclusion of new words in dictionaries with exemplification from English, entitled ‘Norms, New Words, and Empirical Reality’ (*IJL* 33[2020] 135–49). After introducing three different views on what a language is, ten Hacken moves on to three major views on the nature of words and the questions related to the inclusion of new words. On the basis of these views, ten Hacken suggests that when deciding a new word’s entry into a dictionary, lexicographers ‘do not need to choose a single perspective and pursue it radically in all cases’, but rather take account of ‘corpus data ... traditional decisions and sensitivities, and their own and other speakers’ linguistic competence’ (p. 147).

‘Global Viewpoints on Lexicography and Neologisms’ is well represented in a special issue of *DJDSNA*, edited by Annette Klosa-Kückelhaus and Ilan Kernerman. Although the articles in this issue are concerned with the current lexicographic treatment of neologisms in languages other than English (i.e. Danish, Dutch, Frisian, Estonian, Swahili, Korean, Spanish, and Modern Greek) and thus not relevant for this review, they do provide several relevant theoretical insights and state-of-the-art research methods contributing to the field of lexicographical

neology and/or neological lexicography. As the guest editors suggest in their introduction to the special issue (*DJDSNA* 41:i[2020] 1–9), questions like ‘how to explain the meaning of neologisms with and without encyclopedic information’ and ‘how to use illustrations and audio-visual media’ remain unanswered (p. 9). Obviously, there is plenty of room for future studies at the interface of lexicography and neologisms.

In many publications this year, metalexicography was a frequently addressed topic. Rufus H. Gouws discusses ‘Special Field and Subject Field Lexicography Contributing to Lexicography’ (*Lexikos* 30[2020] 143–70). Though this article uses non-English dictionaries as examples, it deserves mention here for its useful introduction to theories and terms in the field of metalexicography. The focus of several thematic studies in *Lexicographica* is on ‘Metalexicography, Dictionaries and Culture’, bringing dictionaries and culture together and revisiting their relation within the domain of metalexicography. Antoni Nomdedeu Rull presents a detailed account of ‘How to Select and Present Cultural Data: A Challenge to Lexicography’ (*Lexicographica* 36[2020] 39–57). The author analyses how the ‘Big Five’ British monolingual learners’ dictionaries display cultural data and then compares the way in which cultural information is shown in dictionaries with that in the Write Assistant tool. It is concluded that Write Assistant does offer more possibilities in data personalization but it is not a finished and feasible product for the moment. Four case studies in *Lexicographica* look specifically at cultural-specific items in Chinese–English dictionaries. Since all the four contributions are centred around L2 learners of Chinese, I will not discuss them in detail. Nevertheless, a handful of Chinese–English dictionaries attested in these studies are worth examining in more detail, and the issues addressed can shed light on future research on bilingual dictionaries. In a little-studied area, namely, English cultural heritage lexicography, Olga M. Karpova sees ‘A New Wave of Shakespeare Lexicography (with Special Reference to LSP [Language for Special Purposes] Dictionaries)’ (*Lexicographica* 36[2020] 241–54). She argues that Shakespeare LSP dictionaries are ‘handy and comprehensive’; their metalanguage, though ‘laconic’, is ‘clear and knowledgeable’ (pp. 251–2). Shakespeare LSP lexicography therefore deserves a place in English author lexicography and its digital future is foreseeable.

Javier Ruano-García investigates ‘The Contribution of Angelina Parker to the *English Dialect Dictionary* [EDD]’ (*DJDSNA* 41:ii[2020] 1–24) based on the data retrieved from *EDD Online*. The major aim of this study is not limited to investigating the role of correspondents in dictionary-making, but also attempts to give Angelina Parker ‘a deserved place’ in the history of Oxfordshire English and, more generally, women’s lexicography.

In Stephen Turton’s ‘The Confessional Sciences: Scientific Lexicography and Sexology in the *Oxford English Dictionary*’ (*Lang&H* 63[2020] 214–32), two rarely connected disciplines, lexicography and sexology, are juxtaposed. Based on some unpublished sources of the *OED*, Turton reveals how scholarly principles were constrained by social mores. The last line of this paper is rather inspiring: ‘There is always an analyst who speaks on the subject’s behalf, and there are always other stories that the telling leaves out’ (p. 228).

Two publications deal with the interface between dictionaries and poems: Andrew Blades and Piers Pennington’s *Poetry & the Dictionary* and Craig

Dworkin's *Dictionary Poetics: Toward a Radical Lexicography*. Both are part of book series—LiverUP's 'Poetry &..' series and FordUP's 'Verbal Arts: Studies in Poetics' series, respectively—which is indicative of the growing interest in intertwining poetry and poetics with other fields. Blades and Pennington's volume got a glowing review by D.A. Lockhart (*DJDSNA* 41:ii[2020] 305–8), which concludes that in general this collection of essays offers readers 'a fruitful and rich cross-disciplinary dive into the mechanics of both language and lyricism' (p. 307), while at the same time pointing out that there are 'moments in some of the essays where the writers get a little too focused on the individual works of poets'. In another review by Patrick Hanks (*IJL* 34[2021] 518–20), the reviewer acknowledges that the principal value of the book lies in the fact that 'it may encourage the reader to visit or revisit the works of some poets who may otherwise have been lost sight of' (p. 519). Dworkin's monograph has a structure similar to that of Blades and Pennington: after an introduction to the avant-garde ways of reading and writing, the following six chapters are devoted to the investigation of several book-length works of poetry from poets who use particular dictionaries to structure their work. Poets include Louis Zukofsky, George Oppen, Clark Coolidge, Bernadette Mayer, Tina Darragh, and Harryette Mullen; dictionaries employed are *Funk & Wagnalls Practical Standard Dictionary of the English Language*, *Webster's Collegiate*, the *OED*, *Webster's New Collegiate*, *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, and *Juba to Jive: A Dictionary of African-American Slang*. Together, the two volumes introduce readers to a good many poems and dictionaries; at the same time, the two publications have a rather restricted scope—the materials investigated are primarily from the United Kingdom and America whereas little attention is given to works from other English-speaking regions. Dworkin explains this shortage as 'a matter of practical exigency' (p. 27). It is hoped that the current scope of research will be expanded in the near future, with more revelatory insights into the fields of poetry and lexicography.

Two contributions by James Lambert deal with the interconnection between lexicography and WE. In 'Lexicography and World Englishes' (in Daniel Schreier, Marianne Hundt, and Edgar W. Schneider, eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes*, pp. 408–35), Lambert discusses the importance of dictionaries for WE and makes a call for more scholarly dictionaries in the field of WE. In this chapter, he also presents a snapshot of the currently available WE dictionaries (as well as glossaries), covering Englishes in Kachru's Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles. Finally, the chapter addresses categorizations of major dictionary types and concludes with a number of caveats for dictionary compilers. Narrowing the scope to Englishes in Asian contexts, Lambert provides a brief historical overview of 'The Lexicography of Asian Englishes' (in Kingsley Bolton, Werner Botha, and Andy Kirkpatrick, eds., *The Handbook of Asian Englishes*, pp. 209–40). From the seventeenth century on, lexicographical products in diverse forms emerged (though slowly) as a result of European trade and colonialism. The nineteenth century saw an increasing need for dictionaries covering Asian-specific lexis, which 'stimulated an unprecedented spurt of dictionary publishing' (p. 212). Making use of a 'lexicographical density' metric to evaluate dictionaries of individual or multiple English varieties in the modern era, Lambert shows that none of the Asian English varieties has received the same

amount of lexicographical treatment and coverage as BrE, AmE, CanE, AusE, NZE, and SAE; however, ‘the possibilities for producing new and/or improved dictionaries for these varieties are practically boundless’ (p. 235).

Taking a closer look at more regionally specific dictionaries, Melissa Xiaohui Qin and Jingyang Gao introduce ‘The *Chinese English Dictionary* [CED]: An Online Resource for Chinese English Lexicography’ (*Wen* 39[2020] 154–70), which was initiated in 2014 and constructed in a crowdsourcing mode—the ‘crowdsourcing compilation pattern’ (p. 159). Based on the data from the CED and six other dictionaries and corpora, the authors revisit the topic of Chinese contributions to the English language. Ilan Stavans reflects ‘On Codifying the Dictionary of Spanglish’ (*DJDSNA* 41:ii[2020] 197–212) and mocks himself as ‘A Lay Lexicographer’. After telling personal anecdotes about his collection of Spanglish items, Stavans calls for more specialists to take part in such a long-term lexicographic task.

Of particular interest to this review are three monographs on the same topic, language contact. Several chapters in each of the books are relevant here, although they overlap partially. The first monograph is the second edition of Yaron Matras’s *Language Contact*. Chapters 7 and 8 are devoted to ‘Lexical Borrowing’ (pp. 179–208) and ‘Grammatical and Phonological Borrowing’ (pp. 209–53), and are concerned with the borrowing of content words and function words respectively. In these two chapters, Matras puts forward a borrowability hierarchy, with different linguistic categories (lexical and grammatical) assuming different positions along this hierarchy. Another publication with a chapter on lexical borrowing is the second edition of *The Handbook of Language Contact*, edited by Raymond Hickey. Philip Durkin’s chapter (‘Contact and Lexical Borrowing’, pp. 169–79) addresses various issues of lexical borrowing, such as types of borrowing, motivations for borrowing, donor languages, borrowing hierarchies and borrowability, and so forth. The last publication to mention here is the chapter on ‘Semantic Borrowing in Language Contact’ by Brian Mott and Natalia J. Laso (in Anthony P. Grant, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*, pp. 155–72). The first half of the chapter deals with the major types of borrowing (as does Durkin’s chapter mentioned above). The remainder of the chapter discusses the causes of semantic borrowing and suggests that the semantic transfer occurring in L1/L2 and standard/dialect is similar to the process of borrowing.

In addition to the chapters mentioned above, there are several specific studies focusing on borrowing. On the basis of *OED* data, Zhen Wu investigates ‘Early Mandarin Loanwords in Contemporary English’ (*EnT* 141:i[2020] 23–9), in order to explain how transcription systems, such as Wade-Giles, Hanyu Pinyin, and earlier transcriptions, influence the spelling of early Chinese loanwords. Also on borrowings from Chinese is Wenge Chen, Derek Irwin, and Junjun Xing’s contribution ‘Towards a Systemic Functional Model for Characterizing Chinese Loanwords in English: The Case of *kowtow*’ (*Lingua* 248[2020] 1–19). Adapted from models in previous studies, the new multi-strata model in this study examines the word *kowtow* at the levels of phonology/graphology, lexicogrammar, discourse semantics, context of situation, and context of culture. It is concluded that *kowtow*, a Chinese loan, has been fully integrated into the English language, and its meaning has been extended in cross-cultural contexts.

Continuing with borrowed words from East Asian languages, Zixi You, Jieun Kiaer, and Hyejeong Ahn notice ‘Growing East Asian Words in English’ (*EnT* 141:ii[2020] 17–34) and examine the attitudes of British university students towards words of East Asian origin (EAW), specifically words from Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. They conclude that students were positive about using EAW; furthermore, ‘the adoption of EAW goes hand in hand with the adoption of East Asian cultural trends’ (p. 25). Food is a vital ingredient in culture and also a fruitful area for lexical borrowing. Jieun Kiaer gives full attention to *Delicious Words: East Asian Food Words in English*, presenting a tasteful study that whets language lovers’ appetite. With a range of mouth-watering examples scattered over five chapters—from the most common to the less well-known, from the established to the most recent, from regional to global—Kiaer’s book presents how the English lexicon is ‘being reshaped, rejuvenated, and made more “delicious” by other languages and cultures’ (p. 1).

Another study concerned with borrowing is Richard Scholar’s *Émigrés: French Words That Turned English*. French is a significant contributor to the English vocabulary with a high number of borrowings. As the title of the book indicates, the focus is specifically on the so-called *émigrés*—French terms that retain their *émigré* status in English, or in other words, the unnaturalized or untranslated French non-natives—including *à la mode*, *naïveté*, *ennui*, *caprice*, and many more. In this book, Scholar makes his readers revisit the question of how much the anglophones have owed to the French language and culture, *et voilà* the process of translingual migration is still continuing.

This year also saw the publication of the second edition of Bas Aarts, April McMahon, and Lars Hinrichs’s *The Handbook of English Linguistics* (a full discussion of each chapter may be found in other sections). Most relevant for the present survey are the five chapters in Part IV that focus on ‘Lexis and Morphology’. Three chapters, ‘English Words’ (pp. 443–61) by Donka Minkova and Robert Stockwell, ‘Compounds and Minor Word-Formation Types’ (pp. 463–82) by Laurie Bauer, and ‘Productivity’ (pp. 483–99) by Ingo Plag, have been largely preserved as they were in the previous edition (reviewed in *YWES* 87[2008] 24–6) with a few updates on data and referencing. (Note that the chapter on ‘English Inflection and Derivation’ has been omitted.) The last two chapters in this section are completely new. Éva Kardos and Stefan Dollinger take up the baton and focus, respectively, on ‘Lexical Semantics’ (pp. 501–23) and ‘English Lexicography: A Global Perspective’ (pp. 525–46). Rather than discussing all categories in content words (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs), Kardos gives particular attention to verb meaning and its relationship to grammatical properties of verbs, because verbs have kindled ‘the most amount of interest for lexical semanticists’ in the past few decades, both in terms of ‘[their] empirical coverage and [their] impact on linguistic theorizing’ (pp. 501, 518). After briefly describing the field of English lexicography in the past fifty or so years, Dollinger presents a model to schematize various kinds of English dictionaries, and then expands the scope to the state of lexicography in the context of WE. Dollinger also discusses innovations in learner’s dictionaries and lexicographical challenges to ELF, highlighting new areas such as learner lexicography and ELF lexicography. The chapter is rounded off by a thought-

provoking question: ‘how can lexicography ... be made more central for the study of English varieties?’ (p. 541).

Bridging the gap between lexical semantics and lexicography, a chapter entitled ‘The Lexical Stock of a Language and the Dictionary’ (in Igor Mel’čuk and Jasmina Milićević, *An Advanced Introduction to Semantics: A Meaning-Text Approach*, pp. 186–227) begins with how lexical units are grouped. In the rest of the chapter, the authors introduce the *Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary* (ECD), a particular type of dictionary to model lexical stock, and they describe its main features with plenty of examples.

Moving to studies on etymology and word histories. Two short accounts by William Sayers examine ‘The Etymologies of Old English *bædling* “Sodomite” and Modern English *bad*’ (ANQ 33[2020] 9–11) and ‘The Etymology of English *hog*’ (ANQ 33[2020] 12–14), with a discussion of the OED evidence in each case. New evidence for ‘Two Coastal Terms of Continental Origin: “Shingle” and “Dene”’ (N&Q 67[2020] 323–6), both said to be of obscure or uncertain origin in the OED, is presented by Keith Briggs. Also looking at a word of obscure origin in the OED, Jay Gilbert reports ‘On the Etymology of “Spate”’ (N&Q 67[2020] 483). Carole Hough looks for place-name evidence in two short papers. She examines ‘The Etymology of *pot* “Deep Hole, Pit”’ (N&Q 67[2020] 27–31), and suggests that ‘the earliest topographical sense of *pot* was “depression”’ (p. 30). In another note, Hough finds ‘Place-Name Evidence for the Etymology of Scots *carse*’ (N&Q 67[2020] 31–2), providing earlier attestations and missing examples in the OED and the second edition of the *Concise Scots Dictionary* (CSD2). In ‘Antedating the OED Entry for *squeteague* and an Overview of its Etymology’ (N&Q 67[2020] 480–3), Andrew Gaudio proposes that the word *squeteague* had been in use since 1803, which was before OED’s and DARE’s earliest references (1838 and 1848). Mirosława Podhajecka finds ‘Additional Evidence for *nu*’ (AS 95[2020] 364–76), a Yiddish loan recorded as ‘ultimately of imitative origin’ in OED3. In this squib, the evidence comes from the English translation of Russian classics, showing ‘chronologically convergent Russian and Yiddish influences’ on *nu* which makes it a word of ‘mixed etymology’ (p. 370). In ‘For OED3: An additional meaning of *to take the piss*’ (N&Q 67[2020] 32–4), Andrew Cooper argues that in PDE, the primary meaning of this expression refers to ‘passive-aggressive provocation’, based on corpus data from BNC and GloWbE.

Several articles introduce the ways in which multiple resources can be used to investigate an individual lexical item. In ‘How to Catch Your Unicorn: Defining Meaning in *Ælfric’s Glossary*, the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and *Urban Dictionary* [UD]’ (DJDSNA 41:ii[2020] 245–76), Annina Seiler examines the meaning of the word *unicorn* in three different dictionaries. One of the findings is that when nonstandard uses or nonce formations of words are missing in professional lexicography (as in the OED), then the crowd-sourced resources (like UD) are ‘the place to look them up’ (p. 272). Turo Vartiainen and Mikko Höglund conduct a fairly comprehensive study on ‘How to Make New Use of Existing Resources: Tracing the History and Geographical Variation of *off of*’ (AS 95[2020] 408–40). In order to illustrate the geographical distribution of *off of* in PDE and in eModE, this study mainly uses the spoken BNC 2014 and NOW for present-day data, and EEBO and COHA for historical data. In a similar

vein, Steffen Ducheyne retrieves data from various sources, including EEBO, Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO), the Royal Society Publishing search tool, and Google Ngrams, to identify and date ‘Early and Earliest Uses of the Word “Newtonian”’ (*N&Q* 67[2020] 483–5). Drawing data from five speech-related corpora and additional dialectal sources, James M. Stratton carries out ‘A Diachronic Analysis of the Adjective Intensifier *well* from Early Modern English to Present Day English’ (*CJL* 65[2020] 216–45). Although the use of *well* as an intensifier lacks attestation in corpus data, it has been retained in dialectal sources, showing that its use ‘did not completely disappear in all British dialects’ (p. 235).

Our daily lexicon reflects our preoccupation with things and events around us and is regularly renewed with up-to-date words of social significance. In this respect, Yaqian Shi and Lei Lei discuss and visualize ‘The Evolution of LGBT Labelling Words’ (*EnT* 141:iv[2020] 33–9). The results show that words like *gay*, *queer*, *homosexual*, *lesbian*, and *bisexual* all have experienced semantic shifts, whereas *transgender* fails to present such semantic change due to ‘a limited coverage of the diachronic data’ (p. 38). Trump’s language has opened the door to a new topic of linguistic research, with two topical publications dealing with linguistic-political issues: Adam Hodges’s book *When Words Trump Politics: Resisting a Hostile Regime of Language* decodes Trumpian politics from a linguistic perspective and reveals the language ideologies behind the words. A collection of essays on the topic of *Language in the Trump Era: Scandals and Emergencies*, edited by Janet McIntosh and Norma Mendoza-Denton, uses plentiful examples to illuminate the features of discursive Trumpian speech style and highlight the (negative) global impact of Trump’s words.

To round off this section, let’s look at the Word of the Year (WOTY) for 2020. WOTY is a tradition where several major dictionaries pick a single word summing up the previous year. The year 2020 was the first (and probably the only) year when all dictionary editors were of the same mind in choosing a Covid-19-related word as their WOTY. Topping the list were ‘pandemic’ (*Merriam-Webster Dictionary*), ‘lockdown’ (*Collins English Dictionary*), ‘quarantine’ (*Cambridge Dictionary*), and the like. Finding it hard to select a WOTY, the Oxford Languages team launched a report on Covid-19 and all its related vocabulary for this ‘unprecedented’ year. The language of Covid-19 went viral, which is also well represented in publications. *Critical Quarterly* published a timely special issue on ‘CoronaGothic: Cultures of the Pandemic’ (*CritQ* 62:iv[2020]), edited by Nick Groom and William Hughes. Some squibs in this issue describe how cultural, historical, and linguistic aspects are closely intertwined in the pandemic context. Searching through a personally compiled Twitter corpus, Antonio Lillo looks for synonyms of ‘COVID-19, the Beer Flu; or, the Disease of Many Names’ (*Lebende Sprachen* 65[2020] 411–37), revealing the attitudes behind the words. Hongqiang Zhu’s article ‘Countering COVID-19-Related Anti-Chinese Racism with Translanguaged Swearing on Social Media’ (*Multilingua* 39[2020] 607–16) analyses the features of translanguaging swearing in response to Trump’s initial use of the racist term ‘Chinese virus’, illustrating the great linguistic creativity in cross-cultural communication. All in all, the pandemic lexicon has brought to the fore a lot of linguistic concerns and will continue to impact our everyday language.

8. Onomastics

The section on onomastics covering books and articles in 2020 will be added to the 2021 edition of *YWES*.

9. Dialectology and Sociolinguistics

The interest of formal syntax in (at least some) non-standard constructions seems to be increasing. One example this year is Elspeth Edelstein's introduction to *English Syntax: A Minimalist Account of Structure and Variation*, where every chapter contains a discussion of 'puzzling' (p. 19) syntactic constructions of some varieties of English, such as differences in transitivity (*I learned him a lesson*), double modals, multiple negation, the ScE negator *-nae*, different complementation of *need* (*the cat needs fed*), reflexive use, or zero adverbs. Dialectologically this is rather stereotypical, and the examples seem to be constructed in most cases (many of them involving *haggis* for some strange reason), but it certainly is an advance on earlier, rather dismissive attitudes in the field (for an in-depth review of this book, see also Section 4). Quite in contrast, Seth Katz has written a dialectologically informed *American English Grammar: An Introduction*, which like Edelstein aims to introduce students to the basic building blocks of grammar, but also debunks common myths about 'correct' English, stressing that 'different varieties of English are appropriate for different rhetorical situations' (p. 1). The introduction already includes a 'Guide to Non-Standard American Varieties' (pp. 9–11) covered in the book, including a substantial number of general vernacular features in nouns, prepositions, adjective comparatives and superlatives, determiners, pronouns, verb tenses, modals, verbal aspect, zero copula, quotatives, adverbs, negation, relative pronouns, *that*-clauses, interrogatives, and existentials. All features are described (with regional affiliation) in the individual chapters, often also including historical information and actual examples. This is an enlightening book, and an example of how syntactic variation can be included in more mainstream linguistic classes.

Turning to regional studies, as every year, our overview starts in the British Isles, moving (roughly) from north to south. Starting with Ireland, Warren Maguire has contributed a book-length study of *Language and Dialect Contact in Ireland: The Phonological Origins of Mid-Ulster English* (MUE) from its English, Scottish, and (surprisingly little) Irish input. After a sociohistorical overview chapter, two long chapters concentrate on the main distinctive phonological features of MUE and similar possible input features in Irish, English, and Scottish. Thus, chapter 3 discusses 'Consonants' (pp. 40–98)—fricatives, velar palatalization, pre-r dentalization, rhoticity, epenthesis, Consonant Cluster Reduction (CCR), and others. Chapter 4 deals with 'Vowels' (pp. 100–44), both in their quality and quantity. Most notable for MUE are the lowering and centralization of KIT and STRUT, lowering of DRESS, backing of TRAP/BATH, unrounding of LOT, fronting of GOOSE, and variation in PRICE. Maguire points out that 'an Irish explanation for divergent phonological features ... cannot be assumed ... potential inputs from English (and Scots) also need to be evaluated' (p. 6), something

this book sets out to do in detail. Indeed, Maguire finds English/Scottish sources, at most with Irish reinforcement, for most consonantal features, and Scots sources for most differences in vowel quality and vowel quantity. Overall, this study claims there is ‘a distinct lack of evidence for direct influence on the phonological development of the dialect from Irish’ (p. 145). Instead, the consonants make MUE a conservative ‘non-regional Midland and southern English type’ (p. 145) close to eModE, whereas the vowels show obvious Scots input. In this way, perhaps, phonology differs from syntax and lexis for this Irish dialect (see also Section 3 for a discussion of this volume).

Martin Schweinberger examines ‘Speech Unit Final *like* in Irish English’ (EWW 41[2020] 89–117), which in the absence of social stratification seems to have become ‘a frequent feature of standard IrE and ... a linguistic marker of Irish identity’ (p. 89). Raymond Hickey looks at another typical discourse marker, ‘*Sure* in Irish English: The Diachrony of a Pragmatic Marker’ (in Ewa Jonsson and Tove Larsson, eds., *Voices Past and Present: Studies of Involved, Speech-Related and Spoken Texts*, pp. 173–86), whose function of ‘affirming shared knowledge’ (p. 176) can be traced back to the late seventeenth century. Also on the history of IrE, Carolina P. Amador-Moreno uncovers *Orality in Written Texts: Using Historical Corpora to Investigate Irish English 1700–1900* [2019], more precisely in emigrant letters. After presenting her materials and giving a sociohistorical overview, the linguistic studies concentrate on, of course, discourse-pragmatic markers (chapter 4, pp. 90–133), but also the use of deictics (chapter 5, pp. 134–66), and the structure of embedded questions (chapter 6, pp. 167–98). For the discourse markers, the author finds that the use of *so* increased over the nineteenth century, especially closing *so* and narrative *so*; *anyway* and *anyhow*, although used in IrE by the nineteenth century, were less frequent than in other varieties, *like* already had discourse functions, and the stereotyped (unstressed) *sure* had been a distinctive trait of IrE for centuries and was perhaps already used as an identity marker ‘signalling Irishness’ (p. 124). For the deictics *here*, *there*, *this*, and *that*, Amador-Moreno finds ‘a clear emotional attachment in the letters’ (p. 139). For pronouns, *ye* and *you* were used prominently, but forms of *thou* also occur. Embedded questions were often not inverted (*she wants to know how much will you charge her*), even in letters of educated writers, suggesting that this feature was ‘not stigmatized nor avoided’ (p. 188).

Raymond Hickey and Carolina Amador-Moreno have edited a collection of papers on *Irish Identities: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. In this volume, Raymond Hickey sees the Irish as ‘Adjusting Language Identity: Twentieth-Century Shifts in Irish English Pronunciation’ (pp. 69–83), due to their political independence and reorientation towards an endonormative, supra-regional Irish pronunciation model based on middle-class Dublin usage, which includes TH-stopping, T-frication, the GOAT-monophthong, the distinction between FOR and FOUR, and an aspirated WH, whereas the earlier non-rhoticity, an open and lowered STRUT-vowel, a lax HAPPY-vowel, raised PRICE, and raised TRAP have disappeared. This change is also traced by Joan O’Sullivan in *Corpus Linguistics and the Analysis of Sociolinguistic Change: Language Variety and Ideology in Advertising*. In contrast to the 1970s, when standard BrE was still dominant in radio advertisements, supra-regional IrE features since then have ‘show[n] dramatic increases’ (p. 103),

for example rhoticity or vowel pronunciations, but also the use of *Ireland* and *Irish* has increased dramatically, pointing to a hyperbolic evocation of a stylized IrE. Recently, especially Advanced Dublin English has become mainstream, conveying a ‘contemporary and cosmopolitan image’, having become a ‘style for a modern Ireland’ (p. 141). O’Sullivan also gives a short overview of this research in ‘Constructing Identity in Radio Advertising in Ireland’ in Hickey and Amador-Moreno, eds., (pp. 220–51), pointing to the changing image of Advanced Dublin English from indexing a cool, contemporary Americanized youth culture in the 1990s, to reflecting a more mature, adult IrE identity in the 2000s.

Stephen Lucek and Victoria Garnett study present-day ‘Perceptions of Linguistic Identity among Irish English Speakers’ (in Hickey and Amador-Moreno, eds., pp. 104–30), finding much overlap of perceived dialect areas but also contradictory labellings. The main dialect areas distinguished are Dublin (with or without subdivisions), Cork, and Northern Ireland. Shane Walsh links ‘Salience and Stereotypes: The Construction of Irish Identity in Irish Jokes’ (in Hickey and Amador-Moreno, eds., pp. 172–97); the Irish, he notes, ‘have long been the butt of jokes in the UK and the USA’ (p. 172). Jokes published abroad tend to have more representations of Irish speech than jokes published in Ireland, and features include general vernacular features like possessive *me* or <-in> for <-ing>, but also actual Irishisms like the discourse markers *sure* or *indeed*, the use of *ye*, or the *after*-perfect, plus lexical features and of course religious euphemisms. More specifically for Cork, Elaine Vaughan and Máiréad Moriarty, in ‘“It’s Gems Like This That Make Me Wish I Hadn’t Left Ireland!”: Humorous Representations of Irish English and Their Role in Diasporic Identities’ (in Hickey and Amador-Moreno, eds., pp. 198–219), investigate the animated cartoon *Martin’s Life* on YouTube, which uses sociocultural Cork English traits to index stereotyped personae like the (politically incorrect, brutally honest) *Irish Mammy*, linked to the situation of the *Returning Emigrant*, which allows a global audience to explicitly reference their (Cork Irish) identities.

Another genre is investigated by Ana Maria Terrazas-Caero in “‘These Kids Don’t Even Sound ... Irish Anymore’: Representing “New” Irishness in Contemporary Irish Fiction’ (in Hickey and Amador-Moreno, eds., pp. 252–82), where she concentrates on pragmatic features like quotatives (*go*, *be like*, and *be there*), the use of the expletive *fuck*, and the discourse marker *like*, which the author claims are ‘more productive in terms of indexing modern Irishness’ (p. 261) than grammatical or lexical features—‘new’ or ‘modern’ Irishness relating to adult, educated, middle-class speakers.

In a much smaller-scale, ethnographic study Fergus O’Dwyer investigates *Linguistic Variation and Social Practices of Normative Masculinity: Authority and Multifunctional Humour in a Dublin Sports Club*, where he looks especially at realizations of the PRICE VOWEL and word-final /t/. O’Dwyer claims that a lower and retraced offset of PRICE is related to ‘Information Talk’ (p. 96), indexing epistemic status: implying a position of knowledge, expertise, or authority, quoting other authoritative positions, or asserting authority (p. 99). Word-final /t/ variants include fricated /t/ (‘slit-t’), glottalized variants, or deletion. Slit-t realizations (particularly often in the pragmatic markers *right* or *but*) seem to ‘cluster around speech where speakers are providing information’ (p. 128), interestingly often

followed by a pause. Fricated /t/ is also examined by Marion Schulte in 'Positive Evaluative Stance and /t/ Frication: A Sociophonetic Analysis of /t/ Realisations in Dublin English' (in Hickey and Amador-Moreno, eds., pp. 84–103), in contrast to O'Dwyer especially in young *female* Dubliners, for whom the fricative realization seems to be a highly prestigious variant associated with 'well-spokenness and propriety ... [and conveying] a positive evaluative stance' (pp. 98–9).

Göran Wolf discusses 'Ulster Scots Identity in Contemporary Northern Ireland' (in Hickey and Amador-Moreno, eds., pp. 131–50), where he observes a growing debate about its status in public discourse as well as in politics but also a growth in literary output, perhaps pointing to 'a renaissance of the language variety' (p. 131). Ideologically, in Ulster Scots texts with extremely divergent spellings (*baag*, *fäsh*, *scunnèr*, or *pletfoarm*) from StE, Wolf detects a link to Unionist or even Loyalist Ulster Scots identities.

Robert McColl Millar this year provides *A Sociolinguistic History of Scotland*, proceeding diachronically. After an overview of prehistoric times and the history of Gaelic, Norn, and Germanic varieties in the country, McColl Millar notes that by the seventeenth century, 'Scots was becoming dialectalised under Standard English ... its time as the default language of non-literary prose was finished' (p. 99). At the same time, Scots served as important input to the creation of Ulster Scots in Northern Ireland. Literary Scots underwent a vernacular revival in the eighteenth century, under influence of the Romantic movement, and spoken Scots became dominant in the north-east, creating the distinctive *Doric* of the area. The nineteenth century saw the creation of a distinct Scottish StE, which has remained the prestige variety until today. Shetland Island Scots was created in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the demise of Norn and immigration from mainland Scotland. The twentieth century is characterized by economic and linguistic 'contraction' (p. 156) but also a new appreciation of vernaculars in literature and popular culture. For the present day, McColl Millar notes, perhaps a little resignedly, that Scots' 'discrete nature seems to be being worn down: as a close relative of the hegemonic language, convergence and even merger is entirely possible' (p. 184).

Moving to the analysis of specific linguistic features, Morgan Sonderegger, Jane Stuart-Smith, Thea Knowles, Rachel Macdonald, and Tamara Rathke discover 'Structured Heterogeneity in Scottish Stops over the Twentieth Century' (*Language* 96[2020] 94–125), where the phonetic cues of voice onset time, closure voicing, and closure duration show that over time, aspiration has become more important, and voicing less important, for the phonetic realization of the contrast. Márton Sóskuthy and Jane Stuart-Smith reconstruct 'Voice Quality and Coda /r/ in Glasgow English in the Early Twentieth Century' (*LVC* 32[2020] 133–57), which has been taken to be weakening since the beginning of the twentieth century. However, the authors argue that this is 'an artefact of a broader shift in voice quality' (p. 153) in working-class Glaswegian towards more pharyngealized qualities.

For Wales, Betsy E. Evans, Matthew Dunbar, and Nicole Chartier chart 'Cardiffians' Perceptions of English in the UK' (*JLG* 8[2020] 1–8), which centre on major cities in England and Wales. They also find that travel experience leads to more nuanced perceptions, suggesting that this may be an important new variable for perception studies.

Turo Vartiainen and Mikko Höglund explain ‘How to Make New Use of Existing Resources: Tracing the History and Geographical Variation of *off of*’ (AS 95[2020] 408–40), a complex preposition that is attested in English since the fifteenth century. The authors find an association with eastern and southern regions for present-day England—a regional distribution that is paralleled by historical data, and that might explain how East Anglian Puritans took this form with them to North America, where it is today found in all major dialect areas.

Patrick Honeybone and Warren Maguire have edited a collection of studies on *Dialect Writing and the North of England* this year, defining ‘dialect writing’ as writing that ‘intends to represent a non-standard dialect’ (p. 3), and including in their definition of the ‘north’ also the west and the east Midlands. In it, Andrea Nini, George Bailey, Diansheng Guo, and Jack Grieve look at ‘The Graphic Representation of Phonological Dialect Features of the North of England on Social Media’ (pp. 266–96), in particular on Twitter, which they argue indeed represents ‘phonetically motivated orthography’ (p. 289) and includes northern features like T-to-R, HAPPY-laxing, LETTER-backing, /u:/ in MOUTH, lack of the FOOT-STRUT split, alveolar *-ing*, vowel reduction (*ma*, *yer*), or consonant reduction (*di’nt*, *wi’*).

Moving to historical material, Warren Maguire conducts a fine-grained ‘Phonological Analysis of Early-Nineteenth-Century Tyneside Dialect Literature: Thomas Wilson’s *The Pitman’s Pay*’ (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 243–65) and argues that this poem ‘allow[s] us to reconstruct the phonology of ... early-nineteenth-century dialect in rich detail’ (p. 244). Maguire discovers a recessive pronunciation of *heaven* with /i:/, and /e:/ and /je/ for FACE, as well as early evidence for a lack of distinction between ME /a:/ and /ai/ in Tyneside. For the same area, Joan Beal discusses ‘Dialect and the Construction of Identity in the Ego-Documents of Thomas Bewick’ (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 51–74), a nineteenth-century Tyneside engraver and naturalist who used local dialect terms to ‘index authentic local knowledge and experience’ (p. 65).

Further south, Jane Hodson asks: “‘Did She Say Dinner, Betsey, at This Taam of Day?’”: Representing Yorkshire Voices and Characters in Novels 1800–1836’ (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 188–210) and finds ‘a nascent set of enregistered features’ (p. 206) of a Yorkshire dialect, including Definite Article Reduction (DAR), <oa> spellings in *doant* or *noan*, or the use of <o> for <a> in *mon*, *mony*, or *onny*, but overall little representation of Yorkshire English in novels of the early nineteenth century. Slightly later, this picture changes, as Paul Cooper shows in ‘Russian Dolls and Dialect Literature: The Enregistrement of Nineteenth-Century “Yorkshire” Dialects’ (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 126–46). Cooper observes that already in the nineteenth century different sub-Yorkshire repertoires (East Riding, West Riding, North Riding) are distinguished, presumably in particular for local audiences, while at the same time a more general Yorkshire dialect is enregistered for a wider audience, employing features such as DAR, *nowt/owt*, *mun* ‘must’, H-dropping, use of *reight* for ‘really’, reflexive *-sen*, or the use of *thee/ta*.

For Lancashire, Ivor Timmins introduces ‘The Bolton/Worktown Corpus: A Case of Accidental Dialectology?’ (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 297–315), which consists of ethnographic material from the 1930s but contains a range of phonologically and morphosyntactically interesting features, such as

enclitics *o'*, *t'* (aka DAR), H-dropping, L-vocalization (especially in *all*, and *call*), alveolar *-ing*, dialect /ɛ:/ in MOUTH, /ɪə/ in FACE, and /ɒ/ in *man*, relative *as*, negative *durn't*, or forms of the second person singular form *thou*.

Tony Crowley discusses 'Representing the Language of Liverpool; or, The (Im)Possibility of Dialect Writing' (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 147–67), finding a discrepancy between an 'awareness of linguistic difference between Liverpool and its surrounding hinterland dating from the late eighteenth century' (p. 162) and its late representation in dialect writing only from the 1950s onwards, perhaps linked to Liverpool's incipient economic decline, and to attempts to reconstruct the city, as well as its development as a hub of popular culture. Also for Liverpool, Patrick Honeybone investigates, manually and bottom-up, 'Which Phonological Features Get Represented in Dialect Writing? Answers and Questions from Three Types of Liverpool English Texts' (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 211–42) from the twentieth century, which feature the absence of the FOOT-STRUT split, the very localized NURSE-SQUARE merger, or T-to-R (as in *gerroff*), whereas Liverpool lenition does not seem to be very salient to authors. Kevin Watson and Marie Møller Jensen report on an 'Automatic Analysis of Dialect Literature: Advantages and Challenges' (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 316–50), which includes identifying all non-standard spellings and adding a phonological transcription in their corpus. They report on their trial of this on Liverpool English, where they successfully identify H-dropping, *th/dh*-stopping, alveolar *-ing*, T-to-R, and the NURSE-SQUARE merger.

Moving to the west Midlands, Esther Asprey looks at 'Black Country Dialect Literature and What It Can Tell Us about Black Country Dialect' (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 29–50), a dialect area that is increasingly being enregistered and commodified. Indexical forms interestingly include some grammatical features like its unique ablaut negation, negated forms of BE like *binna*, or the third person female subject pronoun '*er*'. Urszula Clark finds 'Enregistering Dialect Representation in Staffordshire Potteries' Cartoons' (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 103–25) clearly aimed at local audiences only. As one example, *shoes daz much at nate ozzy tizz owe dee!* indexes *Staffy Cher* (Staffordshire) identities largely through respelling to indicate vowel qualities, making it 'virtually impossible to decode ... without a working knowledge of the ... dialect' (p. 122). (If you were wondering, the StE respelling would read as 'It's used as much at night as it is all day.')

Finally for this collection, for the east Midlands, Natalie Braber looks at 'Nottingham: City of Literature—Dialect Literature and Literary Dialect' (in Honeybone and Maguire, eds., pp. 75–102), an area little studied so far but again showing many local features in dialect writing, both of pronunciation (/au/-monophthongization, GOOSE-fronting, DRESS-raising, FLEECE-lowering, yod-dropping, L-vocalization, T-to-R, and others), non-standard morphosyntax (i.e. use of *thee*, reflexive *-sen*, DAR), and lexis.

For the south-west, Tam Blaxter and Richard Coates investigate 'The TRAP-BATH Split in Bristol English' (*ELL* 24[2020] 269–306), which shows a complex pattern: next to the traditional length-only TRAP-BATH split, there is 'a length and backness split diffusing from the east and ... a merger diffusing from the north' (p. 269).

Roy Alderton examines ‘Speaker Gender and Salience in Sociolinguistic Speech Perception: GOOSE-Fronting in Standard Southern British English’ (*JEngL* 48[2020] 72–96), a change led by young women but below the level of social awareness. Alderton finds no influence of gender priming, suggesting that perhaps ‘sociolinguistic priming effects may be over-stated’ (p. 72). Moving to the metropolis, Erez Levon observes the ‘Same Difference: The Phonetic Shape of High Rising Terminals [HRT] in London’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 49–73), where, perhaps surprisingly, and in contrast to other varieties of English, clearly different pragmatic functions (statements vs floor holds) are not distinguished phonetically either by rise excursion size and rise dynamism or alignment of the rise onset with the nuclear syllable. Levon suggests that this might be due to the fact that HRT has relatively recently emerged in this variety. Jenny Cheshire is ‘Taking the Longer View: Explaining Multicultural London English [MLE] and Multicultural Paris French’ (*JSoc* 24[2020] 308–27) and finds four factors that may have helped MLE to emerge: the host language was ‘swamped by other languages’ (p. 323), children acquired the language largely from each other, the young people are indexing their neighbourhood positively, and there are dense social networks ties to maintain the newly emerging multi-ethnolect. Other factors (music, colonial legacy) may have added to the differences Cheshire observes between London and Paris. Also for MLE, David Hall observes that ‘The Impersonal Gets Personal: A New Pronoun in Multicultural London English’ (*NLLT* 38[2020] 117–50), the new pronoun being *man*. Hall provides a formal analysis and claims that *man* is featureless for person, which makes it possible for *man* to refer to ‘the full lattice of possible referents including speaker and addressee’ (p. 117), although it also has to be said that first-person referents seem to be favoured.

Far away across the Atlantic, for Canada, in a short squib Derek Denis looks at perhaps the best-known stereotype of this North American variety and asks, ‘How Canadian Was *eh*? A Baseline Investigation of Usage and Ideology’ (*CJL* 65[2020] 583–92)—note the past tense. Comparing historical regional varieties, Denis finds that *eh* was more frequent in southern Ontario than in southern Vancouver Island, but that even historically confirmational *you know* and the newer *right* were used more frequently. Nevertheless, the frequency of *eh* must have been sufficient for its enregisterment as a Canadianism, vis-à-vis US AmE.

Sali A. Tagliamonte and Bridget L. Jankowski point ‘Up North *there*: Discourse-Pragmatic Deixis in Northern Ontario’ (*JPrag* 170[2020] 216–30), i.e. non-locative uses of *there*, which correlate with higher proportions of franco-phone populations in the communities. Staying with Ontario English, Karlien Franco and Sali A. Tagliamonte find ‘New *-way(s)* with *-ward(s)*: Lexicalization, Splitting and Sociolinguistic Patterns’ (*LVC* 32[2020] 217–39), i.e. variable uses of *forward(s)*, *inward(s)*, or *halfway(s)*. There seems to be a trend towards (indeed) *-wards*, but towards zero in *-way* words, with the exception of strongly socially conditioned *anyways*, which ‘has gained prestige recently’ (p. 235).

Sali A. Tagliamonte and Katharina Pabst draw ‘A *cool* Comparison: Adjectives of Positive Evaluation in Toronto, Canada and York, England’ (*JEngL* 48[2020] 3–30) and find that the two varieties do not necessarily pattern similarly: *cool* and *awesome* trend in Toronto, whereas in York *lovely*, *great*, and *brilliant* are used the most. Also comparing Canada and northern English, Matt

Hunt Gardner and Sali A. Tagliamonte investigate ‘*The Bike, the Back, and the Boyfriend: Confronting the “Definite Article Conspiracy” in Canadian and British English*’ (*EWV* 41[2020] 225–54). They find that the use of *the* with personal domain possessed nouns is stable and does not show significant differences between the two varieties. Claire Childs, Christopher Harvey, Karen P. Corrigan, and Sali A. Tagliamonte provide us with ‘Transatlantic Perspectives on Variation in Negative Expressions’ (*ELL* 24[2020] 23–47), especially the StE variation between negation with *any* and *no* (*I didn’t have any money* vs *I had no money*). Again, the variation is ‘largely stable’ (p. 23), and the main factor seems to be the type of verb, not social variables. Finally, Charles Boberg looks at ‘Foreign (a) in North American English: Variation and Change in Loan Phonology’ (*JEngL* 48[2020] 31–71), i.e. the realization of <a> in *lava*, *pasta*, or *spa*. Traditionally CanE uses the TRAP vowel here, but seems to be converging on AmE (ah) (aka the PALM vowel).

On the Atlantic coast, James N. Stanford studies *New England English: Large-Scale Acoustic Sociophonetics and Dialectology*, based on online (yes, Mechanical Turk) audio recordings and questionnaires, and a host of fieldwork interviews, detailing the ‘fast-paced generational sound change in the English of northeastern New England’ (p. ix). Many traditional features of New England English, such as the lack of rhoticity, PALM-fronting, a ‘broad’ BATH vowel (i.e. /a/), the distinction of FORCE vs NORTH, or the lack of the MARY-MERRY-MARRY merger are undergoing supra-regional levelling to the General AmE variants, due to gentrification, the influx of newcomers, and other rapid demographic shifts. By contrast, in the Boston hub area, the traditional variants seem to be stronger, but even here they are receding in apparent time (see also Section 3).

E.J. White quotes Robert de Niro and asks, *You Talkin’ to Me? The Unruly History of New York English*, written for a lay audience to explain the stigma of this metropolitan variety (which is perceived as *rude*, *aggressive*, *loud*, and many other negative things), but also tracing New York place names, and the influence of New Yorkers on American slang, and songwriting from Broadway to hip hop. White relies on earlier research, but her personal approach may make this an easily accessible first introduction to this fascinating urban dialect in its socio-historical context (see also Section 1).

Further south, Betsy Sneller observes ‘Phonological Rule Spreading across Hostile Lines: (TH)-Fronting in Philadelphia’ (*LVC* 32[2020] 25–47), traditionally a feature of AAE, which is adopted by white speakers. However, these speakers display ‘overtly hostile attitudes towards black neighbors’ (p. 25) so the diffusion is clearly not caused by positive affiliation. Instead, Sneller suggests that TH-fronting has become a salient index of ‘*street* or *masculine* identity’ (p. 26). Also in Philadelphia, William Labov finds evidence for ‘The Regularity of Regular Sound Change’ (*Language* 96[2020] 42–59) in (ey)-raising before consonants (i.e. the FACE-vowel), a change below the level of social awareness that has been proceeding for over a century, where, in his words, ‘a few candidates for lexical effects were detected ... but by the end none were found to have escaped the tyranny of phonetic constraints’ (p. 56).

Moving inland, Aaron Dinkin directs our attention to ‘The Foot of the Lake: A Sharp Dialect Boundary in Rural Northern New York’ (*AS* 95[2020] 321–55), where to the west we find the Northern Cities Shift (NCS) and no low back

merger, whereas to the east the merger is more advanced, and TRAP, part of the NCS, is not raised. Dinkin suggests this may be due to ‘historical patterns of transportation’ (p. 321) since the eastern communities were historically not directly accessible to the Great Lakes shipping network. Annette D’Onofrio and Jaime Benheim are ‘Contextualizing Reversal: Local Dynamics of the Northern Cities Shift in a Chicago Community’ (*JSoc* 24[2020] 469–91), where they observe the NCS to be ‘dramatically reversing’ (p. 469), not because of a change in orientation towards more supra-local meanings but as a change away from ‘particular NCS-linked racialized and classed Chicagoan personae’ (p. 471): white working-class individuals like tradesmen, police officers, or firefighters who live in white enclaves of Irish-, Italian-, or Polish-American communities. Sarah Braun ‘Map[s] Perceptions of Language Variation in Wisconsin: On “Goin’ Fishin’ at my Cabin Don’t Cha Know” and “Normal Like Me”’ (*AS* 95[2020] 82–102) and finds evidence for three enregistered dialect areas: Milwaukee, the north, and central Wisconsin, divided along urban-rural perceptions and ‘the belief in a regionally located standard variety’ (p. 82) for the centre.

Stuart Davis, Kelly Berkson, and Alyssa Strickler ‘Unlock [...] the Mystery of Dialect B: A Note on Incipient /aɪ/-Raising in Fort Wayne, Indiana’ (*AS* 95[2020] 149–72), where they observe four different production patterns from full raising to no raising at all. ‘Dialect B’ involves raising in *write*, but not before flapped /t/s, and not in any monomorphemic trochaic words (*bison*, *cyber*, *tiger*), according to the authors an incipient stage of full raising. Larry Lafond and Kenneth W. Moffett look at ‘Lexical Complexities in the St. Louis Dialect Island’ (*AS* 95[2020] 173–202) in Missouri and Illinois and find that lexical selection (e.g. *dinner* vs *supper*, *drinking fountain* vs *water cooler*) is robustly linked to age and place (St. Louis vs Metro East). Staying in the area and coming back to the NCS, Jordan Kodner ‘Model[s] Language Change in the St. Louis Corridor’ (*LVC* 32[2020] 77–106), supporting an earlier suggestion that ‘migration into cities along Route 66 imported Inland North features into the Corridor’ (p. 77) before they then spread to communities further away.

Over on the Pacific coast, Valerie Fridland, Alicia Beckford Wassink, Lauren Hall-Lew, and Tyler Kendall have edited the third volume of *Speech in the Western States*, concentrating on *Understudied Varieties*. In it, David Bowie looks at a variety we have indeed not seen reported on much in the past, ‘English in the North: The Vowels of Southcentral Alaska’ (pp. 123–43), i.e. the area around Anchorage. Speakers there have tendencies towards the Western Vowel Change and show the COT-CAUGHT merger. Julia Thomas Swan carries her ‘Bag across the Border: Sociocultural Background, Ideological Stance, and bag Raising in Seattle and Vancouver’ (*AS* 95[2020] 46–81) and finds that Western (prevelar) BAG-raising in both cities is linked to being ‘ideologically opposed to perceived encroachment’, e.g. by gentrification or the increased cost of living, and ‘conservative stances toward changes in their city’ (p. 46).

Joseph A. Stanley observes ‘The Absence of a Religiolect among Latter-Day Saints in Southwest Washington’ (in Fridland et al., eds., pp. 95–122), where they are a small minority, and finds that ‘Latter-Day Saints’ speech in Cowlitz County was no more Utahn and no less Washingtonian than their non-Latter-Day Saint neighbors’ speech’ (p. 109). Alicia Beckford Wassink and Sharon Hargus

link ‘Heritage Language Features and the Yakama English Dialect’ (in Fridland et al., eds., pp. 11–38) in Washington State. The speakers show /u:/-fronting but otherwise little evidence of western features (no COT-CAUGHT merger, BAG-raising, or lax vowel retraction). In addition, the authors observe a distinctive glottal replacement of /t/, with long closure phases and distinctive release bursts as well as creakiness in the vowels preceding /t/ similar to other Native AmE varieties, but also mirroring ejective stops in Sahaptin (the heritage language in question). On another Native AmE variety, Ian Clayton and Valerie Fridland investigate ‘Western Vowel Patterns in White and Native American Nevadans’ Speech’ (in Fridland et al., eds., pp. 39–63), agreeing with Wassink and Hargus above that ‘Native American English varieties are sorely understudied’ (p. 39). In contrast to the Yakama English speakers above, however, their speakers from the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony (RSIC) seem to take part in the vowel shifts characteristic of white Nevadans and of the west more generally (including the COT-CAUGHT merger, fronted back vowels, and the retraction or lowering of front lax vowels), but /au/ seems to have a backer realization, and RSIC speakers tend to neutralize the difference between *PILL* and *PEEL*—both features perhaps ‘serving as meaningful ethnic distinctions’ (p. 55).

Jim Wood, Raffaella Zanuttini, Laurence Horn, and Jason Zentz move us to a grammatical variable in ‘Dative Country: Markedness and Geographical Variation in Southern Dative Constructions’ (*AS* 95[2020] 3–45). They find that not all variations (Personal Dative: *I got me a job*, Dative Presentative: *Here’s you some money*, and Extended Benefactive: *I looked for him one*) and permutations are equally acceptable to speakers, but there is a core southern area with the highest acceptability, even for constructions that are too rare to show up in corpora.

For the southern US and AAVE, Martha Austen examines the ‘Production and Perception of the PIN-PEN Merger’ (*JLG* 8[2020] 115–26) and finds that the near-merger ‘in which speakers cannot *hear* the difference between PIN and PEN words, yet pronounce them differently’ (p. 115) is quite common. There does not seem to be a distinct geographical distribution as to whether the merger happens towards /t/, or /ɛ/.

Appalachian English (AppE) is well-studied this year, (not only) due to the volume *Appalachian Englishes in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Kirk Hazen. J. Daniel Hasty asks, ‘Just What and Where Are Appalachian Englishes?’ (in Hazen, ed., pp. 3–19), pointing out that the main division is between a northern (parts of West Virginia and Pennsylvania) and a southern area (parts of Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, and North Carolina). Southern Appalachian is characterized by /aɪ/-ungliding even before voiceless consonants, /æ/-breaking, and lack of the COT-CAUGHT merger, which is increasingly used in northern Appalachia, perhaps because these speakers are ‘beginning to align more with non-Southern varieties ... targeting urban varieties from outside the region’ (p. 17). Paul E. Reed gives an overview of ‘Phonological Possibilities in Appalachian Englishes’ (in Hazen, ed., pp. 20–35), stressing that AppE is not some ‘type of antiquated version of English’ (p. 22), but as dynamic and changeable as other varieties. Thus, the distinction between /w/ and /ɹ/ is slowly disappearing, as is L-vocalization, and H-addition in *it* or *ain’t*. Use of the stereotyped /aɪ/-ungliding and of the Southern Vowel Shift depends on speakers’ ‘rootedness’ in the area (see below), whereas vowel-breaking and the PEN-PIN-merger seem to

be stable. Outside the collection, Paul E. Reed stresses ‘The Importance of Rootedness in the Study of Appalachian English: Case Study Evidence for a Proposed Rootedness Metric’ (*AS* 95[2020] 203–26), which might of course be relevant more generally. Reed’s metric involves place and community attachment measures (willingness to relocate, travel habits, self-identification, familial connection, areal identification ranking, local integration, and centrality of place identity), tapping into locally relevant categories. Kirk Hazen himself presents ‘Grammar across Appalachia’ (in Hazen, ed., pp. 36–51), pointing out that distinctive features ‘in day-to-day conversations dwindled’ (p. 40) over the course of the twentieth century, such as *a*-prefixing, multiple negation, *was*-levelling, demonstrative *them*, or regularized reflexives. The traditional second person plural *you ‘uns* is now giving way to pan-southern *y’all*, and the new quotative *be like* is gaining ground, as everywhere. Frances Blanchette, Paul E. Reed, Erin Flannery, and Carrie N. Jackson also observe ‘Linguistic Diversity in Appalachia: The Case of Negative Auxiliary Inversion’ (*AS* 95[2020] 297–320), i.e. in constructions like *Didn’t everybody watch Superbowl 53*, which might be ambiguous between reading ‘not all’ and ‘no one’, but tends to be read as meaning ‘not all’ by Appalachians, who also had more positive attitudes towards the construction.

Back in Hazen ed., Allison Burkette looks at ‘Discourse in Appalachia’ (pp. 55–68)—for example, *a*-prefixing has changed from being an unmarked non-standard feature to indexing narrative speech, used by younger speakers to create dramatic effect. Jennifer Cramer links ‘Identity and Representation in Appalachia: Perceptions in and of Appalachia, Its People, and Its Languages’ (pp. 69–83), all of which are often seen as marginal to mainstream America, and are stigmatized and ridiculed. However, there are some indications that Appalachians see their own way of speaking as ‘homey’, ‘pleasant’, and ‘beautiful’ and as indexing ‘their heritage and culture’ (p. 77), with some even reclaiming the term ‘hillbilly’ as an expression of regional pride.

Christine Mallinson and J. Inscoc discuss ‘Language, Gender, and Sexuality in Appalachia’ (in Hazen, ed., pp. 84–98) and point out that especially women suffer from the negative associations of AppE, as do Appalachians of colour and gender-queer individuals, who are doubly or triply marginalized. Speaking of Appalachians of colour, the main ethnic groups are presented by Becky Childs in ‘Language and Ethnicity in Appalachia’ (in Hazen, ed., pp. 99–112), who points out that ‘ethnic diversity has long been a part of the Appalachian region’ (p. 99). Thus, Cherokee speakers maintain the /aɪ/-diphthong in their English variety and have a more syllable-timed speech rhythm. African American Appalachians (or Afrilachians) by contrast tend to have the local /aɪ/-ungliding, are rhotic and have *BOOT* and *BOAT* fronting, like their white neighbours. However, for grammar, older speakers pattern more with local norms, whereas middle-aged speakers are more aligned with mainstream AAE. For the Latinx community, not many studies exist, but they similarly seem to show a mix of mainstream southern and local Appalachian features.

Jordan Lovejoy sees ‘Redneck Memes as an Appalachian Reclamation of Vernacular Authority, Language, and Identity’ (in Hazen, ed., pp. 115–29). Besides the stereotyped associations of ‘redneck’ (i.e. backward, rural, uneducated, racist, xenophobic, homophobic, sexist), there is a second meaning

referring to leftist union supporters in the 1920s (who wore red bandanas). Lovejoy observes a reclamation of this second meaning in internet memes today that serve as positive self-identification, not least by subversively using stigmatized vernacular language features. Isabelle Shepherd and Kirk Hazen discuss ‘Intersections of Literature and Dialect in Appalachia’ (in Hazen, ed., pp. 130–44), where AppE is typically used to signal authenticity but is also skilfully employed to point out generational differences ‘as a set of endearing traits that distinguish older characters from younger ones’ (p. 135). Walt Wolfram, in the ‘Afterword: Reflections on the Study of English in Appalachia’ (in Hazen, ed., pp. 177–92), stresses that ‘knowledge has to be shared to have value’ (p. 178) and calls for community engagement projects to give back a little to the people who have enabled the research in the first place.

In a book-length study, William Salmon looks at *Negative Inversion, Social Meaning, and Gricean Implicature: A Study across Three Texas Ethnolects*, i.e. constructions like *Can’t nobody teach you to be a cowboy*. The three ethnolects of the title are informal, vernacular AAE, Anglo English and Chicano English. Salmon debunks some generative myths about this stigmatized construction, arguing that negative inversion (NI) originates in expletive constructions (*There can’t nobody beat ’em*), that, against generative wisdom, definite NPs are allowed but pragmatically restricted, and that its emphatic character ‘arises as an interaction of Gricean reasoning and [its] status as a . . . social marker’ (p. 3). Also in contrast to earlier accounts, Salmon finds that in the three ethnolects investigated, NI is not monolithic but functions in different ways syntactically, semantically, and pragmatically.

Katie Carmichael reports on what has happened ‘(æ)fter the Storm: An Examination of the Short-A System in Greater New Orleans[GNO]’ (*LVC* 32[2020] 107–31). While the traditional split-*a* system is still in place for many speakers, others have shifted towards the supra-local nasal system, correlating with speakers’ orientation to places outside GNO (perhaps Reed would call it lack of rootedness).

Back on the east coast, Robin Dodsworth and Richard Benton study the speech of Raleigh, North Carolina, in *Language Variation and Change in Social Networks: A Bipartite Approach*, in particular the retreat from the Southern Vowel Shift (SVS) there since the 1970s, which involves glide strengthening of /ai/, and the reversal of changes in /i/, /ɪ/, /e/, /ɛ/, and /æ/. This is due to the influx of (especially white-collar) newcomers, which made Raleigh a ‘model of urban dialect contact setting’ (p. 39). After a social reallocation of local variants, which increasingly became heard as ‘working-class’, white-collar speakers led in the move away from the SVS, which retained covert prestige as ‘friendly’, ‘down to earth’, and perhaps ‘tough’. Dodsworth and Benton’s careful social network analysis across the generations shows that community integration generally corresponds to the maintenance of the vernacular, and that the retreat from the SVS correlates with weakening of these network ties.

For Florida, Phillip M. Carter, Lydda López Valdez, and Nandi Sims observe ‘New Dialect Formation through Language Contact: Vocalic and Prosodic Developments in Miami English’ (*AS* 95[2020] 119–48). Prosodic rhythm and vowel quality in second-generation Latinx speakers show more syllable-timed speech, lower and backer /æ/ (both before nasals and non-pre-nasally), and

backer tokens of /u/, pointing to ‘the emergence of a distinctive ethno-linguistic speech variety in South Florida’ (p. 137).

Speaking of ethnicity, Anne H. Charity Hudley, Christine Mallinson, and Mary Bucholtz call for a move ‘Toward Racial Justice in Linguistics: Interdisciplinary Insights into Theorizing Race in the Discipline and Diversifying the Profession’ (*Language* 96[2020] e200–35) since they see a lack of ‘explicit theoretical perspectives that would enable [linguists] to address race-related questions in an adequate way’ (p. e200). They propose including more scholars from racially minoritized communities, and including different theoretical and methodological approaches from neighbouring fields like sociology, anthropology, or psychology. Aris Clemons and Anna Lawrence support this in ‘Beyond Position Statements on Race: Fostering an Ethos of Antiracist Scholarship in Linguistic Research (Response to Charity Hudley et al.)’ (*Language* 96[2020] e254–67), arguing for the incorporation of ‘a variety of perspectives ... and real-life experiences’ (p. e255) in order to avoid the perpetuation of hegemonic (white middle-class cisgender male) ideologies. Ignacio L. Montoya advocates ‘Enabling Excellence and Racial Justice in Universities by Addressing Structural Obstacles to Work by and with People from Racially Minoritized Communities: Response to Charity Hudley et al.’ (*Language* 96[2020] e236–46), who are also structurally disadvantaged by the limits posed on ‘novel epistemologies and methodologies’ (p. e245). Charity Hudley et al. respond in ‘From Theory to Action: Working Collectively toward a More Antiracist Linguistics’ (*Language* 96[2020] e307–19), pointing towards the importance of talking openly about ‘the personal, the professional, and the political’ (p. e307) in order to abandon white supremacist conceptualizations of linguistics.

Moving to studies of AAE, Sharese King and Jeremy Calder discuss ‘The Nature of Boot Fronting among African Americans in Bakersfield, California’ (in Fridland et al., eds., pp. 64–78). They find that although AAE speakers in Bakersfield avoid the low back merger, their production of *boot* does not ‘differ significantly from their White American peers’ (p. 65), but a finer analysis shows both aspects of southern fronting, especially in older, male speakers, and newer Western trends, led by younger women, indexing their multi-dimensional, fluid identities. Steven Gilbers, Nienke Hoeksema, Kees de Bot, and Wander Lowie uncover ‘Regional Variation in West and East Coast African-American English Prosody and Rap Flows’ (*L&S* 63[2020] 713–45), surely a field little studied so far. The authors find ‘more rhythmic and melodic variation on the West Coast’ (p. 713), both in rap and in speech, whereas east coast AAE is less rhythmically diverse and more monotone, suggesting that there is a link between rap flow and prosodic features of speech.

Jennifer B. Delfino observes young students in Washington DC ‘Talking “Like a Race”: Gender, Authority, and Articulate Speech in African American Students’ *marking* Speech Acts’ (*IJSL* 265[2020] 57–79), where her students ‘mark’ StE through parody (involving high/nasal pitch, soft volume, elongated, super-standard vowels, rhoticity, gratuitous politeness) as ‘white’, ‘feminized’, ‘ineffective’, ‘weak’, and AAL as indexing ‘tough masculinity’ (p. 58), recalling Sneller’s similar results from Philadelphia above. In this way, Delfino claims, these students re-semiotize AAL as ‘articulate’ and ‘authoritative’. Another stereotype of AAE is taken up by Christian Ilbury in ‘“Sassy Queens”: Stylistic

Orthographic Variation in Twitter and the Enregisterment of AAVE' (*JSoc* 24[2020] 245–64) in tweets by ten gay British men. He claims that especially lexical and phonological features of AAE (for example *yall*, *yaas*, *momma*, <t/d>-stopping, monophthongized /aɪ/, or CCR) were used to 'signal the development of a very specific persona—the "Sassy Queen"' (p. 245), based on the imagination of black women as 'confrontational, fierce, and determined' (p. 258).

John McWhorter takes us 'Revisiting Invariant *am* in Early African American Vernacular English' (in *AS* 95[2020] 379–407), often dismissed as a fabrication or part of a 'minstrel caricature' (p. 379) of AAE. However, McWhorter argues that we should take those early depictions seriously and that they indicate that invariant *am* was a historical feature of nineteenth-century AAE that had disappeared by the Second World War, perhaps even a precursor of invariant *be*, which is curiously absent from the historical sources.

For Jewish English, Rachel Steindel Burdin examines 'The Perception of Macro-Rhythm in Jewish English Intonation' (*AS* 95[2020] 263–96), and finds that a distinct alternation of high and low pitch is heard as constituting part of an ethno-linguistic Jewish English repertoire, especially a distinctive rise-fall with a higher peak than in General AmE, which has perhaps spread into Jewish English from Yiddish.

Adina Staicov presents a book-length study of one of 'the least studied ethnic varieties in the United States' (p. 51), in *Creating Belonging in San Francisco Chinatown's Diasporic Community: Morphosyntactic Aspects of Indexing Ethnic Identity*. After tracing the sociocultural changes in the community over the past 150 years, Staicov discusses definite and indefinite article use, tense marking, and number marking across first- and second-generation immigrants. In all cases, younger second-generation speakers use significantly fewer non-standard forms (zero article, zero tense and number marking, all presumably substrate effects from the heritage languages, especially Cantonese) than older and first-generation speakers, and female speakers use fewer non-standard forms than male speakers. Whereas first-generation speakers mainly identified as 'Chinese', younger speakers relied more on local meanings and were more integrated into mainstream American society.

Erez Levon writes on 'Language, (In)Security, and Sexuality' (*JSoc* 24[2020] 111–18) since 'issues of insecurity, vulnerability, and precarity [*sic*!] pervade the lived experiences of people whose embodiments of gender and/or sexuality do not conform to hegemonic societal norms' (p. 111). Levon calls for an integrated approach to (in)security that would link sociopolitical structure with individual psychology, in order to investigate how people react differently to societal stigmatization.

Heiko Motschenbacher takes us 'Walking on Wilton Drive: A Linguistic Landscape Analysis of a Homonormative Space' (*L&C* 72[2020] 25–43). This main street in Wilton Manors, Florida, is constituted as a gay space by linguistic and non-linguistic signage, and 'same-sex sexualities are discursively constructed as the local norm' (p. 25)—this only applies to male gay sexuality, however, since lesbians and other sexualities are marginalized, and to only one specific type of gay sexuality, namely 'middle-class ... white, and ... focus[ing] on matters of consumption' (p. 41). Lewis Esposito 'Link[s] Gender, Sexuality, and Affect' with 'The Linguistic and Social Patterning of Phrase-Final Posttonic

Lengthening' (*LVC* 32[2020] 191–216), and finds that 'gay men and straight women lengthen their phrase-final posttonic syllables equally' (p. 191)—a feature that is heard as 'feminine', 'gay', and signalling 'expressive affect', especially 'flamboyance' and 'emotiveness'.

Rob Drummonds looks at 'Teenage Swearing in the UK' (*EWV* 41[2020] 59–88), more specifically in Manchester, where *fuck* and *shit* are by far the most frequently used swearwords. Drummonds also notes that *dickhead* seems to be more of a male insult, whereas *bastard* is used more by females. He also asks, 'Why so much swearing?' (p. 83) and notes that at least for these teenagers, swearing is 'simply part of the unmarked, and almost unremarkable, everyday language' (p. 83).

Also related mainly to age, Anna-Brita Stenström moves 'From *yes* to *innit*: Origin, Development and General Characteristics of Pragmatic Markers' (in Jonsson and Larsson, eds., pp. 265–81). In BrE, *yes* and *yeah* are typically used as responses, mid-utterance *okay* and *innit* function as contact checks, and at the end of utterances *yeah* and *innit* have a triggering effect. Since the 1990s, *yeah* and *okay* have become more common, and *innit*, the popular teenage feature of the 1990s, has remained in adult use, but has not increased in frequency. Also for BrE, Karin Aijmer says 'That's Absolutely Fine' in 'An Investigation of *absolutely*' (in Paula Rautioaho, Arja Nurmi, and Juhani Klemola, eds., *Corpora and the Changing Society: Studies in the Evolution of English*, pp. 143–67), which has become much more frequent over the past twenty years, especially in older female speakers. And this concludes our overview of dialectological and sociolinguistic research this year.

10. New Englishes and Creolistics

This section covers publications on New Englishes and creolistics. We begin with articles on several varieties and then move on to region-specific monographs and articles. 2020 once again proved very fruitful in terms of WE research, with many publications showing new theoretical and empirical directions.

A major publication this year has been the *Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes*, edited by Daniel Schreier, Marianne Hundt, and Edgar W. Schneider. In 'World Englishes: An Introduction' (pp. 1–22), the editors outline the development of WE as a field and highlight current developments before providing an overview of the chapters. Following the introduction, Part I, 'The Making of Englishes', begins with Raymond Hickey elaborating on 'The Colonial and Postcolonial Expansion of English' (pp. 25–50). The chapter gives an overview of how English has become a global language, ranging from colonial expansion to postcolonial independence as well as globalization. Next, Sarah Buschfeld and Alexander Kautzsch illustrate the vast area of 'Theoretical Models of English as a World Language' (pp. 51–71), covering early conceptualizations, such as the ENL/ESL/EFL distinction, as well as the most important models, such as Kachru's Circles model, Schneider's Dynamic Model, and, most recently, their own Extra- and Intraterritorial Forces (EIF) model. Chapter 4 by Lisa Lim assesses 'The Contribution of Language Contact to the Emergence of World

Englishes' (pp. 72–98). In addition to traditionally dominant contact scenarios such as in colonies of the British empire, Lim also addresses recent areas of language contact, as in computer-mediated communication and the language teaching industry. As the last chapter of Part I, Salikoko S. Mufwene comments on 'Population Structure and the Emergence of World Englishes' (pp. 99–119), stressing the important role that population structure plays as an ecological factor in how WE develop. Part II, on 'World Englishes Old and New', begins with 'English in North America' (pp. 160–84), in which Merja Kytö gives an overview of the colonial settlement of North America, some of the varieties of English that have developed in the continent, as well as some linguistic features of North American Englishes. This is followed by 'English in the Caribbean and the Central American Rim' (pp. 185–209) by Michael Aceto. In addition to similar key points to the previous chapter, the author also discusses some important theoretical questions regarding decreolization and creole continua. In the next chapter, Bertus van Rooy gives an overview of 'English in Africa' (pp. 210–35), focusing more on the history and theoretical considerations as opposed to linguistic features in African Englishes. The next overview by Claudia Lange covers 'English in South Asia' (pp. 236–62) and, in addition to commenting on the history and features of IndE and Sri Lankan English (SLE), also addresses theoretical aspects such as IndE as the linguistic 'epicentre' of South Asia. In chapter 12, Lionel Wee considers 'English in Southeast Asia' (pp. 263–81). In a slightly different approach, Wee gives equal attention to Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Thailand in terms of the history of English as well as language policies in the four countries. The last regional overview in this part by Carolin Biewer and Kate Burridge outlines 'World Englishes Old and New: English in Australasia and the South Pacific' (pp. 282–308). Instead of going over the many varieties of this region one by one, the authors discuss the potential of areally shared features in the region. Following the regional surveys, Part III focuses on 'Linguistics and World Englishes', highlighting specific aspects of linguistic theorizing in relation to varieties of English. First, Christiane Meierkord considers 'The Global Growth of English at the Grassroots' (pp. 311–38), detailing how, where, and why English spreads and is used amongst individuals who fall outside the elite that is typically in focus in WE research. Next, Alison Edwards and Philip Seargeant go 'Beyond English as a Second or Foreign Language: Local Uses and the Cultural Politics of Identification' (pp. 339–59). Highlighting the local contexts of Japan and the Netherlands respectively, the authors find that despite lacking the colonial background, English has developed important functions in terms of being a creative resource and a commodity for the countries' populations. Christian Mair then stresses that 'World Englishes in Cyberspace' (pp. 360–83) require careful consideration as well, since the digital realm represents an important resource and space for speakers of WE. Next, Daniel Schreier focuses on 'World Englishes and Their Dialect Roots' (pp. 384–407), which are sometimes easy but often difficult to trace. However, several features from dialect roots can still be identified in WE. Shifting to dictionary practices, James Lambert gives an overview of 'Lexicography and World Englishes' (pp. 408–35) by listing and commenting on dictionaries of WE (see also Section 7). Next, Alexandra D'Arcy points out 'The Relevance of World Englishes for Variationist Sociolinguistics' (pp. 436–58). Importantly, D'Arcy notes that the 'field

[variationist sociolinguistics] must necessarily push its boundaries beyond its primary focus on native-speaker varieties and monolingualism' (p. 452). This thought is continued in the next chapter on 'Multilingualism and the World Englishes' (pp. 459–83) by Sue Fox, in which the benefits of considering multilingualism as an asset are also highlighted. Next, Magnus Huber is concerned with 'Unearthing the Diachrony of World Englishes' (pp. 484–505): while there is a considerable amount of historical research on BrE and AmE, diachronic research on other varieties is only emerging. Much of this and synchronic research uses 'Corpus-Based Approaches to World Englishes' (pp. 506–33), as outlined by Marianne Hundt. Although corpora such as ICE are great resources, there are still many directions to be explored. Similarly, 'World Englishes from the Perspective of Dialect Typology' (pp. 534–58), as noted by Benedikt Szmrecsanyi and Melanie Röthlisberger, holds great potential in understanding similarities and differences between varieties. Another important issue is the relation between 'Language Acquisition and World Englishes' (pp. 559–84): Sarah Buschfeld finds that much can be learned if language-acquisition and WE research cross-fertilized more (see also her monograph below). The last set of chapters covers 'Current Challenges', starting with 'Norms and Standards in World Englishes' (pp. 587–608) by Pam Peters. Based on the examples of Singapore and the Philippines, Peters observes that, while varieties will continue to look at exonormative norms and standards, many factors influence a variety's development. Such factors are outlined by Erik Schlee in 'Identity and Indexicality in the Study of World Englishes' (pp. 609–32). Social meaning as an explanatory category plays a crucial role in understanding how WE develop and, again, sociolinguistic insights need to be taken into account. As Mario Saraceni shows, another factor is 'The Politics of World Englishes' (pp. 633–51). Questions of equality and diversity are important in understanding how WE develop and how they need to be framed theoretically. Next, Andrew Moody comments on 'World Englishes in the Media' (pp. 652–75): while traditionally not considered in sufficient detail, including the impact of mass media has great potential in understanding certain facets and features of WE. Finally, in the last contribution, on 'World Englishes and Transnationalism' (pp. 676–701), Brook Bolander identifies terminological issues related to the notion of 'transnationalism'; however, there are various shifts currently at work in the field (e.g. in terms of 'a growing emphasis on transnational subjectivity', p. 695). Overall, this handbook is an impressive achievement. It combines 'traditional' profiling of varieties with a range of issues that have emerged in WE research in the past decades. We particularly appreciated that pidgins and creoles as well as Expanding Circle varieties received attention throughout.

Another exciting new publication this year is *Modelling World Englishes: A Joint Approach to Postcolonial and Non-Postcolonial Varieties*, edited by Sarah Buschfeld and the late Alexander Kautzsch. This book offers an overview of the EIF model conceptualized by Buschfeld and Kautzsch and puts it to the test in applications to multiple regional contexts. In the 'Introduction' (pp. 1–15), the editors set the stage by describing the model and offering an outlook on the contributions to come. The first of these is 'English in England: The Parent Perspective' (pp. 16–37) by Clive Upton, who provides ten reflections on English in England and finds that, despite the historical importance of the variety,

there has been no endonormative stabilization for a long time. Next, Anne Schröder and Frederic Zähres focus on 'English in Namibia: Multilingualism and Ethnic Variation in the Extra- and Intra-Territorial Forces Model' (pp. 38–62). They highlight that the EIF model needs to consider multilingualism and the existence of multiple regional varieties. In the next contribution, Saeb Sadek applies the EIF model to 'English in the United Arab Emirates: Status and Functions' (pp. 63–84), stressing the usefulness of the EIF model for a variety that is situated between being a postcolonial and a non-postcolonial English. In chapter 5, Sachin Labade, Claudia Lange, and Sven Leuckert focus on 'English in India: Global Aspirations, Local Identities at the Grassroots' (pp. 85–111). Based on an attitudinal study carried out in Maharashtra, they identify a need to differentiate more closely between language attitudes and language identity. Next, Lionel Wee comments on 'English in Singapore: Two Issues for the EIF Model' (pp. 112–32), noting that the EIF model (and others) are free to move past the developmental phases described in the Dynamic Model. Moving on, Bejay Villaflores Bolivar discusses 'English in the Philippines: A Case of Rootedness and Routedness' (pp. 133–53). Bolivar highlights the applicability of the EIF model to hybridization, which plays a big role in the Cebuano community in the Philippines. Next, Sofia Rüdiger focuses on 'English in South Korea: Applying the EIF Model' (pp. 154–78). Considering the application of the EIF model to the Korean context a success, Rüdiger sees 'evidence that English has become a fixed part of the linguistic ecology in Korea' (p. 170). In the last contribution on Asia, Saya Ike and James D'Angelo describe 'English in Japan: The Applicability of the EIF Model' (pp. 179–201). While the EIF model proves useful in their opinion, particularly in establishing the foundation phase of English in Japan, the authors also note that some forces described in the EIF model may need further clarification. Chapter 10 is Kate Burridge and Pam Peters's 'English in Australia—Extra-Territorial Influences' (pp. 202–27). They highlight both resistance to and (subconscious) acceptance of AmE influences in Australia, noting that extra-territorial forces do not affect all varieties in the same way. Next, Edgar W. Schneider moves to 'English in North America: Accounting for Its Evolution' (pp. 228–50). After describing AmE in terms of the Dynamic and the EIF models, Schneider identifies issues for the future, such as accounting for nationalism as an unfortunate force in modern times, as well as moving beyond the nation-state as the dominant unit in research on WE. In chapter 12, Stephanie Hackert, Alexander Laube, and Diana Wengler visit 'English in The Bahamas and Developmental Models of World Englishes: A Critical Analysis' (pp. 251–73). They also consider the EIF model a valuable addition in the description of English in the Bahamas, but ultimately agree with Schneider in that nation-state models may have limitations in the long run. Next, Philipp Meer and Dagmar Deuber analyse 'Standard English in Trinidad: Multinormativity, Translocality, and Implications for the Dynamic Model and the EIF Model' (pp. 274–97). They describe a small case study and propose a revised version of the EIF model, which accounts for 'multinormative stabilization' as it can be identified in the Trinidadian context. Accounting for multiple lesser-known varieties, Daniel Schreier discusses the 'Englishes in Tristan da Cunha, St Helena, Bermuda and the Falkland Islands: PCE [Postcolonial English], Non-PCE or Both? Blurred Boundaries in the Atlantic' (pp. 298–321). All four varieties share sizeable

monolingual communities but are subject to language contact with other languages and dialects as well as various other forces. Patricia Ronan then focuses on 'English in Ireland: Intra-Territorial Perspectives on Language Contact' (pp. 322–46). Ronan emphasizes that important developments affecting English in Ireland, such as the large-scale language shift, cannot be adequately described by the Dynamic Model but by the additional forces described in the EIF model. In chapter 16, Cristina Suárez-Gómez considers 'English in Gibraltar: Applying the EIF Model to English in Non-Postcolonial Overseas Territories' (pp. 347–70). As Gibraltar is a territory with ties to the UK and Spain as well as a shift to English, the EIF model is able to account for the complexities of the Gibraltarian context better than other models. Finally, the last country-focused contribution is Thorsten Brato's 'English in Ghana: Extra- and Intra-Territorial Forces in a Developmental Perspective' (pp. 371–96). While welcoming the EIF model as a useful resource for describing English in Ghana and beyond, Brato also suggests that '*sociodemographic background force* should be relabelled as *sociodemographic factors*' (p. 392) in order to account for the importance of these factors. The final contribution is a 'Synopsis: Fine-Tuning the EIF Model' (pp. 397–415) by Sarah Buschfeld. In addition to summarizing the contributions to the collection, Buschfeld addresses various criticisms directed at the model. Overall, the book is an extremely valuable contribution to WE research and represents a highly innovative project. The chapters do not 'just' apply the model; instead, strengths and weaknesses of the model are evaluated and aspects of the model that fit the context at hand are emphasized. The editors' openness to criticism of the model is to be lauded; this will ensure longevity of the EIF model.

A monograph postponed from last year's issue is Julia Davydova's *Quotation in Indigenised and Learner English: A Sociolinguistic Account of Variation*. In the 'Introduction' (pp. 1–6), Davydova provides some very general background and the motivation for her book, explaining that her foci are the 'contrast and similarities between ESL and EFL English ... [drawing] on the domain of quotative marking for illustration' (p. 3). Quotatives are selected for multiple reasons, including the high degree of variation in the feature. In chapter 2, on the 'Globalisation of English: Forms and Contexts' (pp. 7–16), Davydova introduces the general framework and some important terminology for her study. In particular, she highlights ESL and EFL as well as the connection between variationist sociolinguistics and WE. Most importantly, she finds that 'the analysis of sociolinguistic variation needs to be extended to the exploration of the newest forms of English as these are the real-world laboratories for the exploration of global linguistic innovations and their patterns of use' (p. 16). The theoretical framework is further developed in chapter 3, on 'The Worldwide Reality of English Quotative Marking' (pp. 17–31). After defining quotation and quotatives (such as *said* and *thought*), Davydova elaborates on the constraints that affect which quotative is used and, finally, comments on the incipient grammaticalization of *be like*. Chapter 4 is devoted to 'Tackling Non-Native Speakers' Attitudes' (pp. 33–53). Davydova uses method triangulation involving an attitudinal questionnaire, distributed among Indian and German students, a Verbal Guise test, and sociolinguistic interviews to identify prevalent attitudes towards different varieties of English that may influence the choice of (borrowed) quotatives. In chapter 5, on 'The Nativised Ecology of Quotation' (pp. 55–89), Davydova analyses data from

eighty students at New Delhi's Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) to establish the quotative inventory of ESL speakers in India. Mass media is highlighted in the chapter as an important factor influencing frequencies of *be like*. Chapter 6, on 'The Learner Ecology of Quotation' (pp. 91–120), is comparable to the previous chapter but focuses on an EFL setting. Data from ninety-seven German students are analysed regarding quotative usage and input and, again, mass media are emphasized as factors in sociolinguistic variation and variant acquisition. Next is chapter 7, on 'Quotation in Non-Native English: Bird's Eye Perspective' (pp. 121–44). In this chapter, the author compares the findings from both varieties and offers a discussion, finding that both Indian and German learners of English are quick to adopt linguistic variants, even though the language ecologies are highly different. The factors that influence variation, however, are manifold and complex. This is followed by chapter 8, on 'Non-Native Speakers' Perceptions and Adaptation of Global Linguistic Innovations' (pp. 145–73). Davydova presents the result of further attitudinal studies, this time focusing on *be like*. Both Indian and German learners 'have developed a mixed baggage of attitudes comprising both positive and negative evaluations of (*be*) *like*' (p. 172). Finally, chapter 9 is 'Putting It All Together' (pp. 175–208). This chapter serves as a discussion and a conclusion to the book, offering commentary on frequency, salience, and other factors influencing *be like*, as well as a set of concluding remarks. Overall, the book is a welcome addition to the already significant body of literature on quotatives and *be like*. The methodological richness of the book illustrates the growing apparatus available to sociolinguists to better understand variation in ESL and EFL contexts.

The first of seven articles covering numerous varieties this year is 'Progressive or Simple? A Corpus-Based Study of Aspect in World Englishes' (*Corpora* 15[2020] 77–106) by Marianne Hundt, Paula Rautioaho, and Carolin Strobl. In this article, the authors investigate the use of progressive vs simple as in *He was driving along the road* vs *He drove along the road* (p. 82) in the newspaper segments of fifteen ICE corpora. The ca. 3,000 tokens they identify were coded for five predictor variables. The results of the statistical modelling using conditional inference trees and random forests show that tense/modality, verb type, and animacy of the subject are the best predictors for the progressive/simple alternation. Another multi-variety corpus study is Gerold Schneider, Marianne Hundt, and Daniel Schreier's 'Pluralized Non-Count Nouns across Englishes: A Corpus-Linguistic Approach to Variety Types' (*CLLT* 16[2020] 515–46). This study analyses pluralized non-count nouns such as *furnitures* first in the BNC and then in the ICE components for Great Britain, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand, Singapore, Hong Kong, India, the Philippines, and Jamaica. While the study reveals certain quantitative differences between ENL and ESL varieties, it also confirms, in line with recent theorizing, that such differences are not always clear-cut. Next, Sandra C. Deshors and Sandra Götz investigate 'Common Ground across Globalized English Varieties: A Multivariate Exploration of Mental Predicates in World Englishes' (*CLLT* 16[2020] 1–28). Using the written sections of ICE Great Britain, Ireland, New Zealand, USA, Canada, Singapore, India, and Hong Kong, tokens of the mental predicates *believe*, *guess*, *suppose*, and *think* are coded for nine variables and analysed statistically using a conditional inference tree. Among other findings, the authors note that multivariate analysis proves

useful for the study of mental predicates and that developmental processes in varieties need to be scrutinized. Specific constructions across varieties are in focus in three articles, starting with ‘The *way*-Construction in World Englishes’ (EWW 41[2020] 1–32) by Thomas Brunner and Thomas Hoffmann. In this study, they analyse ca. 15,000 tokens of the *way*-construction (as in *Thinking my way round this idea*) from GloWbE and analyse them using various statistical methods, including mixed-effects models. They find that cognitive factors from SLA affect how the *way*-construction is used in WE, although such properties disappear the further a variety develops in terms of the Dynamic Model. Also drawing on GloWbE in addition to ICE is Seth Mehl’s ‘*Make us difficult*: Portrait of a Non-Standard Construction’ (EWW 41[2020] 352–67), in which the author presents and discusses a hitherto unresearched construction. In addition to providing frequencies, the paper also discusses variant rates (*make us difficult*-construction vs standard construction) and addresses comparable constructions, such as the *make me difficult*-alternative. Finally, Ole Schützler investigates ‘*Although*-Constructions in Varieties of English’ (WEn 39[2020] 443–61). His analysis of concessive clauses with *although* in the ICE corpora for BrE, CanE, NZE, NigE, IndE, and PhilE reveals that spoken language and interaction favour final positioning of *although*-clauses; however, Schützler does not identify a systematic difference between the L1 (BrE, CanE, NZE) and the L2 (NigE, IndE, PhilE) varieties in his dataset. Finally, Michael Westphal and Guyanne Wilson comment on ‘New Englishes, New Methods: Focus on Corpus Linguistics’ (Anglistik 31[2020] 47–65). The authors investigate forms and frequencies of question tags in the ICE corpora for PhilE and Trinidadian English (TrinE) and identify a high frequency of invariant question tags, while canonical forms are infrequent. Most importantly, their paper serves as a plea to broaden the scope of what is considered worthy of being researched in WE.

While not a single book on varieties in Oceania was published in 2019, there were two in 2020, a monograph and an edited volume on AusE. Whereas the monograph deals with the perceptual side of AusE, the edited volume largely focuses on the production side. In *Folklinguistics and Social Meaning in Australian English*, Cara Penry Williams provides a systematic discourse-analytic account of folklinguistic commentaries about variants of AusE to explore what social meanings they index and how these meanings are embedded in larger language ideologies. Following the ‘Introduction’ (pp. 1–5), chapter 2, ‘Conceptualising Social Meaning’ (pp. 6–25), formulates a coherent theory of social meaning, integrating the notions of ideology, indexicality, identity (or rather identities), stance, style, and linguistic form. The third chapter, ‘Studying Social Meaning via Folklinguistics’ (pp. 26–49), starts by placing folklinguistics on the map of linguistics by providing counterarguments to positions held against studying non-linguists’ beliefs about language. Beyond that, the chapter introduces a tripartite distinction between ‘use’, ‘mention’, and ‘voicing’, i.e. whether a speaker uses a linguistic feature, explicitly talks about it, or implicitly evaluates it. Next, the author introduces her data, fifteen semi-structured interviews and over 700 questionnaires from young Melbournians. Chapter 4, ‘Phonetic and Phonological Variation’ (pp. 50–87), presents findings on the use, mention, and voicing of pronunciations of words representing four vocalic features: (1) *derby* (START-NURSE variation), (2) *dance* and *castle* (TRAP versus PALM in BATH words),

(3) *ceremony* (presence or absence of secondary stress), and (4) *Allen/Ellen* (prelateral TRAP-DRESS merger). Feature (2) receives many comments. While *PALM* in *dance* is sometimes considered 'pretentious', TRAP is variably considered 'normal' or a feature of 'ocker' speech (see below). The discussion of feature (4) furthermore suggests that laypeople can indeed give accurate accounts of their own uses. Chapter 5, 'Lexical Variation' (pp. 88–118), explores use and comments about regional lexical variation, heteronyms, generic trademarks, and address terms. In chapter 6, attention is turned to 'Discourse and Grammatical Variation' (pp. 119–56), in particular, clippings and 'embellished clippings' (e.g. *barbie*), the (ing) variable (treated as grammatical here), pronouns, and final particle *but*. Participants see (embellished) clippings as typically 'Australian' and mention an iconic link between these forms and Australians' (stereotypically) 'laidback' (p. 124) attitude. Social meanings of the alveolar realization of (ing) draw on established meanings (such as 'informal' or 'lazy') but also associate this variant with the local types of 'the wog' or 'the bogan' (see below). Another form related to the bogan type is the second person plural pronoun *youse*. Like *youse*, final contrastive particle *but* is not used by the participants themselves but attracts a fair number of comments. The participants relate it to 'uneducatedness', 'informality', 'incorrectness', and Queensland. Chapter 7, 'Social Types and Language Ideologies' (pp. 157–89), elegantly ties together the findings of the previous three chapters by describing prevalent local type identities and their linguistic repertoires and by explaining how these are embedded in larger language ideologies. Specific identities discussed are the ocker (the rural working-class Other), the wog (the 'ethnic Other', p. 165), the bogan (the suburban 'chav', p. 166), the Queenslander (the 'regional Other', p. 169), and posh types (the 'higher social class Other'). The participants use these Others as a foil for their own positionings as 'normal'. Finally, the author analyses language ideologies surrounding AusE such as that it consists only of 'broad accents' (p. 174), that it is 'a relaxed version of' BrE (p. 174), or that the real AusE is only spoken in the outback.

Next is an edited collection on *Australian English Reimagined: Structure, Features and Developments* by Louisa Willoughby and Howard Manns. As they point out in chapter 1 on 'Introducing Australian English' (pp. 1–12), the edited collection 'brings together leading scholars of Australian English (AusE) who review its features and variation in its use' (p. 1). In addition to a brief description of AusE as a World English, the editors give overviews of the book's contents. This is followed by Part I, 'Features of Australian English', starting with chapter 2 containing Felicity Cox's description of the 'Phonetics and Phonology of Australian English' (pp. 15–33). In this chapter, Cox points out the diversity of Englishes in Australia, but focuses on the vowels and consonants of 'Mainstream Australian English'. In chapter 3 on 'Tense, Aspect and Modality in Australian English' (pp. 34–50), Peter Collins and Xinyue Yao compare TMA developments in AusE to AmE and BrE and find that colloquialization and Americanization are crucial factors affecting the AusE present perfect, progressive, modals, and semi-modals. Chapter 4 by Isabelle Burke on 'Negation in Australian English: From *Bugger All* to *No Worries*' (pp. 51–65) investigates 'conventional' as well as creative forms of negation in AusE and concludes that AusE negation is 'grammatically conservative but lexically adventurous' (p. 62). In chapter 5 on

'Reimagining Discourse-Pragmatic Features of Australian Englishes' (pp. 66–83), Celeste Rodríguez Louro gives an overview of various discourse-pragmatic features, such as general extenders, quotatives, and clause-final *but*. The study of discourse pragmatics, according to her, is at risk of being ignored or undervalued despite the ubiquity of discourse-pragmatic features in language use. Finally, chapter 6 by Howard Manns comments on 'The Lexicon of Australian English' (pp. 84–100). Manns points out the many sources of the AusE lexicon, including indigenous borrowings and creative items, and finds that the lexicon reflects Australian identities rather well. Part II, 'Internal Variation in Australian English', begins with chapter 7 on the 'Sociophonetics of Australian English' (pp. 103–19), in which Debbie Loakes summarizes previous studies of sociophonetic variation in AusE. Differences exist, for instance, between realizations of /t/ in Aboriginal English and Mainstream AusE. Next, chapter 8 by Lee Murray and Howard Manns delves into 'Lexical and Morphosyntactic Variation in Australian English' (pp. 120–33). Similar to the previous chapter, this is but an overview; two points that the authors highlight are age-related variation in the use of tense and aspect and patterns of regional lexical variation. Chapter 9 by Greg Dickson focuses on 'Aboriginal English(es)' (pp. 134–54) and stresses that, despite a positive trend towards embracing these varieties more in the last decades, there is still a need to view Aboriginal English(es) in their social context and not only from a formal perspective. In chapter 10 on the 'Ethnolectal Variability in Australian English' (pp. 155–71), Joshua Clothier comes to a similar conclusion for minorities in Australia in general, but also finds that much has been done in ethnographic research on varieties of AusE. Finally, Part III, 'Historical Development of Australian English', begins with a 'History of Australian English' (pp. 175–92) by Kate Burridge. After an overview of the colonial history of Australia, Burridge highlights the distinct informal nature of AusE in comparison to AmE and BrE. Minna Korhonen identifies 'American Influences on Australian English' (pp. 193–209) in chapter 12: they can be found across linguistic levels, but AusE speakers have a rather negative attitude towards Americanization and underestimate the impact that AmE has on AusE. Next, Pam Peters comments on the 'Codification of Australian English' (pp. 210–23). After locating AusE in Schneider's Dynamic Model, Peters briefly describes dictionaries and usage guides as well as corpora that show evidence of AusE codification before moving on to the variety's differentiation. In chapter 14, Louisa Willoughby investigates 'Attitudes to Australian English' (pp. 224–37). Despite more widespread acceptance of a local AusE variety, there are still concerns due to AusE's relatively high degree of informality. Finally, Simon Musgrave and Michael Haugh close the book with a note on 'The Australian National Corpus (and beyond)' (pp. 238–56). This corpus is a valuable resource in teaching and research, but also comes with certain limitations. Overall, this book functions almost like a handbook, since it mostly offers research overviews as opposed to original research. This approach can be irritating at first but does not take away from the usefulness of the book for further investigations of AusE.

Fewer articles on Oceania were published this year than last year. These comprise five articles on the two major Antipodean varieties, four on AusE and one on NZE. As humour is a good start, we will begin with Kerry Mullan's 'Humour in French and Australian English Initial Interactions' (*JPrag* 169[2020] 86–99).

This article compares the use of humour of eight unacquainted Australian and French speakers in dyadic interactions. It shows that Australians tend to use humour oriented towards third parties, often based on ‘incongruous images/references’ (p. 91), with the pragmatic function of establishing a relationship with their interlocutors and in initial turns. Next, James Grama, Catherine E. Travis, and Simon Gonzalez describe ‘Ethnolectal and Community Change ov(er) Time’ in the use of ‘Word-Final (er) in Australian English’ (*AuJL* 40[2020] 346–68). Their study shows that lengthening and concomitant retraction and backing of word-final schwa towards [a] occurred between the 1970s and 2010s. This change was led by second-generation Greek-Australian teenagers in the 1970s and spread to the community via working-class female speech, demonstrating that minority migrant communities can be drivers of linguistic change. In the last three articles of this section, we shift the focus from Anglo-Australians and migrants to Australia’s and New Zealand’s indigenous populations. Robert Mailhammer, Stacey Sherwood, and Hywel Stoakes uncover ‘The Inconspicuous Substratum’ in ‘Indigenous Australian Languages and the Phonetics of Stop Contrasts in English on Croker Island’ (*EWJ* 41[2020] 162–92). They investigate the assumption that Aboriginal Englishes neutralize the voicing contrast in stops. Contrary to expectation, bilingual and monolingual speakers of Aboriginal Englishes do not differ from speakers of Anglo-AusE when the cues of voice onset time (VOT) and closure duration are considered. However, what sets the group of indigenous speakers apart is that they exhibit phonetic voicing in phonologically voiceless stops, which might be conditioned by substratum influence. Monika Bednarek’s ‘Keyword Analysis and the Indexing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Identity’ presents ‘A Corpus Linguistic Analysis of the Australian Indigenous TV Drama *Redfern Now*’ (*IJCL* 25[2020] 369–99). Comparing language use in *Redfern Now* with dialogues on US television, she shows that *blackfella*, *whitefella*, *deadly* (‘cool’, ‘fantastic’), and *eh* have high keyness for *Redfern Now* and are associated with Aboriginal Englishes. Another linguistic characteristic of the indigenous series is the frequent use of kinship terms.

Staying with the topic of indigeneity but directing our attention to New Zealand, Andreea Simona Calude, Steven Miller, and Mark Pagel’s ‘Modelling Loanword Success’ showcases ‘A Sociolinguistic Quantitative Study of Māori Loanwords in New Zealand English’ (*CLLT* 16[2020] 29–66). Their mixed-effects models reveal that loanwords are preferred when their English equivalents are longer, when they are content rather than function words, when the English equivalent is not lexicalized, and when they express cultural rather than core concepts (e.g. *kaimatua* ‘elder’ rather than *whare* ‘house’) in both the Māori and Pākehā group. Only for white European New Zealanders do they find a preference for monosemous rather than polysemous loanwords, whereas an effect for the social factor gender was only found in the Māori group, in which loanwords were favoured by female speakers. For the latter group the audience’s ethnicity was also a significant predictor in the direction of same-ethnicity audiences heightening the use of loanwords compared to mixed audiences, an effect that is mediated by comparative word length.

As in the last issues of *YWES*, Asia remains the most popular continent in WE research. Two articles this year cover multiple Asian varieties, starting with

Lucía Loureiro-Porto's '(Un)democratic Epicene Pronouns in Asian Englishes: A Register Approach' (*JEngL* 48[2020] 282–313). This study investigates the use of epicene pronouns, with a focus on the sexist option generic *he* and democratic options *he or she* and *they*, in the ICE corpora for Hong Kong, India, and Singapore in comparison to BrE. An analysis including language-internal and language-external factors reveals that there are differences between BrE and Asian Englishes and that singular *they* spreads from spontaneous spoken language to other types of registers. In 'Multilingual English Users' Linguistic Innovation' (*WEn* 39[2020] 236–48), Li Wei asks if non-native speakers can innovate as well. Research on this topic has been dominated by an English-European bias, a monolingual bias, and a lingual bias. Taking a translingual perspective on linguistic innovations found in sinophone contexts reveals that, while there is creativity and innovation, examples show that traditional approaches involving named languages do not do justice to the complexity of how language is used.

The next area is South Asia, which is the subject of six articles this year. First, Raphaël Domanegre investigates 'Variation and Change in the Short Vowels of Delhi English' (*LVC* 32[2020] 49–76), focusing on apparent-time variation in the TRAP, DRESS, and KIT vowels in speech produced by twenty-two educated Delhi residents. The study shows that these vowels are possibly part of a chain shift, and, while other varieties of English are undergoing comparable developments, there is sufficient reason to consider IndE as a variety with its own, potentially unique characteristics. Further in the South Asian context, Robert Fuchs analyses 'The Progressive in 19th and 20th Century Settler and Indigenous Indian English' (*WEn* 39[2020] 394–410). Comparing the progressive in IndE and BrE, Fuchs finds that 'both [were] affected by similar long-term diachronic trends in the development of the progressive aspect' (p. 406). More precisely, the frequencies of the progressive have doubled in both varieties. However, the presented findings remain tentative until more and larger diachronic corpora are made available. Next, Melanie Revis and Tobias Bernaisch investigate 'The Pragmatic Nativisation of Pauses in Asian Englishes' (*WEn* 39[2020] 135–53) based on the ICE corpora for IndE, SLE, and, for comparison, BrE. They analyse the use of filled and unfilled pauses using conditional inference trees as well as mixed-effects models and highlight the latter as more useful for their study. The choice between filled and unfilled pauses is determined by various factors such as word class, but variety emerges as the dominant variable. Next, Mohammad Mosiur Rahman and Manjet Kaur Mehar Singh consider 'Language Ideology of English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education: A Case Study from Bangladesh' (*EnT* 36[2020] 40–6). Reviewing institutional policy statements and interviews with students, faculty members, and a member of the university's senate clearly shows that English is the dominant medium of instruction as well as the 'language of choice'; all groups consider English most beneficial in higher education. Laura García-Castro analyses 'Finite and Non-Finite Complement Clauses in Postcolonial Englishes' (*WEn* 39[2020] 411–26), specifically in the GloWbE components for IndE, SLE, and Bangladeshi English (BdE) as well as in BrE as reference variety. The statistical analysis of complement clauses after the verb *remember* reveals a preference of finite complement clauses in the South Asian Englishes, although all varieties are influenced by semantic factors, such as the

meaning of, and subject animacy in, the complement clause. Finally, an overview article by Shyam B. Pandey describes the history, uses, and attitudes towards 'English in Nepal' (*WEn* 39[2020] 500–13). In contrast to the overview articles for Iran and Turkey described later, Pandey finds that, based on its functions and attitudes towards it, English in Nepal 'is an Outer Circle context' (p. 512) as it plays an important role in the country.

The section on Southeast Asia starts with Sarah Buschfeld's well-written *Children's English in Singapore: Acquisition, Properties, and Use*. After an 'Introduction' (pp. 1–4) that describes the object of investigation, viz. the under-researched topic of L1 SingE, the author provides background information on language policies in Singapore and describes the rise of English as a home language in chapter 2, 'Singapore English: Evolution, Sociolinguistic Background, and Structural Characteristics' (pp. 5–34). The rise is particularly noticeable in the Chinese and Indian ethnic groups, in which over half of the 5- to 14-year-olds spoke English at home in 2010. The chapter ends with a review of literature on L1 SingE and a structural description of L2 SingE/CSE (Colloquial Singapore English). Chapter 3, 'Acquiring English as a First Language: Setting the Scene' (pp. 35–64), approaches the topic of L1 SingE from a language-acquisition perspective, with special reference to aspects of 'childhood bi-/multilingualism' (p. 36) and a problematization of the native speaker concept. Chapter 4 deals with 'Setting the Methodological Scene' for 'Investigating the Acquisition of L1 Singapore English' (pp. 66–121) by combining methods from WE and language acquisition. Buschfeld also introduces the participants of her study in this chapter. These include thirty-seven bi-/multilingual Singaporean children from predominantly Chinese and Indian academic families and a group of twenty-one age-matched monolingual and bi-/multilingual children from England. The author recorded their speech and carried out a questionnaire study with their parents in 2014/15. The findings of the questionnaire study are described in chapter 5, 'Singapore English: Acquisitional Background, Usage Domains, and Features' (pp. 122–61). They underscore the important role of English for the children in the sample. The chapter closes with a definition of a feature catalogue of L1 child SingE that includes many well-known features of L2 SingE/CSE. Three of the listed features are then subjected to quantitative analyses. Chapter 6, 'The Acquisition of Subject Pronouns' (pp. 162–85), indicates that compared to their English peers, the use of zero pronouns is not 'transitional' (p. 184) in Singaporean children. The same pattern is found for unmarked past tense in chapter 7, 'The Acquisition of Past Tense Marking' (pp. 186–213). In addition to a higher frequency of unmarked forms compared to their British peers, the use of *finish* as another past tense marking strategy is sometimes found in L1 child SingE. Based on these findings, Buschfeld argues that 'Singaporean children analyze and acquire the language in much more analytic ways' (p. 211). In chapter 8, 'The Acquisition of Vowel Sounds' (pp. 214–54), the findings of acoustic analyses investigating potential mergers of KIT-FLEECE and FOOT-GOOSE are reported. While the Singaporean children merge both sets in terms of formant frequencies, they maintain a length distinction, even though it is less pronounced than that of the ancestral British children. The 'Discussion' in chapter 9 (pp. 255–67) summarizes and explains the main findings in terms of an interplay of multiple reasons. It also makes clear that a full understanding of emerging L1

contexts can only be achieved by uniting the fields of WE and language acquisition. Chapter 10 presents a concise ‘Conclusion’ (pp. 268–71), which brings home the point that L1 SingE is not dissimilar to other L1 Englishes around the world and that ‘there is no reason to deny Singaporeans native speaker status’ (p. 270).

Six articles were published on varieties of English spoken in the region of Southeast Asia in 2020. Compared to the research output last year, this year’s research is less strongly focused on Singapore, with only two articles published. Another two articles deal with PhilE and one article each with Malaysian English (MalE) and English in Vietnam. Starting with the city-state of Singapore, Michelle M. Lazar provides a CDA of ‘Linguistic (Homo)Nationalism, Legitimacies, and Authenticities in Singapore’s *Pink Dot* Discourse’ (*WEn* 39[2020] 653–66). The author analyses language choices in *Pink Dot* videos that promote a yearly event in support of diverse gender and sexualities groups in heteronormative Singapore. She demonstrates that the linguistic choices of these videos are intimately connected with Singapore’s nationalist values and language policies. The author therefore concludes that ‘*Pink Dot* finds ways to “speak back” to power from within the space of discourse itself, rather than through a militant counter-discourse’ (p. 664). Next, Debra Ziegeler documents ‘Changes in the Functions of *already* in Singapore English’ taking ‘A Grammaticalization Approach’ (*JPCL* 35[2020] 293–331). Her short-term diachronic analysis of the functions of *already* from the mid-1990s to 2009 reveals that the share of the completive function of *already* decreased while that of its inchoative function increased. The author assumes that the completive function is now expressed by past tense rather than by *already* as in earlier times. She therefore clearly shows that *already* has not grammaticalized to become a past-tense marker in CSE, most likely due to ‘the continuous presence of the lexifier as the standard sub-variety in the contact pool’ (p. 321).

Moving north-east, we can find two articles on PhilE. Loy Lising, Pam Peters, and Adam Smith’s ‘Code-Switching in Online Academic Discourse: Resources for Philippine English’ (*EWV* 41[2020] 131–61) demonstrates that code-switching practices are well established in posts from twenty-four bi-/multilingual students in a closed academic discussion group on Facebook, with roughly a third of all utterances featuring code-switched segments. The authors argue that it is through performative and discourse-structuring code-switches that various Tagalog words and phrases have made it into today’s PhilE. Next, Wilkinson Daniel Wong Gonzalez and Mie Hiramoto deconstruct the notion of ‘PhilE’ when they ask whether ‘Two Englishes Diverged in the Philippines’ and provide ‘A Substratist Account of Manila Chinese English’ (*JPCL* 35[2020] 125–59). A comparison of frequencies of four linguistic features indicates that a separate variety of English has emerged in the Chinese Filipino community in Manila that differs both from Manila English and AmE, the input variety to PhilE, and that is influenced by Tagalog and (Hybrid) Hokkien, the substrate languages of Manila Chinese English.

Finally, we will direct our gaze to English spoken in Malaysia and Vietnam with the two final articles reviewed in this section. Sarah Lee and Thilagavathi Shanmuganathan detail the process of ‘Reconceptualizing *aunt*y as an Address Term in Urban Multilingual Malaysia’ (*WEn* 39[2020] 198–213). They show that

the choice of the address term *aunty* over equivalent terms in local languages carries subtle meanings in multilingual and multi-ethnic Kuala Lumpur. These can for example range from using *aunty* (rather than Tamil *athei*) to mark one's status as an outsider to a family in an Indian community to using it to pay tribute to the (assumed) modern lifestyle of an addressee. Moving from the Outer Circle to the Expanding Circle, Phuong Minh Tran and Kenneth Tanemura write about 'English in Vietnam' (*WEn* 39[2020] 528–41). The authors start by sketching the troubled history of English as a foreign language in Vietnam, whose establishment gained momentum in the years following the Vietnam War when the country opened its economy and proficiency in English was considered key to getting a well-paid job. Apart from this instrumental function, the authors detect the beginnings of an interpersonal function, especially in younger urban speakers.

Contributions on WE in the Middle East focus on Iran and Turkey this year. First, Mahdi Dahmardeh and Sung-Do Kim analyse 'Gender Representation in Iranian English Language Coursebooks' (*EnT* 36[2020] 12–22). They analyse five local coursebooks used in ELT and note that, unfortunately unsurprisingly, male perspectives are overrepresented in these coursebooks. The reasons for this are 'deeply ingrained sexism, or ... misunderstandings and misinterpretations of religion' (p. 21). Next, Negin Hosseini Goodrich gives an overview of 'English in Iran' (*WEn* 39[2020] 482–99). In addition to a survey of the historical and sociolinguistic situation of English in the country, Goodrich also provides insights into English in education and the media as well as the functions of English in Iran. Despite the government's negative perspective on English, it represents an important and popular language among the population. Beril T. Arik offers a comparable analysis of 'English in Turkey' (*WEn* 39[2020] 514–27), commenting on history and functions of, as well as attitudes towards, English. Arik highlights disparities in access to English (which is limited for women and rural inhabitants) as well as the country's complicated position between East and West. However, generally, English is popular in Turkey as well, which can be seen in 'The Use of English in Movies in Turkey' (*EnT* 36[2020] 35–41) by Beril T. Arik and Engin Arik. Based on a corpus study, the authors illustrate that movies shown in Turkish movie theatres come from various international backgrounds, but, in contrast to TV productions, are often not dubbed and, hence, released in English (or another original language).

The first three contributions on East Asia this year focus on English in China. First, Zimeng Pan analyses 'Culture-Specific Conceptualisations Relating to Corruption in China English' (*Lingua* 245[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102948>), using the English-language websites of *China Daily*, *People's Daily*, and *Global Times* as resources. The study, which is embedded in the cultural linguistics framework that has recently received increasing attention, finds cultural metaphors such as CORRUPTION AS AN ENEMY in the data. Instantiations of cultural metaphors are tied to a specifically Chinese context, providing further proof of potential nativization. In 'The Chinese English Dictionary: An Online Resource for Chinese English Lexicography' (*WEn* 39[2020] 154–70), Melissa Xiaohui Qin and Jingyang Gao investigate contact-induced lexis in the Chinese–English dictionary as well as in additional resources. A combination of qualitative and quantitative analyses reveals that 'Chinese languages, cultures and identities have been and are being constantly injected into English, giving rise to

new words and compounds since the second millennium' (p. 166). Some items disappear almost immediately after entering English; others persist and become important components of English vocabulary. Next, Jinjun Wang and Xingya Huang study 'English in the Language Ecology of a Community of Indigenous Derung People in Northwest Yunnan' (*WEn* 39[2020] 171–82). More precisely, they investigate the linguistic landscapes as well as language instruction in elementary and secondary schools in the Dulongjiang township. While English emerges as the second most frequently used language after Chinese, it is never used in isolation in the local linguistic landscape. Teaching practices present a similar situation, with Chinese first, English second, and Derung third, showcasing the importance of English even in local indigenous contexts.

Hong Kong is the subject of two articles, starting with Qian Wang's 'A Corpus-Based Contrastive Analysis of *I think* in spoken Hong Kong English: Research from the International Corpus of English (ICE)' (*AuJL* 40[2020] 319–45). This article analyses the frequency, position, collocation patterns, and functions of the discourse marker *I think* in some private and some public conversations featured in ICE-Hong Kong and, for comparison, ICE-Great Britain, and reveals differences for instance in terms of which speech situations favour the use of *I think*. Next, Ninja Schulz, Carolin Biewer, and Lisa Lehnen ask 'Hongkongites, Hong Kongers, Hong Kong Belongers? Tracing Identity (Re)constructions in News Discourse in Hong Kong from 1903 to 1999' (*EWV* 41[2020] 295–324). Taking the importance of identity construction in the development of WE as their starting point, they investigate instances of *Hongkonger(s)*, *Hongkongite(s)*, and *mainlander(s)* in issues of the *South China Morning Post* from 1903 to 1999. They find that historical events, such as the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong, have had an influence on how the inhabitants of Hong Kong have referred to themselves and to others. This approach to investigating language identities in post-colonial varieties of English is unique and laudable, since it takes the necessary diachronic perspective to uncover shifting identity constructions over time.

Moving to South Korea, Sven Leuckert and Sofia Rüdiger discuss 'Non-Canonical Syntax in an Expanding Circle Variety: Fronting in Spoken Korean(ized) English' (*EWV* 41[2020] 33–58). The authors investigate frequencies and usage contexts of topicalization and left-dislocation in Korean(ized) English, represented by the Spoken Korean English Corpus (SPOKE), in comparison to AmE, as represented by the Santa Barbara Corpus, as well as BrE, IndE, and HKE, each represented by their spoken ICE components. There are clear frequency differences between the varieties, as both constructions are on their way to becoming potentially nativized features of KorE.

Finally, three studies focus on Japanese English, starting with Toshiko Yamaguchi's 'Multi-Competence, Expressivity, Non-Native Variants: An Investigation into Japanese English' (*AEnglishes* 22[2020] 112–24). Based on twenty-five study participants' presentational talks on set topics, Yamaguchi wants to find out how expressivity is utilized by Japanese English speakers. Overall, speakers use native and non-native forms, and there is a need for English instructors in Japan to avoid classifying non-native forms as unacceptable by default. Next, Toshiko Yamaguchi and Poh Shin Chiew ask 'Is There Conflation? An Acoustic Analysis of Vowels in Japanese English' (*AEnglishes*

22[2020] 35–51). An acoustic analysis of four speakers in Praat reveals that, in contrast to previous claims in the literature, speakers of Japanese English do not systematically conflate vowels. Instead, as in Yamaguchi's previous study summarized above, speakers mix native and non-native forms but are fully intelligible to other native and non-native speakers. Finally, Glenn Toh reports on 'Challenges in English-Medium Instruction (EMI) at a Japanese University' (*WEn* 39[2020] 334–47). The dominant force of holding up a degree of 'Japanness' is a challenge for EMI initiatives in Japan, which Toh observes in the context of a Japanese university trying (and failing) to implement EMI.

The section on Africa opens with a monograph that is not easily placed in our structure based on regions and nation states because Mirka Honkanen's *World Englishes on the Web* portrays the linguistic repertoire of *The Nigerian Diaspora in the USA*. The 'Introduction' (pp. 1–8) contextualizes the topic under investigation in current sociolinguistic thinking. Chapter 2 describes 'The Sociolinguistics of the Nigerian Diaspora' (pp. 9–21). The profile of the Nigerian diaspora is that of a well-educated and upwardly socially mobile group. Compared to Nigerians in the homeland, this group tends to have little or no proficiency in ethnic Nigerian languages and more access to AAVE. Chapter 3, 'Resources, Repertoires, and Authenticity in Times of Globalization' (pp. 23–46), sets the theoretical framework for the study, which is firmly embedded in the sociolinguistics of globalization, a paradigm that calls for a rethinking of classical sociolinguistic concepts. The author trades concepts such as 'variety' and 'authentic speaker' for 'ethnolinguistic repertoire' and processual and agentive 'authentication'. Chapter 4 presents the 'Data and Methods' (pp. 47–69), i.e. a subsample of the Nairaland 2 Corpus comprising posts of fifty US-based Nigerians ('the core 50 subcorpus') and a combination of qualitative ethnographic discourse-analytic and corpus-linguistic methods. Chapter 5 provides background information about 'African Americans and their Vernacular English' (pp. 71–89) with special attention paid to the relationships between African Americans and Nigerians in the US, which are 'complex and full of tensions and misunderstandings' (p. 73). Despite the overall negative attitude towards African Americans and AAVE, AAVE can still be found on Nairaland, as chapter 6, 'African-American Linguistic Resources in Diasporic Nigerian Repertoires' (pp. 91–227) uncovers. Members of the core fifty differ in their extent of AAVE use, which the author neatly captures by distinguishing five user types: (1) consistent experts, (2) inconsistent experts, (3) occasional users, (4) minimal users, and (5) non-users. While reactions to type 1 users are mostly negative because 'many NLers [Nairalanders] do not accept AAVE as a major building block of an authentically Nigerian language repertoire' (p. 115), less frequent use of AAVE is more rarely met with criticism. Typical contexts of style-shifting into AAVE are rap battles, accommodation to other users, and fictional narratives. Typical AAVE features on the forum are habitual *be* and futurate *I'ma*, or spellings indicating non-rhoticity, TH-stopping or KIT-lowering in *thing*, and widespread use of address terms. Features used by 90 per cent of the core fifty are *aint*, *y'all*, and augmentation with *ass*. Chapter 7 shifts the perspective from AAVE to 'Nigerian Linguistic Resources in Diasporic Nigerian Repertoires' (pp. 229–76). Nigerian Pidgin (NigP) plays an important role in the ethnolinguistic repertoires of Nairalanders. Thirty of the core fifty are proficient in it and it is generally valued

as a code that can index Nigerianness. Ethnic languages are less often used because ‘they are not seen as appropriate on the ethnically inclusive Nigerian forum’ (p. 253). Alongside NigP, the use of NigE can also be found but is rarely the object of metalinguistic commentary. The ‘Discussion’ (pp. 277–303) in chapter 8 summarizes the main findings and reflects on linguistic and non-linguistic authentication. While ethnic languages and to some extent NigP are means of authenticating one’s Nigerianness, NigE does not seem to fulfil this function. In opposition to ethnic languages and NigP, AAVE is seen as a deauthenticating device, especially when used excessively or exclusively. Chapter 9 presents the ‘Conclusion’ (pp. 305–13) and derives avenues for further research.

Seven articles on varieties of English spoken in Africa appeared. We will start with a general article, namely Felix Banda’s ‘Sociolinguistics and Modes of Social Class Signalling: African Perspectives’ (*JSoc* 24[2020] 3–15), which is part of the journal’s theme series ‘Rethinking Social Class in Sociolinguistics’. Banda describes the many indicators of social class that exist in the African context, ranging from one’s place of residence via the school one attended to the language one speaks. The author depicts how these signals become locally relevant in a social interaction at a community development workshop in rural Kenya in which an urban Western-educated development agent interacted with rural participants. By choosing English in this context rather than Sheng or the participants’ L1, the agent established a social class hierarchy that positioned the participants as lower-class uneducated people without a voice. These, however, contested the structure by making comments in Dholuo and refusing to speak English.

Moving to West Africa, we can find two studies on GhE and one on NigE. Thorsten Brato analyses ‘Noun Phrase Complexity in Ghanaian English’ (*WEn* 39[2020] 377–93) from a diachronic perspective based on the Historical Corpus of English in Ghana (HiCE Ghana) (1966–1975) and ICE-Ghana (2000s). His results reveal that text type is the most important predictor for NP complexity, while syntactic function (subject vs non-subject) only has a weak effect. Overall, his results point to increasing complexification of the NP, especially in terms of post-modification, over time, which Brato mainly attributes to the expansion of the education sector through which ‘the variety became more diverse and its writers more confident in using more complex linguistic structures’ (p. 391). Moving on to discourse in Ghana, we find Mark Nartey and Aditi Bhatia’s ‘Mythological Heroism in the Discourse of Kwame Nkrumah’ (*WEn* 39[2020] 581–93). In a discourse-analytic investigation of fifteen speeches by the politician who led Ghana to independence, the authors postulate that he was able to garner support from the masses by portraying himself as a mythical hero, a ‘valiant leader’, and ‘noble revolutionary’ in a pan-African fight against the ‘conspiratorial enemy’ (p. 584) of colonialism. Moving further east to a country that gained independence a few years later than Ghana, Foluke Olayinka Unuabonah and Florence Oluwaseyi Daniel present ‘*Haba!* Bilingual Interjections in Nigerian English: A Corpus-Based Study’ (*JPrag* 163[2020] 66–77). Based on data from GloWbE, they show that while *haba* (Hausa) is similar in its function to *no way* in English, *kai* (Hausa) and *chei/chai* (Igbo) perform functions similar to English *Oh my God*, and onomatopoeic *mtchew* takes on functions of the gesture of kissing teeth, expressing anger, disgust, and contempt.

Travelling further south to Namibia, Anne Schröder, Frederic Zähres, and Alexander Kautzsch's 'Ethnic Variation in the Phonology of Namibian English' takes 'A First Approach to Baster English' (*EWJ* 41[2020] 193–224). The Reboboth Baster ethnic group, descendants of Dutch and Khokhoi people, emigrated to Namibia from South Africa in the second half of the nineteenth century. This 'unique Baster identity with its roots between South Africa and Namibia [is] reflected linguistically' (p. 213), as an acoustic analysis of 545 tokens of KIT, DRESS, TRAP, and NURSE in reading and interview data from five community members reveals. Most informants show a KIT-split into [ɪ] and [ɔ], the NamE-specific NURSE-WORK split into [ɜ:] and retracted towards [ɔ:] after /w/, and a TRAP-DRESS merger, while two informants exhibit DRESS-raising, a feature typical of White SAE. This variety is the topic of the second-to-last article reviewed in this section: Haidee Kruger and Bertus van Rooy's 'A Multifactorial Analysis of Contact-Induced Change in Speech Reporting in Written White South African English (WSAfE)' (*ELL* 24[2020] 179–209). In a diachronic corpus-based study on reporting constructions in BrE and White SAE between 1800 and 2000, the authors find that cross-linguistic influence becomes evident in proportional frequency boosts or cuts in White SAE compared to BrE, in a process of convergence with trajectories of equivalent structures in Afrikaans. The final article in this section is Ian Bekker and Erez Levon's 'Parodies of Whiteness: Die Antwoord and the Politics of Race, Gender, and Class in South Africa' (*LSoc* 49[2020] 115–47). Their close analysis of a music video by the South African hip-hop/dance band Die Antwoord reveals that the group parodies current conceptions of Afrikaaner whiteness through exaggeration and incongruity in characters representing the traditional poor white, the nouveau riche feminine, and hypermasculine stereotypes. Beyond that, the authors claim that the band uses meta-parody as they stage a *zef* persona, a lower-class white who appropriates aesthetics of coloured Cape Flats culture, a type of persona the band could be identified with. Bekker and Levon interpret this self-reflexive act as 'an ambivalent commentary on the unresolved state of race relations in contemporary South Africa' (p. 137).

The next continent in focus is Europe, which is the subject of one edited collection and one article. A major contribution that is missing from last year's issue of *YWES* is Raymond Hickey's edited collection on *English in the German-Speaking World*. This title moves beyond just Europe but, since much of the focus is on Europe and German is derived from Proto-Indo-European, we have decided to place the book in this section. The scope of the volume and contextualizations of the contributions are offered in Raymond Hickey's introduction, 'English in the German-Speaking World: The Nature and Scale of Language Influence' (pp. 1–10). This is followed by the book's first major section on 'The Status of English', with Christian Mair's 'English in the German-Speaking World: An Inevitable Presence' (pp. 13–30) as its first contribution. Mair employs de Swaan's 'World Language System' framework to discuss the role of English in Germany; he identifies an 'inevitable presence of English in the contemporary sociolinguistic ecology of Germany' (p. 26). Next, Sandra Mollin broadens the scope in 'English in Germany and the European Context' (pp. 31–52) and compares English in the German to English in the Dutch context. Despite increasing levels of proficiency and more acceptance of English, it still

represents an Expanding Circle variety. A view into the past is offered by Göran Wolf, who describes 'English in the Former German Democratic Republic' (pp. 53–70). Perhaps surprisingly, Wolf finds evidence for both direct and indirect influence of English on the German Democratic Republic. The next group of articles focus on 'The Transmission of English', starting with Friederike Klippel's contribution on 'The History of English Instruction in the German-Speaking World' (pp. 77–95). Based on a historical overview, Klippel notes that '[i]nterest in the English language was nearly always accompanied by a strong interest in the country, its culture and literature' (p. 92). Next, Sabine Doff zooms in on 'English Language (Teacher) Education in Germany after 1945' (pp. 96–113), noting that major changes in terms of English-language education only occurred in the 1970s and after. Finally, Susanne Göpferich, Ina Alexandra Machura, and Janine T. Murphy comment on 'Supporting English Medium Instruction at German Institutions of Higher Education' (pp. 114–40). While survey respondents, i.e. teaching staff, show interest in participating in measures to improve competences in English-medium instruction, they perceive it as an increased workload. Part III of the book, on 'Domains and Features of English', starts with Theresa Heyd and Britta Schneider's 'Anglophone Practices in Berlin: From Historical Evidence to Transnational Communities' (pp. 143–64), in which they discuss the sociolinguistic 'community' concept in light of the multitudes of bi- and multilingual communities that intersect in Berlin. Another study involving linguistic landscapes is Janet M. Fuller's 'English in the German-Speaking World: Immigration and Integration' (pp. 165–84). Fuller notes that English also plays an important role for immigrants to Germany and that different languages fulfil different roles, depending on context. Next, Alexander Onysko comments on 'Processes of Language Contact in English Influence on German' (pp. 185–207). Onysko finds that 'anglicisms are regular phenomena of language contact, which shapes the development of all languages and dialects to varying extents' (p. 202). Raymond Hickey, in turn, focuses on 'Persistent Features in the English of German Speakers' (pp. 208–28), particularly those found at the level of pronunciation. Sandra Jansen and Christian Langstrof work on 'Compiling a Speech Corpus of German English: Rhoticity and the BATH Vowel' (pp. 229–49). They use the 'Paderborn Archive of German Learner English' to study variation in rhoticity and the BATH vowel and identify structured variation in their data. The last contribution to this section, 'A Question of Direction: German Influence on English' (pp. 250–64) by Julia Landmann, is the counterpart to Onysko's contribution and discusses the functions of recent German borrowings in English. The book's final section moves 'Beyond Germany', starting with 'Varieties of English in the Netherlands and Germany' (pp. 267–93) by Alison Edwards and Robert Fuchs. Based on a questionnaire distributed in the two countries, Edwards and Fuchs identify a more positive attitude of Germans towards their own variety compared to the Dutch; however, attitudes are affected by sociodemographic factors. In 'English in Austria: Policies and Practices' (pp. 294–314), Ute Smit and Marlene Schwarz analyse English in the public and private spheres as well as in education and note, also considering findings from a newspaper corpus, that English is not only prevalent in Austria but also perceived as a useful language by most. Next, Simone Pfenninger and Richard Watts comment on 'English in Switzerland' (pp. 315–33). The situation there is unique in the European context

in that Switzerland is complex in its sociolinguistic makeup; decisions on the introduction of English are, therefore, based at the canton level. Sarah Buschfeld and Anne Schröder shift the focus to ‘English and German in Namibia’ (pp. 334–60): English and German play important roles in addition to Afrikaans; English has been imported in Namibia ‘as a second language for practical and ideological reasons and is nowadays used for intraethnic communication without having any deep historical roots there’ (p. 358). In the American context, Joseph Salmons and Miranda E. Wilkerson comment on ‘English in German-Speaking Wisconsin and the Aftermath’ (pp. 361–83). Perhaps unbeknown to most, Wisconsin had a sizeable German-speaking community that, over time, has shifted to English as their dominant language. The final contribution is ‘The English “Infusion” in Pennsylvania German’ (pp. 384–407) by Mark L. Loudon. While Pennsylvania German shows influence from English, particularly in its lexicon, it is rather modest compared to other similar contact scenarios. Hickey’s edited collection is a significant contribution and stands out in its unique but purposeful and clearly structured set of articles. The fact that most of the contributions work with original material stands out positively as well.

The only article focusing on Europe in the present survey is ‘English EU Terminology in Serbian: Linguistic Importation and Substitution’ (*EnT* 36[2020] 40–6) by Violeta Stojičić. In the alignment of ‘Serbian legislation with the legislation of the EU’ (p. 40), importation and substitution have emerged as important processes. For importation, direct loans are relevant; substitution, in turn, is evident in loan translations of compound and complex terms.

Only one article on the Caribbean has been published this year (other than contributions on pidgins and creoles), ‘Variability and Acceptability in Trinidadian English’ by Guyanne Wilson (*WEn* 39[2020] 462–79); 131 participants filled in a test of thirty-six items, which included the linguistic items as well as demographic information. Participants were asked to rate the acceptability of a set of sentences, some of which contained variation in terms of agreement. This acceptability test is a way to ensure that usage is not conflated with acceptability and enhances WE methodology.

Research on contact languages was prolific in 2020, with one monograph and eleven articles. We have deliberately chosen the term ‘contact languages’ here because the first monograph reviewed is about a language that cannot be categorized as ‘pidgin’ or ‘creole’, according to the author. Peter Mühlhäusler documents *Pitkern-Norf’k: The Language of Pitcairn Island and Norfolk Island*, a difficult endeavour given that it is not usually spoken in front of outsiders. The author arrives at his description after more than twenty years of ‘slow fieldwork’ (p. viii) in the communities, meticulous archival work, and a systematic synthesis of prior research. The first chapter, ‘Ontology’ (pp. 1–27), presents a kaleidoscope of old and new labels used for Pitkern and Norf’k by insiders and outsiders, academics and non-academics, linguists and non-linguists. The author shows that negative etic descriptions and their implied views became emic over time so that speakers became ashamed of their language until it recently started to become revalorized. Chapter 2, ‘Orthography and Spelling Issues’ (pp. 29–62), details the ongoing heated debate surrounding writing systems for Pitkern and Norf’k. The author argues that this debate can be informed by linguists but can ultimately only be settled by the community. In chapter 3, the influence of

'Geography, Demography, Cultural Factors' (pp. 63–100) on Pitkern and Norf'k is described from an ecolinguistic perspective. Chapter 4 starts by addressing problems involved in documenting aspects of 'Phonetics and Phonology' (pp. 101–33), given the incomparability of impressionistic transcriptions, drastic changes over time, and the unfocused nature of Pitkern-Norf'k. Nonetheless, we learn, for example, that Pitkern and Norf'k are non-rhotic and that they show differences in pronunciation. Chapter 5, 'Inflectional Morphology and Syntax' (pp. 135–200), is the core of the monograph. While Pitkern and Norf'k possess some creole features, which the author attributes to influence from St Kitts Creole spoken by one of the Bounty mutineers rather than independent creolization, other features are again un-creole-like such as a complex negation system or widespread use of prepositions and conjunctions. Overall, it becomes evident that very few grammatical features originate in the substrate Tahitian. Chapter 6 describes the multifaceted 'Lexicon' (pp. 201–55) of Pitkern-Norf'k with words of Tahitian origin, words from St Kitts Creole, some Scots words as well as nautical words, and a very wide range of eponyms. Chapter 7 is dedicated to 'Discourse Features and Pragmatics' (pp. 257–91) and sketches typical oral genres and salient speech acts. Chapter 8 describes the 'External History and Changes in Progress' (pp. 293–341). It starts with a discussion of the main linguistic socializers among the mutineers and the later influence of English-speaking 'interlopers'. Next, key moments in the history of the two islands are described. These include the relocation of Pitcairners to Norfolk Island as part of a social experiment in 1856 and the subsequent return of some families to Pitcairn, the starting point of the divergence of the two languages, whose separate development until the present day are described in the remainder of the chapter. Chapter 9 presents the 'History of Research' (pp. 343–95) on Pitkern-Norf'k as 'a history of missed opportunities' (p. 351) for the first 150 years. It was only in the second half of the twentieth century that considerable interest in Pitkern and Norf'k awakened. The author describes and assesses the outcome of this interest by specific individuals and himself. In the final chapter, 'Conclusions and Findings' (pp. 383–95), Mühlhäusler reflects on his approach before summarizing the main findings and giving an outlook on the future of Pitkern and Norf'k, which looks brighter for the latter than the former.

We will start our review of articles and book chapters with some general works on contact languages with much research focused on creoles before we move on to case studies on specific English-lexifier pidgins and creoles in America and Africa. Michel DeGraff comments on Charity Hudley et al.'s article 'Toward Racial Justice in Linguistics: Interdisciplinary Insights into Theorizing Race in the Discipline and Diversifying the Profession' (*Language* 96[2020] e200–e235, reviewed in Section 9 above) from the perspective of creole studies in 'Toward Racial Justice in Linguistics: The Case of Creole Studies' (*Language* 96[2020] e292–e306). He invokes a 'funder principle' in creole studies, stating that those who financed creole studies during the colonial era had an impact on how creoles have been theorized and studied, for example as languages that deviate from 'regular languages' ('Creole Exceptionalism'). What is needed to counteract this principle is "seed funding" from new funders that have truly progressive egalitarian ideology' (p. e303), an ideal that, according to DeGraff, may be difficult to attain given that those in positions of power tend to support

work against racial injustice only if it satisfies their own agendas. Staying on the contested topic of Creole Exceptionalism, Silvia Kouwenberg and John Victor Singler ask 'Are Creoles a Special Type of Language? Methodological Issues in New Approaches to an Old Question' (in Norval Smith, Tonjes Veenstra, and Enoch O. Aboh, eds., *Advances in Contact Linguistics: In Honour of Pieter Muysken*, pp. 107–58). Kouwenberg and Singler critically assess the method used in Bakker et al.'s 'Creoles are Typologically Distinct from Non-Creoles' (*JPCL* 26[2011] 5–42; see *YWES* 92[2013] 107). In their meticulous analysis, Kouwenberg and Singler suggest that Bakker et al.'s application of the phylogenetic method to measure the distance between creoles and non-creoles is flawed for several reasons, including data sparseness and therefore low statistical power, a bias in the selection of features, systematic errors in coding feature values, missing application of benchmarks, as well as the number and treatment of missing values. They conclude that they 'do not expect a corrected data matrix to reproduce the separation [between creoles and non-creoles]' (p. 153) and thus argue against Creole Exceptionalism. While structurally speaking creoles may not be special, they seem to be when it comes to the risk of becoming extinct, as we learn in Nala H. Lee's 'The Status of Endangered Contact Languages of the World' (*ARL* 6[2020] 301–18), which reports that pidgins, creoles, and mixed languages are twice as likely to be at risk of endangerment or extinction in comparison to non-contact languages. Lee emphasizes that contact languages are as much worth preserving as non-contact languages because they also express specific ethnic and cultural identities, encode local knowledge, contribute to linguistic diversity, and in their entirety show possibilities and constraints in language contact. The final article, Marlyse Baptista's 'Competition, Selection, and the Role of Congruence in Creole Genesis and Development' (*Language* 96[2020] 160–99), does not attend to the end of a creole's lifecycle but to its beginnings. She stresses the importance of congruence in creole formation. In other words, if lexifier and substrates or adstrates have features speakers consider to be similar, these stand a better chance of becoming part of the newly forming contact language. She specifies the notion of 'congruence' by distinguishing between congruence in form and function ('matter mapping') and syntactic distribution ('pattern mapping'). To support her argument, she presents evidence of nineteen phonemic, grammatical, and lexical features displaying complete or partial congruence in twenty contact languages.

Apart from these four general articles, we can find seven articles on specific pidgins and creoles. Five articles deal with contact languages in America and two with pidgins and creoles in Africa. This year's research output clearly focuses on Atlantic contact languages. The first article is the only article that touches on a Pacific English-lexifier contact language, albeit through the lens of Atlantic Dominican French Creole speakers. Christina Higgins and Gavin K. Furukawa report on 'Localizing the Transnational Call Center Industry' through 'Training Creole Speakers in Dominica to Serve Pidgin Speakers in Hawai'i' (*JSoc* 24[2020] 613–33). Their article describes how they trained eighty-one Dominican call centre agents for interactions with pidgin-speaking Hawaiian clients in a one-month workshop that introduced agents to structural and discourse-pragmatic features of Hawaiian Pidgin. In particular, the team focused on contextualization cues for different intensity levels of anger and frustration in

customer complaints and the need for expressing reciprocal empathy in response to these by recounting personal experiences, a strategy that conflicts with global call centre guidelines on efficiency and the avoidance of statements that could be interpreted as pleas of guilt. Focusing on a creole further east in the Caribbean Sea, Cristina Suárez-Gómez and Margarita María Chamorro-Díaz investigate ‘Copula Deletion in San Andresan Creole’ on the basis of transcripts of recordings with three women from San Andrés (*Miscelánea* 61[2020] 13–32). Their database comprises 150 tokens of present and absent copulative and auxiliary *be*, which form the dependent variable of a binominal regression. Their statistical analysis reveals that the category of the subject and the type of predicate condition the choice between realized forms and zero-forms. While following NPs favour the use of *be*, pronoun subjects and future marker *gwain* (‘gonna’) do not. Dealing with a creole back on the mainland, more precisely, in Suriname, James Essegbey and Adrienne Bruyn present ‘Moving into and out of Sranan: Multiple Effects of Contact’ (in Smith et al., eds., pp. 37–60). The authors present a cognitive-semantic analysis of the expression of motion in Sranan, Ewe (a Gbe language), and Dutch; they show that the expression of motion in Sranan seems to have been modelled on the structure of West African Gbe languages, which formed part of the substrate. However, more recently, Sranan has seemed to be undergoing a change towards structures found in Dutch. Next, Bettina Migge calls for ‘Broadening Creole Studies: From Grammar Towards Discourse’ (*JPCL* 35[2020] 160–77) and performs an analysis of pragmatic markers in Pamaka and Ndyuka, two Eastern Maroon creoles spoken in Suriname and French Guiana. Based on recorded data, Migge draws up an inventory of eighteen pragmatic markers, describes their functions, and illustrates what personae speakers project when using them in face-threatening interactions. In another guest column, Migge writes about ‘Mediating Creoles: Language Practices on a YouTube Show’ (*JPCL* 35[2020] 381–404), namely *Radio Wie Loetoe*. The programme is a call-in talk show with a live chat that caters to a diverse audience, including French Guianese and diasporic Eastern Maroons in France and the Netherlands. Migge’s analysis indicates that Eastern Maroon creoles are used to express aspects of speakers’ identities and to discuss private topics, while French is used to inform and to talk about professional topics. Dutch also features on the show and is used to accommodate guests and callers from Suriname. English is limited to well-known words and words related to pop culture and YouTube. Contrary to expectation, Migge finds that Sranan, a creole that used to compete with Eastern Maroon creoles, has an unexpectedly low representation on the show and in the chat.

Turning our attention to Africa, we can witness the publication of two articles on pidgins and creoles in West Africa. Kofi Yakpo’s article compares ‘Sociolinguistic Characteristics of the English-Lexifier Contact Languages of West Africa’ (in Smith et al., eds., pp. 61–83), including Nigerian Pidgin, Cameroon Pidgin, Ghanaian Pidgin English, Pichi (Equatorial Guinea), and Krio (Sierra Leone). He posits a cline considering the dimensions of speaker community, status and corpus planning, and domains of use, in which Pichi can be found at the lower end and Krio at the upper end. In general, he shows that despite high and increasing levels of use, these contact languages have not yet gained status so that ‘the potential of these languages remains untapped by

official policies across the region for education, political participation, economic activity and cultural production' (p. 76). The final article in this section zooms in on one of the five West African contact languages, namely Cameroon Pidgin English. Sarah FitzGerald's develops 'A Corpus-Based Method for Identifying Word Class in an English Lexified Extended Pidgin' (*WEn* 39[2020] 348–66). Her method draws on multiple sources of distributional evidence to establish the word class of the locative copula *deiy* in the Spoken Cameroon Pidgin English Corpus. It includes comparative collocational analyses of *deiy* and equivalent forms, comparisons of relative frequencies of collocational patterns, as well as the integration of biodata to establish whether certain collocations can be found in the wider community. Collating these different types of evidence, FitzGerald concludes that *deiy* is a verbal copula in Cameroon Pidgin English. On a much larger scale, the author can be credited with the design of a new empirical method for determining word-class membership amidst widespread multifunctionality in pidgins and creoles.

11. Second Language Acquisition

Numerous publications in the discipline of SLA addressed the development of different components of interlanguage grammar (phonology, morphosyntax, vocabulary, pragmatics, etc.) as well as the interfaces between them, L2 processing (speech, morphological, syntactic, lexical, etc.), the development of the four language skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing), individual learner differences, the role of input, interaction, and practice in L2 learning, and other topics. In the related field of bilingualism research, numerous topics were explored, including bilingual cognition and codeswitching. What follows is an overview of journal articles that have dealt with these topics in which English featured as the L2. A review of books published in 2020 will be included in the *YWES* volume covering 2021.

We first look at the work that deals with the development of interlanguage grammar. Starting with L2 phonology, several studies address speech perception. Kakeru Yazawa, James Whang, Mariko Kondo, and Paola Escudero examine 'Language-Dependent Cue Weighting' in 'An Investigation of Perception Modes in L2 Learning' (*SLR* 36[2020] 557–81) conducted with Japanese L2 learners of English. Elaine Schmidt, Ana Pérez, Luca Cilibrasi, and Ianthi Tsimpli argue that 'Prosody Facilitates Memory Recall in L1 But Not in L2 in Highly Proficient Listeners' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 223–38) based on evidence from Greek L2 learners of English. 'The Perception and Interpretation of Sentence Types by L1 Spanish–L2 English Speakers' (*LAB* 10[2020] 499–529) is explored by Malina Radu, Laura Colantoni, Gabrielle Klassen, Matthew Patience, Ana Teresa Pérez-Leroux, and Olga Tararova. Okim Kang, Meghan Moran, Hyunkee Ahn, and Soon Park look at 'Proficiency as a Mediating Variable of Intelligibility for Different Varieties of Accents' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 471–87) while testing Korean L2 learners of English. Finally, Esther Gomez Lacabex and Francisco Gallardo-del-Puerto compare 'Explicit Phonetic Instruction vs Implicit Attention to Native Exposure' focusing

on 'Phonological Awareness of English Schwa in CLIL' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 419–42) in a study with Basque/Spanish L2 learners of English.

Among studies on speech production, Geoffrey Schwartz and Kamil Kązmierski deal with 'Vowel Dynamics in the Acquisition of L2 English' through 'An Acoustic Study of L1 Polish Learners' (*LangAcq* 27[2020] 227–54). Felix Kpogo and Virginia C. Mueller Gathercole investigate 'The Influence of Native English-Speaking Environment on Akan-English Bilinguals' Production of English Inter-Dental Fricatives' (*IJB* 24[2020] 559–71). In one of the two studies considering the influence of orthography, Bene Bassetti, Paolo Mairano, Jackie Masterson, and Tania Cerni explore 'Effects of Orthographic Forms on Second Language Speech Production and Phonological Awareness, with Consideration of Speaker-Level Predictors' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 1218–56) looking at Italian L2 learners of English. In the other study, Mirjana Sokolović-Perović, Bene Bassetti, and Susannah Dillon claim that 'English Orthographic Forms Affect L2 English Speech Production in Native Users of a Non-Alphabetic Writing System' (*BLC* 23[2020] 591–601) based on evidence from Japanese L2 learners of English. In the domain of prosody, Anh-Thư T Nguyễn compares 'F0 Patterns of Tone Versus Non-Tone Languages' looking at 'The Case of Vietnamese Speakers of English' (*SLR* 36[2020] 97–121). 'A Cross-Language Study on Feedforward and Feedback Control of Voice Intensity in Chinese–English Bilinguals' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 771–95) is conducted by Xiao Cai, Yulong Yin, and Qingfang Zhang. 'The Influence of the Native Language on Phonological Preparation in Spoken Word Production in a Second Language' (*LAB* 10[2020] 109–51) is explored by Chuchu Li, Yakov Kronrod, and Min Wang in a study with Chinese and Japanese L2 learners of English. Finally, Annie C. Gilbert, Maxime Cousineau-Perusse, and Debra Titone claim that 'L2 Exposure Modulates the Scope of Planning during First and Second Language Production' (*BLC* 23[2020] 1093–1105) based on evidence from French L2 learners of English.

Among studies into the learning of L2 pronunciation, Kazuya Saito, Hui Sun, and Adam Tierney argue that 'Domain-General Auditory Processing Determines Success in Second Language Pronunciation Learning in Adulthood' based on 'A Longitudinal Study' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 1083–1112) with Chinese L2 learners of English. The same population is included in a study by Runhan Zhang and Zhou-min Yuan, which deals with 'Examining the Effects of Explicit Pronunciation Instruction on the Development of L2 Pronunciation' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 905–18). Natalia Wisniewska and Joan C. Mora ask 'Can Captioned Video Benefit Second Language Pronunciation?' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 599–624) in a study with Spanish/Catalan L2 learners of English.

Moving on to L2 morphosyntax, Isabel Nadine Jensen, Roumyana Slabakova, Marit Westergaard, and Björn Lundquist test 'The Bottleneck Hypothesis in L2 Acquisition' through 'L1 Norwegian Learners' Knowledge of Syntax and Morphology in L2 English' (*SLR* 36[2020] 3–29). Mahmoud Azaz studies 'Structural Surface Overlap and Derivational Complexity in Crosslinguistic Transfer' focusing on the 'Acquisition of English Genitive Alternation by Egyptian Arabic-Speaking Learners' (*SLR* 36[2020] 529–56). Jeanne Heil and Luis López address what they call 'Acquisition without Evidence' in a study of 'English Infinitives and Poverty of Stimulus in Adult Second Language

Acquisition' (*SLR* 36[2020] 415–43) with Spanish L2 learners of English. Keiko Kaku-MacDonald, Juana M. Liceras, and Nina Kazanina investigate the 'Acquisition of Aspect in L2' focusing on 'The Computation of Event Completion by Japanese Learners of English' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 185–214). Sujeong Kim, Heejeong Ko, and Hyun-Kwon Yang argue that 'Telicity and Mode of Merge in L2 Acquisition of Resultatives' (*LangAcq* 27[2020] 117–59) in a study with Korean L2 learners of English. Hae In Park asks 'How Do Korean–English Bilinguals Speak and Think about Motion Events?' considering 'Evidence from Verbal and Non-Verbal Tasks' (*BLC* 23[2020] 483–99). Norbert Vanek deals with 'Changing Event Categorization in Second Language Users through Perceptual Learning' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 309–48) with Chinese L2 learners of English. Kholoud A. Al-Thubaiti tackles the 'Pre-emption of L1 Properties in the L2 Acquisition of English *Wh*-Interrogatives' examining the 'Effects of L2 Proficiency and Age of Onset' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 443–73) in a study with Saudi Arabic L2 learners of English. Orly Lipka examines 'Syntactic Awareness Skills in English among Children Who Speak Slavic or Chinese Languages as a First Language and English as a Second Language' (*IJB* 24[2020] 115–28). Karina Tachihara and Adele E. Goldberg demonstrate 'Reduced Competition Effects and Noisier Representations in a Second Language' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 219–65) in a study with L2 learners from seventy-three different language backgrounds. Haerim Hwang, Hyeyoung Jung, and Hyunwoo Kim explore the 'Effects of Written Versus Spoken Production Modalities on Syntactic Complexity Measures in Beginning-Level Child EFL Learners' (*MLJ* 104[2020] 267–83), who are native speakers of Korean. Finally, Minjin Lee and Andrea Révész deal with 'Promoting Grammatical Development through Captions and Textual Enhancement in Multimodal Input-Based Tasks' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 625–51) in a study with Korean L2 learners of English.

Several studies look at the properties at the interface of syntax and other linguistic domains in interlanguage grammars. Properties at the syntax–lexicon, syntax–semantics, and syntax–discourse interface are examined by Mingjun Wu, Lawrence Jun Zhang, Di Wu, and Tongshun Wang in a study into the 'Effects of the Interface Categories on the Acquisition Patterns of English Reflexives among Learners of English as a Foreign Language' (*IJB* 24[2020] 651–71) whose native language is Chinese. Holger Hopp, Joseph Bail, and Carrie N. Jackson tackle 'Frequency at the Syntax–Discourse Interface' in 'A Bidirectional Study on Fronting Options in L1/L2 German and L1/L2 English' (*SLR* 36[2020] 65–96). Focusing on the syntax–discourse interface, Teresa Quesada and Cristóbal Lozano address the question: 'Which Factors Determine the Choice of Referential Expressions in L2 English Discourse?' based on 'New Evidence from the COREFL Corpus' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 959–86), which contains data from Spanish L2 learners of English.

In a large body of studies on L2 vocabulary, Beatriz González-Fernández and Norbert Schmitt investigate 'Word Knowledge' through 'Exploring the Relationships and Order of Acquisition of Vocabulary Knowledge Components' (*AppLing* 41[2020] 481–505) in a study with Spanish L2 learners of English. The study by Barbara C. Malt with Chinese L2 learners of English contributes to 'Understanding L2 Word Learning Outcomes' by examining 'The Roles of Semantic Relations, Input, and Language Dissimilarity' (*IJB* 24[2020] 478–91).

Agnieszka Otwinowska, Małgorzata Foryś-Nogala, Weronika Kobosko, and Jakub Szweczyk tackle 'Learning Orthographic Cognates and Non-Cognates in the Classroom' by Polish L2 learners of English, addressing the question: 'Does Awareness of Cross-Linguistic Similarity Matter?' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 685–731). Carl Cañizares-Álvarez and Virginia C. Mueller Gathercole look at 'The Influence of First Language Polysemy and First Language and Second Language Lexical Frequencies on Second Language Learners' Use of False Cognates' (*IJB* 24[2020] 530–41) in a study with Spanish L2 learners of English. 'Continuing to Explore the Multidimensional Nature of Lexical Sophistication', Masaki Eguchi and Kristopher Kyle examine 'The Case of Oral Proficiency Interviews' (*MLJ* 104[2020] 381–400) by Japanese L2 learners of English.

Several studies deal with modalities and methods of vocabulary learning. Yanxue Feng and Stuart Webb explore 'Learning Vocabulary through Reading, Listening, and Viewing' aiming to answer the question: 'Which Mode of Input Is Most Effective?' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 499–523). Barry Lee Reynolds investigates 'The Effects of Nonce Words, Frequency, Contextual Richness, and L2 Vocabulary Knowledge on the Incidental Acquisition of Vocabulary through Reading' in a study which is 'More Than a Replication of Zahar et al. (2001) & Tekmen and Daloğlu (2006)' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 75–102). Pengchong Zhang and Suzanne Graham look at 'Learning Vocabulary through Listening' focusing on 'The Role of Vocabulary Knowledge and Listening Proficiency' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 1017–53). Zhouhan Jin and Stuart Webb investigate 'Incidental Vocabulary Learning through Listening to Teacher Talk' (*MLJ* 104[2020] 550–66). In all four above-mentioned studies, L2 learners are native speakers of Chinese. Dutch L2 learners of English are involved in the study by Eva Puimège and Elke Peters, which tackles 'Learning Formulaic Sequences through Viewing L2 Television and Factors that Affect Learning' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 525–49). Hansol Lee, Mark Warschauer, and Jang Ho Lee contribute 'Toward the Establishment of a Data-Driven Learning Model' examining the 'Role of Learner Factors in Corpus-Based Second Language Vocabulary Learning' (*MLJ* 104[2020] 345–62) based on evidence from Korean L2 learners of English. Moussa Ahmadian and Azar Tajabadi investigate to what extent the 'Collaborative Dialogue' provides 'Opportunities and Challenges in Vocabulary Acquisition and Retention of Threshold EFL Learners' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 133–60) in a study with Iranian L2 learners of English. Vanessa De Wilde, Marc Brysbaert, and June Eyckmans deal with 'Learning English through Out-of-School Exposure' in a study with Dutch L2 learners of English which seeks to answer the question: 'How Do Word-Related Variables and Proficiency Influence Receptive Vocabulary Learning?' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 349–81).

L2 pragmatics is represented in an article by Meisam Ziafar, which explores 'The Influence of Explicit, Implicit, and Contrastive Lexical Approaches on Pragmatic Competence' based on 'The Case of Iranian EFL Learners' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 103–31).

We now turn to work on L2 processing. Starting with speech processing, Jeong-eun Kim, Yejin Cho, Youngsun Cho, Yeonjung Hong, Seohyun Kim, and Hosung Nam examine 'The Effects of L1–L2 Phonological Mappings on L2 Phonological Sensitivity' based on 'Evidence from Self-Paced Listening' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 1041–76) by Korean L2 learners of English. Hia Datta, Arild Hestvik,

Nancy Vidal, Carol Tessel, Miwako Hisagi, Marcin Wróblewski, and Valerie L. Shafer investigate 'Automaticity of Speech Processing in Early Bilingual Adults and Children' (*BLC* 23[2020] 429–45) in a study with Spanish L2 learners of English. Aleuna Lee, Michelle Perdomo, and Edith Kaan explore 'Native and Second-Language Processing of Contrastive Pitch Accent' in 'An ERP Study' (*SLR* 36[2020] 503–27) with Chinese L2 learners of English. Finally, in a study with Chinese and Portuguese L2 learners of English, Guilherme D. Garcia deals with 'Language Transfer and Positional Bias in English Stress' (*SLR* 36[2020] 445–74).

In the area of morphological processing, Junmin Li and Marcus Taft investigate 'The Processing of English Prefixed Words by Chinese–English Bilinguals' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 239–49), while Brian V. Rusk, Johanne Paradis, and Juhani Järviö look at the 'Comprehension of English Plural-Singular Marking by Mandarin-L1, Early L2-Immersion Learners' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 547–77).

When it comes to syntactic processing, Robyn Berghoff studies 'The Processing of Object–Subject Ambiguities in Early Second-Language Acquirers' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 963–92) based on evidence from Afrikaans L2 learners of English. Carla Contemori, Lucia Pozzan, Phillip Galinsky, and Paola E. Dussias deal with cases 'Whe[re] Actions and Looks Don't Line Up', that is, they examine 'The Contribution of Referential and Prosodic Information in the Processing of PP Ambiguities in Child-L2 Speakers of English' (*LAB* 10[2020] 623–56) whose native language is Spanish. Spanish L2 learners of English also take part in a study by Scott Crossley, Nicholas D. Duran, YouJin Kim, Tiffany Lester, and Samuel Clark, which looks at 'The Action Dynamics of Native and Non-Native Speakers of English in Processing Active and Passive Sentences' (*LAB* 10[2020] 58–85). Hyunwoo Kim, Gyu-Ho Shin, and Haerim Hwang explore the 'Integration of Verbal and Constructional Information in the Second Language Processing of English Dative Constructions' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 825–47) based on evidence from Korean L2 learners of English. Holger Hopp investigates 'Morphosyntactic Adaptation in Adult L2 Processing' in a study with German L2 learners of English examining the relationship between 'Exposure and the Processing of Case and Tense Violations' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 627–56). The same population features in a study by the same author, who, in collaboration with Carrie N. Jackson, tackles 'Prediction Error and Implicit Learning in L1 and L2 Syntactic Priming' (*IJB* 24[2020] 895–911). 'Cross-Linguistic Syntactic Priming in Korean Learners of English' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 1223–47) is dealt with by Myeongeun Son. Finally, Helen Zhao, Shuting Huang, Yacong Zhou, and Ruiming Wang explore the application of 'Schematic Diagrams in Second Language Learning of English Prepositions' in 'A Behavioral and Event-Related Potential Study' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 721–48) with Chinese L2 learners of English.

Among numerous studies of lexical processing, Nan Jiang, Man Li, and Taomei Guo tell 'A Tale of Two Frequency Effects' based on evidence from Chinese L2 learners of English, which contributes 'Toward a Verification Model of L2 Word Recognition' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 215–36). 'Visual Recognition of Cognates and Interlingual Homographs in Two Non-Native Languages' is studied by Yanjiao Zhu and Peggy Pik Ki Mok, providing 'Evidence from Asian Adult Trilinguals' (*LAB* 10[2020] 441–70), who are native speakers of

Cantonese, L2 learners of English, and L3 learners of German. In a study on spoken word recognition with Hindi L2 learners of English, Seema Prasad, Shiji Viswambharan, and Ramesh Mishra argue that ‘Visual Working Memory Load Constrains Language Non-Selective Activation under Task-Demands’ (*LAB* 10[2020] 805–46). Lijuan Liang and Baoguo Chen explore ‘The Impact of Language Proficiency on the Time Course and Neural Basis of L2 Semantic Access in Bilinguals’ (*IJB* 24[2020] 840–60) in a study with Chinese L2 learners of English. Flora Vanlangendonck, David Peeters, Shirley-Ann Rueschemeyer, and Ton Dijkstra argue that ‘Mixing the Stimulus List in Bilingual Lexical Decision Turns Cognate Facilitation Effects into Mirrored Inhibition Effects’ (*BLC* 23[2020] 836–44) based on evidence from Dutch L2 learners of English. Reza Rafi deals with ‘Processing Backward Translation at Intermediate L2 Proficiency’ examining ‘The Role of Lexical, Conceptual, and Phonological Links’ (*LAB* 10[2020] 35–57). Stephanie McMillen, Linda Jarmulowicz, Michael M. Mackay, and D. Kimbrough Oller look at ‘Rapid Shift in Naming Efficiency on a Rapid Automatic Naming Task by Young Spanish-Speaking English Language Learners’ (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 847–72). Keerthi Ramanujan and Brendan S. Weekes study the ‘Predictors of Lexical Retrieval in Hindi–English Bilingual Speakers’ (*BLC* 23[2020] 265–73). Billy Mor and Anat Prior examine ‘Individual Differences in L2 Frequency Effects in Different Script Bilinguals’ (*IJB* 24[2020] 672–90) based on evidence from Hebrew L2 learners of English. Brent Wolter, Junko Yamashita, and Chi Yui Leung investigate ‘Conceptual Transfer and Lexical Development in Adjectives of Space’ considering ‘Evidence from Judgments, Reaction Times, and Eye Tracking’ (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 595–625) provided by Japanese L2 learners of English. Among studies on L2 collocation-processing, Suhad Sonbul and Dina El-Dakhs deal with ‘Timed Versus Untimed Recognition of L2 Collocations’ seeking to answer the question ‘Does Estimated Proficiency Modulate Congruency Effects?’ (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 1197–1222) based on evidence from Saudi Arabian L2 learners of English. Manuel F. Pulido and Paola E. Dussias explore possible ‘Desirable Difficulties while Learning Collocations in a Second Language’ in a study with Spanish L2 learners of English and conclude that ‘Conditions That Induce L1 Interference Improve Learning’ (*BLC* 23[2020] 652–67). Some lexical processing studies deal with the relationship between language and emotion. Juan Zhang, Chenggang Wu, Zhen Yuan, and Yaxuan Meng investigate ‘Different Early and Late Processing of Emotion-Label Words and Emotion-Laden Words in a Second Language’ in ‘An ERP Study’ (*SLR* 36[2020] 399–412) with Chinese L2 learners of English. Dana M. Basnight-Brown, Stephanie A. Kazanas, and Jeanette Altarriba address ‘Translation Ambiguity in Mandarin-English Bilinguals’ focusing on the ‘Translation Production Differences in Concrete, Abstract, and Emotion Words’ (*LAB* 10[2020] 559–86). The topic of language and emotion is also tackled in an article that does not deal with L2 processing at all, reporting on a study by Candice Frances, Angela De Bruin, and Jon Andoni Duñabeitia on ‘The Influence of Emotional and Foreign Language Context in Content Learning’ (*SSLA* 42[2020] 891–903).

The next group of articles we consider are those on the development of language skills. Starting with L2 listening, Payman Vafaei and Yuichi Suzuki examine ‘The Relative Significance of Syntactic Knowledge and Vocabulary

Knowledge in Second Language Listening Ability' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 383–410) involving Iranian L2 learners of English. Laurence Bruggeman and Anne Cutler argue that there is 'No L1 Privilege in Talker Adaptation' (*BLC* 23[2020] 681–93) in a study with Dutch L2 learners of English.

Moving on to L2 reading, Alexandra Gottardo, Norah Amin, Asma Amin, Redab Al-Janaideh, Xi Chen, and Johanne Paradis investigate 'Word Reading in English and Arabic in Children Who Are Syrian Refugees' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 1305–28). The same population is involved in a study by Redab Al Janaideh, Alexandra Gottardo, Sana Tibi, Johanne Paradis, and Xi Chen, which examines 'The Role of Word Reading and Oral Language Skills in Reading Comprehension in Syrian Refugee Children' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 1283–1304). Razan Silawi, Yasmin Shalhoub-Awwad, and Anat Prior look into the 'Monitoring of Reading Comprehension across the First, Second, and Third Language' in a study with Arabic learners of L2 Hebrew and L3 English addressing the question: 'Domain-General or Language-Specific?' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 886–922). Ana Pellicer-Sánchez, Elsa Tragant, Kathy Conklin, Michael Rodgers, Raquel Serrano, and Àngels Llanes explore 'Young Learners' Processing of Multimodal Input and Its Impact on Reading Comprehension' in 'An Eye-Tracking Study' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 577–98) with Catalan-Spanish L2 learners of English. The same population is involved in a related study, which does not only consider reading, in which Geòrgia Pujadas and Carmen Muñoz 'Examin[e] Adolescent EFL Learners' TV Viewing Comprehension through Captions and Subtitles' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 551–75). Finally, Jin Kyoung Hwang, Jeannette Mancilla-Martinez, Janna Brown McClain, Min Hyun Oh, and Israel Flores study 'Spanish-Speaking English Learners' English Language and Literacy Skills', focusing on 'The Predictive Role of Conceptually Scored Vocabulary' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 1–24).

As for L2 speaking, Kazuya Saito asks: 'Multi- or Single-Word Units?' in a study that examines 'The Role of Collocation Use in Comprehensible and Contextually Appropriate Second Language Speech' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 548–88) by Japanese L2 learners of English. Shungo Suzuki and Judit Kormos focus on the 'Linguistic Dimensions of Comprehensibility and Perceived Fluency' in 'An Investigation of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency in Second Language Argumentative Speech' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 143–67) by Japanese L2 learners of English. Hanjing Yu and Wander Lowie explore the 'Dynamic Paths of Complexity and Accuracy in Second Language Speech' in 'A Longitudinal Case Study of Chinese Learners' (*AppLing* 41[2020] 855–77). Adriana Soto-Corominas, Johanne Paradis, Brian V. Rusk, Stefka Marinova-Todd, and Xuan Zhang look into 'Oral Language Profiles of English Second Language Learners in Adolescence' with thirty-nine different L1 backgrounds, arguing that 'Cognitive and Input Factors Influence How They Compare to Their Monolingual Peers' (*SSLA* 42[2020] 697–720). Taking a somewhat broader perspective, Maria Graziano, Elena Nicoladis, and Paula Marentette explore 'How Referential Gestures Align with Speech' providing 'Evidence from Monolingual and Bilingual Speakers' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 266–304), the bilingual speakers being French L2 learners of English.

Closing this part with L2 writing, James Garner, Scott Crossley, and Kristopher Kyle deal with 'Beginning and Intermediate L2 Writer's Use of N-

Grams' in 'An Association Measures Study' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 51–74) with Korean L2 learners of English. 'In Search of New Benchmarks', Kátia R Monteiro, Scott A. Crossley, and Kristopher Kyle 'Us[e] L2 Lexical Frequency and Contextual Diversity Indices to Assess Second Language Writing' (*AppLing* 41[2020] 280–300). Ghulam Abbas Khushik and Ari Huhta engage in 'Investigating Syntactic Complexity in EFL Learners' Writing across Common European Framework of Reference Levels A1, A2, and B1' (*AppLing* 41[2020] 506–32) in a study with Pakistani and Finnish L2 learners of English. Nihat Polat, Laura Mahalingappa, and Rae L. Mancilla explore 'Longitudinal Growth Trajectories of Written Syntactic Complexity' based on 'The Case of Turkish Learners in an Intensive English Program' (*AppLing* 41[2020] 688–711). Marcus Ströbel, Elma Kerz, and Daniel Wiechmann examine 'The Relationship between First and Second Language Writing' by 'Investigating the Effects of First Language Complexity on Second Language Complexity in Advanced Stages of Learning' based on evidence from German L2 learners of English (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 732–67). Marije Michel, Andrea Révész, Xiaojun Lu, Nektaria-Efstathia Kourtali, Minjin Lee, and Lais Borges engage in 'Investigating L2 Writing Processes across Independent and Integrated Tasks' in 'A Mixed-Methods Study' (*SLR* 36[2020] 277–304) with Chinese L2 learners of English. Finally, Gary G. Fogal deals with 'Investigating Variability in L2 Development' while 'Extending a Complexity Theory Perspective on L2 Writing Studies and Authorial Voice' based on evidence from Thai L2 learners of English (*AppLing* 41[2020] 575–600).

We now turn to work on individual learner differences. Among studies on language aptitude, Lars Bokander and Emanuel Bylund engage in 'Probing the Internal Validity of the LLAMA Language Aptitude Tests' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 11–47) in a study with Afrikaans, English, German, Wolof, Dutch, French, Japanese, Korean, and Chinese L2 learners of English. Nektaria-Efstathia Kourtali and Andrea Révész investigate 'The Roles of Recasts, Task Complexity, and Aptitude in Child Second Language Development' based on evidence from Greek L2 learners of English (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 179–218).

When it comes to motivation, Mostafa Papi and Phil Hiver consider 'Language Learning Motivation as a Complex Dynamic System' adopting 'A Global Perspective of Truth, Control, and Value' (*MLJ* 104[2020] 209–32) in a study with Iranian L2 learners of English. Phil Hiver and Ali H. Al-Hoorie engage in 'Reexamining the Role of Vision in Second Language Motivation' while conducting 'A Preregistered Conceptual Replication of You, Dörnyei, and Csizér (2016)' (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 48–102) with Korean L2 learners of English. Finally, Karsten Schmidtke-Bode and Gregor Kachel deal with 'Exploring the Motivational Antecedents of Nepalese Learners of L2 English' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 379–418).

As for learning styles and learning strategies, Carol Lethaby and Russell Mayne conduct 'A Critical Examination of Perceptual Learning Styles in English Language Teaching' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 221–37), while Nils Jaekel studies 'Language Learning Strategy Use in Context' focusing on 'The Effects of Self-Efficacy and CLIL on Language Proficiency' (*IRAL* 58[2020] 195–220) based on evidence from German L2 learners of English.

Several studies deal with age. Eun-Kyoung Rosa Lee investigates ‘Age of Onset, Type of Exposure, and Ultimate Attainment of L2 Morpho-Syntactic Sensitivity’ (*SSLA* 42[2020] 801–23) in a study with Korean L2 learners of English. Jürgen Baumert, Johanna Fleckenstein, Michael Leucht, Olaf Köller, and Jens Möllerc examine ‘The Long-Term Proficiency of Early, Middle, and Late Starters Learning English as a Foreign Language at School’ in ‘A Narrative Review and Empirical Study’ (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 1091–1135) with German L2 learners of English. Katalin Fenyvesi, Mikkel B. Hansen, and Teresa Cadierno look at ‘The Role of Individual Differences in Younger vs Older Primary School Learners of English in Denmark’ (*IRAL* 58[2020] 289–322). Simone E. Pfenninger deals with ‘The Dynamic Multicausality of Age of First Bilingual Language Exposure’ providing ‘Evidence from a Longitudinal Content and Language Integrated Learning Study with Dense Time Serial Measurements’ (*MLJ* 104[2020] 662–86) involving German L2 learners of English. Finally, Johanne Paradis, Adriana Soto-Corominas, Xi Chen, and Alexandra Gottardo explore ‘How Language Environment, Age, and Cognitive Capacity Support the Bilingual Development of Syrian Refugee Children Recently Arrived in Canada’ (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 1255–81).

The next group of studies we consider are those on the role of input, interaction, and practice in L2 learning. Becky H. Huang, Yung-Hsiang Shawn Chang, Mingxia Zhi, and Luping Niu examine ‘The Effect of Input on Bilingual Adolescents’ Long-Term Language Outcomes in a Foreign Language Instruction Context’ (*IJB* 24[2020] 8–25) based on evidence from Chinese L2 learners of English. Li-Jen Kuo, Yu-Min Ku, Zhuo Chen, and Melike Ünal Gezer study ‘The Relationship between Input and Literacy and Metalinguistic Development’ in ‘A Study with Chinese–English Bilinguals’ (*IJB* 24[2020] 26–45). María Martínez-Adrián asks ‘¿Los juntamos?’ in ‘A Study of L1 Use in Interactional Strategies in CLIL vs NON-CLIL Primary School Learners’ (*IRAL* 58[2020] 1–27) whose native language is Spanish. Du Re Kim looks at the ‘Emergence of Proactive Self-Initiated Self-Repair as an Indicator of L2 IC [interactional competence] Development’ (*AppLing* 41[2020] 901–21). YouJin Kim, Stephen Skalicky, and YeonJoo Jung investigate ‘The Role of Linguistic Alignment on Question Development in Face-to-Face and Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication Contexts’ in ‘A Conceptual Replication Study’ (*LangLearn* 70[2020] 643–84) with Korean L2 learners of English. In a study called ‘Prefacing Opposition’ with Japanese L2 learners of English, David Aline and Yuri Hosoda examine ‘Resources for Adumbrating Conflict Talk in Second Language Peer Discussions’ (*IRAL* 58[2020] 161–94). Qing Wang investigates ‘Negotiation of Meaning and Negotiation of Form in Chinese EFL Classroom Discourse’ (*IRAL* 58[2020] 239–62). Finally, Kim McDonough, Pavel Trofimovich, Libing Lu, and Dato Abashidze address ‘Visual Cues during Interaction’ with the aim of answering the question: ‘Are Recasts Different from Noncorrective Repetition?’ (*SLR* 36[2020] 359–70).

Studies that do not neatly fit into any of the categories mentioned above include the one by Mehri Izadi and Nahid Yarahmadzahi, which examines ‘The Metalinguistic Awareness of Bilingual (Persian–Baluchi) and Monolingual (Persian) Learners of English Language’ (*LAB* 10[2020] 249–89), the one by Reza Nakhaie investigating ‘Language Proficiency and Sociocultural Integration

of Canadian Newcomers' (*AppPsycholing* 41[2020] 1437–64), and the one by Tamara Sorenson Duncan and Johanne Paradis, which addresses the question: 'How Does Maternal Education Influence the Linguistic Environment Supporting Bilingual Language Development in Child Second Language Learners of English?' (*IJB* 24[2020] 46–61) based on evidence from L2 learners with Arabic, Cantonese, Farsi, Gujarati, Hindi, Mandarin, Punjabi, Somali, Spanish, and Urdu L1 background.

Turning now to the field of bilingualism research, some studies deal with the cognitive abilities of sequential bilinguals, who are in fact L2 learners. Morgane Simonis, Lize Van der Linden, Benoit Galand, Philippe Hiligsmann, and Arnaud Szmalec investigate 'Executive Control Performance and Foreign-Language Proficiency Associated with Immersion Education in French-Speaking Belgium' (*BLC* 23[2020] 355–70). Nga-Yan Hui, Mingyu Yuan, Manson Cheuk-Man Fong, and William Shi-yuan Wang argue that 'L2 Proficiency Predicts Inhibitory Ability in L1-Dominant Speakers' (*IJB* 24[2020] 984–98) based on evidence from Cantonese L2 learners of English. Finally, Michael Mouthon, Asaid Khateb, François Lazeyras, Alan J. Pegna, Hannelore Lee-Jahnke, Caroline Lehr, and Jean-Marie Annoni conclude that 'Second-Language Proficiency Modulates the Brain Language Control Network in Bilingual Translators' in 'An Event-Related fMRI Study' (*BLC* 23[2020] 251–64) with French and German L2 learners of English.

Within studies on code-switching, Mathieu Declerck, Iva Ivanova, Jonathan Grainger, and Jon Andoni Duñabeitia ask: 'Are Similar Control Processes Implemented during Single and Dual Language Production?' in a study with French L2 learners of English in which 'Evidence from Switching between Speech Registers and Languages' (*BLC* 23[2020] 694–701) is provided. In 'Didn't Hear That Coming', Alice Shen, Susanne Gahl, and Keith Johnson report on a study that examines the 'Effects of Withholding Phonetic Cues to Code-Switching' (*BLC* 23[2020] 1020–31) based on evidence from Spanish L2 learners of English. The same population features in a study by Jessica G. Cox, Ashley LaBoda, and Najee Mendes, "'I'm Gonna Spanglish It on You'", dealing with 'Self-Reported vs Oral Production of Spanish–English Codeswitching' (*BLC* 23[2020] 446–58).

12. English as a Lingua Franca

The past year has been a vibrant one for ELF. The implementation of ELF-aware pedagogy in ELT has continued to be a strong focus for many ELF researchers, with more attention being given to introducing concrete classroom activities and resources to help teachers put ELF-aware teaching into practice. Two special issues, respectively of *ELangT* edited by Yasemin Bayyurt and Martin Dewey, and *LeLeL* edited by Enrico Grazzi, Lucilla Lopriore, and Sávio Siqueira, are dedicated to this theme. Besides ELT, an array of foci can be found in the field, ranging from ELF in (higher) education, in the workplace (BELF), in translation and interpreting, and in other institutional and social contexts, to comparison between ELF-users and Native English Speakers (NESs), fluency, accuracy, and

other non-verbal features displayed in spoken ELF interactions, ELF as researched through social media, and ELF in particular geonational contexts. These very different studies evidence that an increasing number of researchers and practitioners recognize the relevance to, and significance of, ELF in a broad range of topics and domains. While all these themes will be covered one by one, this section will begin with papers conceptualizing ELF and ELF research with respect to other research fields.

In *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan: Towards Multilingual Practices*, edited by Mayu Konakahara and Keiko Tsuchiya (whose chapters are reviewed in various parts in this section), Tomokazu Ishikawa offers a theoretical discussion of the ‘Complexity of English as a Multilingua Franca’ (EMF) and problematizes the ‘Place of Monolingual Standard English’ (StE) in this ubiquitously multilingual world (pp. 91–109). Ishikawa elucidates StE ideologies along with ideologies of authenticity and anonymity, and the notion of EMF with translanguage, theories of transculturality and transmodalities, and Larsen-Freeman’s Complexity Theory. Lastly, he illustrates how monolingual StE and EMF are indeed connected. Introducing the notion of ‘Lingua Franca Scenarios’ (in Karin Tusting, ed., *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Ethnography*, pp. 299–311), Janus Mortensen discusses common themes investigated in different but interrelated research disciplines and methodologies—for example, interactional sociolinguistics, ELT, interactionally oriented approaches to pragmatics—and their implications in language teaching and language-teaching policy. Mortensen suggests considering the transient social configurations of international speakers a methodological tool to investigate interactional strategies. He also calls for further longitudinal ethnographic studies in lingua franca scenarios, not necessarily dominated by English. In their monograph *Corpus Linguistics for World Englishes: A Guide for Research*, Claudia Lange and Sven Leuckert offer a chapter to highlight the significance of conducting comparative studies of ‘World Englishes, Learner Englishes, and English as a Lingua Franca’ (pp. 168–93). By introducing important learner corpora and ELF corpora, and discussing case studies in WE and ELF, Lange and Leuckert wish to reduce any stigma attached to Learner Englishes and ELF, and to show their research potential, especially for WE and for the use of corpus-linguistic methods.

Stressing the importance of ELF-awareness for the teaching and learning of English, a great deal of research attends to the question how ELT can be informed, and even liberated, by ELF research in various interrelated aspects, one of which is dedicated to understanding what constitutes ELF-aware pedagogy in ELT. In the introduction to the *ELangT* special issue, devoted to the positive synergies between ‘English as a Lingua Franca [research] and language teaching [practice]’, Yasemin Bayyurt and Martin Dewey, ‘Locating ELF in ELT’ (*ELangT* 74[2020] 369–76), survey the problem of the lack of implementation of ELF-aware/ELF-informed pedagogic practices despite abundant ELF research on ELT. As a response, they maintain that there is no single straightforward ‘ELF method’ (p. 374) for ELT practices because educational settings, beliefs, and practices differ; instead, what practitioners could do is to adopt ‘an eclectic approach’ (p. 373) to existing methodologies with critical reflection. ‘Defining ELF as a Sociolinguistic Concept and a Pedagogical Perspective’ (in Yesim Bektas Cetinkaya, ed., *Intercultural Competence in ELT: Raising Awareness in*

Classrooms, pp. 21–37), Elif Kemalolu-Er and Esma Biricik Deniz first describe the sociolinguistic phenomenon of English being used as a lingua franca across the world, and notions that are important to ELF. They then illustrate elements through which ELF-aware pedagogy can enrich the classroom, the students, and the teachers; in particular, they suggest several explicit and implicit ways that teachers can integrate ELF into the classroom. ‘Exploring Standards-Based, Intelligibility-Based, and Complex Conceptions of English in a Lingua Franca Context’ (in Christopher Hall and Rachel Wicaksono, eds., *Ontologies of English: Conceptualising the Language for Learning, Teaching, and Assessment*, pp. 233–52), Nathan Page contends that binary distinctions such as standards-based versus intelligibility-based conceptions of language and advocating one approach for teaching and learning oversimplify language use. Conversational and interview data from Japanese volunteers serving in Africa show that participants’ conceptualization of ELF use is layered, and context- and identity-dependent. While Page supports the view that pedagogical response to the global diversity of English could be made central in international teaching training and assessments, he also cautions against an intelligibility-only approach. In ‘English as a Lingua Franca and Transcultural Communication: Rethinking Competences and Pedagogy for ELT’ (in Hall and Wicaksono, eds., pp. 253–72), Will Baker expounds how the current interpretation of communicative competence in ELT is too narrow (echoing Chan reviewed later in this section) and misrepresents intercultural/transcultural communication. Baker submits alternative conceptualizations of communication and competence, and he suggests four approaches that can be adopted in ELT. Baker stresses that the significance of these suggestions is not to enforce a new, radical change, but to give stakeholders the freedom to choose an approach and select from content sources that differ from conventional ELT practices. In ‘What Do We Really Mean by ELF-Informed Pedagogy? An Enquiry into Converging Themes’ (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 323–31), Barbara Seidlhofer and Henry Widdowson propose a reconceptualization of ELF use and EFL learning, whereby learner errors are seen as natural selection and interference as multilingual elements in language use. They succinctly re-emphasize that it is attention to learners’ communicative capability in using English in lingua franca contexts rather than acquisition of native speakers’ norms that would fulfil the educational goals of English teaching pedagogy.

Moving away from conceptualization, we will now discuss the positive impact of implementing ELF-aware practices and intercultural awareness in ELT, and the favourable attitudes of teachers and learner-users towards an ELF-aware approach. ‘An Analysis of Accommodation during English Team Teaching in a Japanese Primary School: From an ELF Perspective’ (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 113–32) was conducted by Ayano Shino, who focuses on the use of code-switching and repetitions between homeroom teachers and assistant language teachers as well as between teachers and students. Shino found that accommodation not only enhances co-instruction, especially by strengthening solidarity between teachers, it also shows students how ELF is practised in classrooms. Yasmina Abdzadeh and Will Baker present the beneficial effect of a ten-session course on implementing ‘Cultural Awareness in an Iranian English Language Classroom: A Teaching Intervention in an Interculturally “Conservative” Setting’ (*JELF* 9[2020] 58–80). Participants’ reflective writings

show that they were able to achieve higher levels of cultural awareness, and acquired the flexibility and adaptability needed to interact effectively in ELF encounters. Given that the course was the first of its kind delivered in a predominantly monolingual, culturally restricted context, this paper provides empirical evidence of the benefits of incorporating cultural awareness in English education.

Martin Dewey and Inmaculada Pineda report on ‘ELF and Teacher Education: Attitudes and Beliefs’ (*ELangT* 74[2020] 428–41) among pre-service and in-service teachers enrolled in Master’s programmes at King’s College London and the University of Malaga. Exploring the practical application of ELF-informed pedagogy in language classrooms, Dewey and Pineda found through an online survey that the ELT practitioners’ teaching priorities aligned with an EMF/ELF perspective, prioritizing (1) successful communication over accuracy, (2) experimentation with linguistic forms, and (3) sociocultural identity promotion among students.

‘ELF Awareness for Teacher Education in Italy: Attitudes and Actions’ (*ELeL* 65[2020] 69–189) by Enrico Grazzi and Lucilla Lopriore discusses findings of a three-year investigation conducted on a national level among upper and lower secondary school in-service Italian teachers. Data from an online questionnaire and follow-up focus groups highlights the process in which teachers’ perceptions, attitudes, and pedagogy have evolved to a more open-minded view of language variability as inherent to language learning. The paper supports the urgent need to develop an ELF-aware attitude among pre- and in-service teachers that would enable them to integrate ELF within their everyday ELT practice. In ‘Voices of Learners in Thai ELT Classrooms: A Wake Up Call Towards Teaching English as a Lingua Franca’ (*AEnglishes* [2020] <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2020.1759248>), Eric A. Ambele and Yusop Boonsuk found that undergraduates who are experienced users of English show a favourable attitude towards applying an ELF approach in ELT classrooms. This once again underscores that the learning objectives, curriculum, materials, and assessments of ELT in Thailand should address the pluricentricity of English and the learners’ cultural and contextual realities in using English rather than still focusing on native norms. In ‘Developing “ELF Competence” in Language Learners and Teachers’ (*ELeL* 65[2020] 5–26), Andrew Blair investigates the impact of an ELF-aware course on the beliefs, attitudes, and priorities of experienced ELT practitioners in the UK. Supported by a critical review of ‘competence’ in the ELT literature, Blair’s action research shows that the teachers participating in his study did show a reflective attitude towards English usage and their teaching. Yet they were also very mindful of actual classroom application and assessments. The study reaffirms the significant role of teacher training/education in developing ELF-awareness—with a reframed, functional notion of competence and ‘linguaging’—for teaching, learning, and assessment. Blair also calls for future research with expanded foci and different methods to address, but not force, the development of ‘ELF-competence’ (p. 26) in ELT.

The concerns of the participants in Blair’s study show that, given all the different teaching and learning contexts around the world, there are obstacles to, and reservations about, adopting an ELF-aware pedagogy in ELT. Starting with curricula, Luís Guerra’s article, ‘ELF-Awareness and Intercultural Communicative Competence in ELT Policies in Portugal’ (*ELeL* 65[2020] 49–68), analyses the

limited impact that contemporary Applied Linguistic theoretical frameworks, such as Intercultural Communicative Competence and ELF, have on European and Portuguese legislative guidelines for language pedagogy, namely the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)* in 2001, the *CEFR Companion Volume with New Descriptors* in 2018, and finally *Essential Learnings* in 2018. Guerra observes the myopic persistence of an approach that relates the English language to native norms and cultures, in that educational legislation openly disregards the contemporary role of English as an international lingua franca. In 'Towards English as an International Language', Jim Yee Him Chan assesses how pedagogical recommendations in WE and ELF literature have (not) been incorporated in 'The Evolving ELT Curricula and Textbooks in Hong Kong' (*IJAL* 30[2020] 244–63) since 1975. An analysis of teaching content shows that although there has been a shift of focus in the curricula from native speaker (NS) linguistic correctness to communicative functions and more varieties of English, a concrete description of these two notions is lacking. Besides, textbooks lag behind what is recommended in the curricula, and native varieties of English are still dominant in listening samples. Chan advocates that to truly engage with the pluricentricity of English, the notion of communicative competence needs to be redefined, and ELF-aware pedagogy needs to be integrated in ELT in Hong Kong.

Taking teachers' and learners' attitudes into consideration, Adem Soruç in 'English as a Lingua Franca and Good Language Teachers' (in Carol Griffiths and Zia Tajeddin, eds., *Lessons from Good Language Teachers*, pp. 67–79) reports on how forty-eight Turkish English-language teachers perceive ELF, on the basis of a short questionnaire consisting of four statements. The study reports an ambivalent attitude—although there is an increased acceptance of ELF, a normative approach persists where achieving native-speaker competence is still viewed as the main learning goal. Soruç hence suggests a more active debate concerning educational policy (including examination policy) before ELF-friendly practices can be realistically implemented. Investigating 'English as a Lingua Franca for Vietnam: Current Issues and Future Directions' (in Van Canh Le, Hoa Thi Mai Nguyen, Thi Thuy Minh Nguyen, and Roger Barnard, eds., *Building Teacher Capacity in English Language Teaching in Vietnam*, Routledge, [2020] pp. xxii + 224, hb £96.00 ISBN 9 7811 3831 3866, pb £29.59 ISBN 9 7810 3209 0672, e-book £29.59 ISBN 9 7804 2945 7371), My Hau Thi Ho and Hanh Thi Nguyen point out the risk of producing another kind of hegemony with Western ELT practitioners advocating that learners and teachers in the non-Western world adopt non-native varieties in ELT. Ho and Nguyen point out that most of their teacher and learner participants do not prefer adopting ELF in their education. Although participants' responses exhibit inadequate critical thinking, their concerns are practical—that StE does possess more cultural capital. Ho and Nguyen suggest that to truly explore what learners and teachers want for themselves, the notions of linguistic imperialism and authentic, successful ELF communication should first be made known to them.

Turning to ELF-aware teacher education, in 'Mezirow Meets Kegan: Conceptual Links and Insights for English as a Lingua Franca Teacher Education' (in Alexis Kokkos, ed., *Expanding Transformation Theory: Affinities between Jack Mezirow and Emancipatory Educationalists*, pp. 106–22), Nicos

Sifakis and Stefania Kordia elucidate how, regarding adult education, Jack Mezirow's transformative learning theory intersects with Robert Kegan's constructive-developmental theory, in that a reconstruction of the premises of our understanding is essential for in-depth transformation. With reference to these two theories, Sifakis and Kordia then explain with concrete learning activities how their ELF-aware, three-phase framework for English teacher education can promote greater autonomy and agency for teachers. In 'ELF-Aware Pre-Service Teacher Education: Practices and Perspectives' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 453–62), Esma Biricik Deniz, Elif Kemaloglu-Er, and Yonca Ozkan present an educational programme raising ELF-awareness among pre-service teachers in Turkey. The authors illustrate that after completing the two-term programme, pre-service teachers became 'critical supporters of ELF' (p. 461), who were aware of both the strengths (presented as three benefits) and the drawbacks (presented as three challenges) of ELF-aware pedagogy. The authors call for the worldwide adoption of ELF-awareness in teacher training, as it enhances teachers' reflexivity, and for more research on ELF-aware teacher education to help implement this approach in practice. In 'Teachers Learning about English as a Lingua Franca on Facebook: Insights from a Community of Practice' (CoP) (*ELeL* 65[2020] 147–68), Luciana Cabrini S. Calvo, Michelle El Kadri, and Telma Gimenez scrutinize Brazilian teachers' interactions in a Facebook community of over 18,000 members. The authors characterize the ways through which members have shaped and reshaped their understanding of ELF, such as by sharing expertise, experiences, and resources as a community. They also contend that social media could be a powerful learning site in teacher development in order to deconstruct beliefs of ELT that other contexts may not be able to achieve.

But again, the implementation of ELF-aware teacher education is not without obstacles. In 'English as a Lingua Franca: Rhetoric or Reality?', Mee Ling Lai investigates the 'Attitudes of Prospective English Teachers in Post-Colonial Hong Kong' (*ASR* 44[2020] 494–514) through the Verbal-guise Technique and group interviews. Lai finds that despite having learned about the WE and ELF paradigms, participants continue to regard ELF as simply rhetoric. The reality is that they still prefer standard native varieties. Two of the reasons for this preference are participants' awareness of the linguistic hierarchy existing among learners, and directives from the Education Bureau that implicitly promote native-speakerism. Lai hence concludes that ELF-aware teacher education is inadequate for practical changes to take places in ELT; what is necessary are top-down initiatives from the the Education Bureau. Koun Choi and Yongcan Liu engage themselves with 'Challenges and Strategies for ELF-Aware Teacher Development' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 442–52) for primary school teachers in South Korea. Three challenges are identified: a lack of pedagogical skills to plan for ELF-aware classes, a lack of concrete teaching materials for raising ELF-awareness, and a mismatch with parents' expectations of StE. Three strategies are proposed in response: guiding teachers to reflect on their teaching approach, cultivating synergistic learning environments where teachers can share resources and insights with their peers, and revising the curriculum for teacher development to incorporate skills to communicate ELF-related ideas to parents. Nicos C. Sifakis also delves into the limits and possibilities of applying an ELF-aware approach to teaching in 'Two Obstacles to Enabling Change in ELF-Aware Teacher

Education and How to Overcome Them' (*ELeL* 65[2020] 104–17). Sifakis discusses teachers' uncertainties concerning their role as English teachers, thus the adoption of an ELF-aware pedagogy, and the scarcity of alternative reference material available for the implementation of ELF-aware teaching. To overcome these obstacles, teachers should acquire an ELF-aware attitude and get acquainted with their crucial role as instructors in developing, implementing, and assessing ELF-oriented tasks that are going to be effective in both EFL classes and in real-world contexts.

To address the concern about inadequate teaching materials and resources for practical applications in the classroom (as observed in various studies mentioned above), a number of researcher-practitioners offer concrete examples of how teachers can conduct ELF-aware tasks with their students. Stressing 'ELF with EFL' but not against EFL, Sávio Siqueira expounds 'What Is Still Needed for This Integration to Happen?' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 377–86) from a decolonizing, de-anglicizing perspective. Siqueira demonstrates with three classroom activities (on intelligibility, pragmatics, and culture) how existing materials can be modified for 'an ELF-aware expansion' (p. 382), showing that it is feasible to merge ELF and EFL for more pluralistic and inclusive learning without eradicating the validity of the original materials and EFL as a whole. Sávio Siqueira also examines three Brazilian coursebooks from the National Textbook Programme in 'ELF Materials for Basic Education in Brazil: Is There Room for an ELF-Aware Practice?' (*ELeL* 65[2020] 118–46). He finds that although linguistically these local coursebooks are still AmE-oriented, methodologically and ideologically there is room for developing ELF-awareness, especially when compared to international materials. Siqueira gives a few examples of how teachers can adapt seemingly non-ELF-oriented materials to ELF-sensitive teaching, once again affirming the power that teachers do have to break away from the monolithic ELT tradition. In line with Abdzadeh and Baker's paper (see above), Cavalheiro proposes a careful reconsideration of traditional EFL teaching practice through 'Developing Intercultural Communication and Intercultural Awareness in the EFL Classroom' (*ELeL* 65[2020] 30–48). Cavalheiro first describes how this intercultural reconsideration was introduced in two pre-service MA programmes in ELT at the University of Lisbon, and then provides examples of activities (developed from an interculturally ELF-aware approach by the participating teachers) that were actually implemented at different school levels. The paper once again prompts practitioners to revise English-language instruction priorities. In 'From "English as a Native Language" to English as a *Lingua Franca*', Mayu Konakahara reports on the positive 'Instructional Effects on Japanese University Students' Attitudes Towards English' (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 183–210) brought by a series of ELF-informed courses. Konakahara first surveys the eight broad topics that were covered in the series and the tasks she had students complete for each topic. Then she illustrates the positive instructional effects with the students' own written reflections on five particular topics that changed their mindset throughout the courses (e.g. what activities or knowledge alone would be inadequate to achieve the transformation). Nicos C. Sifakis, Natasha Tsantila, Aristeia Masina, and Katerina Vourdanou use the case of Greece to exemplify 'Designing ELF-Aware Lessons in High-Stakes Exam Contexts' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 463–72). Through a detailed account of original

ELF-aware interventions developed by two teachers who prepare students for standardized exams, and positive responses from both students and teachers to those interventions, the authors demonstrate that it is possible to incorporate ELF-aware pedagogy into existing textbook tasks that cater for high-stakes exams. Like other practitioner-researchers, the authors call for more research on ELF-awareness interventions in different EFL contexts and teacher education.

Previous research and that outlined above have demonstrated that assessments and exams are considered high-stakes contexts for a lot of teachers and learners and a challenge for implementing ELF-aware practices. As such, researchers have been advocating ELF-aware language testing. For instance, Jennifer Jenkins, who concludes the special issue in *ELangT* with 'Where Are We with ELF and Language Testing? An Opinion Piece' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 473–9), links the developments in ELF research, particularly the focus on multilingualism and translanguaging, to their implications for language testing in the higher education context. Following a survey of the development of ELF tests in contrast with (native) English tests, she proposes the idea of self-assessment, as the best evaluator of one's ability to use ELF is indeed the assessed person him- or herself. Jenkins continues to explain the potential content of and concerns about, self-assessment, and ends on the note that challenging existing international testing bodies will be a long struggle. Constant Leung and Jennifer Jenkins in 'Mediating Communication—ELF and Flexible Multilingualism Perspectives on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages' (*ApPL* 3[2020] 26–41) examine and expand the notion of mediation in the *CEFR Companion Volume* [2018]. Analysing data from ELF research, Leung and Jenkins show that topic maintenance and topic shift strategies can trigger unpredictable interactional moves, and that success in mediation depends on co-construction. The authors point out the difficulty of mapping multilingual mediation on the levels of a rating scale and criticize *CEFR*'s approach to mediation for ignoring the situationally flexible and dynamic use of multilingual sensibilities and practices in discourse interaction. Gary J. Ockey and R. Roz Hirsch in 'A Step Toward the Assessment of English as a Lingua Franca' (in Gary J. Ockey and Brent A. Green, eds., *Another Generation of Fundamental Considerations in Language Assessment*, pp. 9–28) highlight the urgency of addressing ELF issues in L2 English assessment tests. Supporting the need for oral communication tests to be ELF-informed, Ockey and Hirsch present an oral assessment test that was implemented at Iowa State University as a best-practice example. The assessment was informed by EIL curriculum development criteria and took into account the criticism levelled by ELF research and its contribution towards current English assessment. The author suggests that it can be seen as a good blueprint for future test development.

There are a few more works that discuss ELF-aware language teaching in specific contexts, and its relation to 'context' itself. The first is on aviation. In 'Pilot Training and English as a Lingua Franca: Some Implications for the Design of Aviation English for Ab Initio Flight Training Courses' (*Especialist* 41:iv[2020] <https://doi.org/10.23925/2318-7115.2020v41i4a7>), Markus Bieswanger, Malila Carvalho De Almeida Prado, and Jennifer Roberts depict the challenges faced by non-native English-speaking students and the native English-speaking instructors who lack the skills to offer help when interacting with these students. The

authors highlight the need for native English-speaking instructors to enhance their ELF-awareness and for aviation English courses to focus on enhancing the intelligibility of students' spoken English as well as students' comprehension of different accents. In hospitality, Waraporn Suebwongsuwan and Singhanat Nomnian explore 'Thai Hotel Undergraduate Interns' Awareness and Attitudes towards English as a Lingua Franca' (*IJAL* 9[2020] 704–14). Results from a Verbal-guise test show that the students possessed positive attitudes towards familiar accents such as American and Thai, and found accents such as Hong Kong and Laotian easy to understand; the students, however, displayed negative attitudes towards the Korean accent. Meanwhile, in questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, the students also displayed their awareness of the prominence of ELF as the medium in this business-related context. Consequently, this study encourages exposure to non-native accents and situated skills development during language classes and hospitality industry internships. Engaging with *Understanding Context in Language Use and Teaching: An ELF Perspective*, Éva Illés, as a researcher-practitioner, attempts to provide theoretical and practical guidelines to implement an ELF-informed approach to ELT. In the first five chapters on context and its pragmatic relevance, Illés argues in favour of the active involvement of language users in shaping the situational conditions of interaction according to interactants' ideational and interpersonal schemata. The last three chapters deal with (1) ELF in connection with the multilingual and multicultural conditions that make spoken ELF interactions diverse; (2) the development of an ELF-informed pedagogy through a problem-oriented approach; (3) ELF-informed teaching practices echoing the principles behind Teaching Language as Communication and Content and Language Integrated Learning. Although the monograph does not align with the latest ELF research, it does provide a thorough analysis of the notion of context.

Zooming out to the use of ELF in education more broadly, a few studies enquired into the use of ELF in EMI contexts, especially regarding the adoption of semiotic resources and translanguaging practices. Tetsuo Harada and Ryo Moriya 'Analyz[e] Discourse in EMI Courses from an ELF Perspective' (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 133–55) by observing classes taught by Japanese-speaking lecturers in applied linguistics to English majors at a private university. They find that consistent with existing research, the linguistic characteristics and discourse structuring of ELF lectures differ from those of L1 English lectures. Yet not only is an overall pattern across all the ELF lectures absent, the strategies employed by the lecturers to make meaning explicit also differ from previous ELF research. A possible explanation could be differences in contextual factors such as the use of semiotic resources and the phase of a lecture. Harada and Moriya thus call for researchers working on EMI lectures conducted in ELF to consider these factors in their studies. 'Translanguaging for Intercultural Communication in International Higher Education: Transcending English as a Lingua Franca' (*IJM* [2020] <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1856113>) by Wanyu Amy Ou, Mingyue Michelle Gu, and Francis M. Hult explores situated practices of ELF among students attending an English-medium university in south-east China. As part of a larger critical sociolinguistic ethnography project, this paper shows that although English is predominantly adopted as the lingua franca, intercultural communication is carried out as a situated translanguaging

practice embracing not only multilingualism but also multimodality and spatiality. In order to satisfy students' need for communicative flexibility, this research calls for a redefinition of the curricular and extracurricular activities in light of a much more dynamic view of communication. Yang Song and Angel M.Y. Lin carried out ethnographic observations to investigate 'Translingual Practices [among Master's students] at [an EMI] Shanghai University' (*WEn* 39[2020] 249–62). Data collected from urban spaces, an international student dormitory, and a WeChat group reveal that students deploy their intercultural experiences and epistemic notions to create meaning. The authors thus recommend integrating translingual negotiation strategies in curriculum planning to facilitate negotiation among ELF interlocutors who share personal, existential, and discipline-specific knowledge resources.

ELF-aware practices have been observed to benefit teaching and learning in EMI contexts, in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and in task-based learning. In 'EMF Awareness in the Japanese EFL/EMI Context' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 408–17), Tomokazu Ishikawa, as a practitioner-researcher, discusses the notion of EMF and foregrounds the positive impact of EMF-aware intervention in L1-shared English classrooms. University students' responses in an open-ended questionnaire indicate that students' own experiences in using their multilingual repertoires with other L1 speakers online in an English classroom have enlightened and empowered them in terms of their understanding of successful communication in English, and of what it means to be capable users of English. In 'ELF Interactions in English-Medium Engineering Classrooms' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 418–27), Kari Sahan illustrates how teachers and students in a Turkish university employ code-switching (translanguaging) to support content learning by negotiating and clarifying meaning, thus enhancing self-expression and identity. Based on her findings, Sahan urges ELT practitioners preparing students for EMI programmes to consider an ELF-informed approach that corresponds to the fluid language use in EMI classrooms in real life, at the same time cautioning that such an approach may also exclude international students not sharing the local language. Inmaculada Pineda reports on a three-year project at a Spanish university which contained a module on 'Teaching ELF-Aware Pedagogical Strategies to EMI Professors of Architecture' (*ELeL* 65[2020] 90–103). Pineda surveys the communication and methodological problems that the professors encountered, as identified by a needs analysis, then describes the content of the module which also provides an answer to the problems they faced. The positive feedback from the professors—that their confidence and skills in delivering EMI classes in ELF were boosted—evinces the success of the teaching of ELF pragmatic strategies, as well as how the project can act as a blueprint for other institutions in a similar context. In 'Triggering Effect of CLIL Practice on English as a Lingua Franca Awareness' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 387–97), Şebnem Yalçın, Yasemin Bayyurt, and Benan Rifaioğlu Alahdab illustrate that ELF-aware teaching and CLIL are highly compatible, for both reject native-speakerism and focus instead on successful communication. English teachers in a CLIL programme at one Turkish primary school responded to open-ended survey questions, stating that CLIL enhanced their language awareness, their commitment to content coverage, and their students' engagement in class. Overall, the confidence of students and teachers in learning and using English was strengthened. 'ELF

Awareness in the Task-Based Classroom: A Way Forward' (*ELangT* 74[2020] 398–407) by Stefania Kordia discusses how task-based language teaching can contribute to the attainment of ELF-aware teaching. Using a class of 12-year-old learners in a Greek primary school as an example, Kordia argues that task-based language teaching can be an effective methodological framework that will assist teachers in integrating a range of metalinguistic and reflective activities in the classroom to help students develop into pragmatically competent and self-reflective ELF-users. Observation-based assessment should be employed to verify students' ability to accommodate interactive contextual needs. Lastly, Kordia details a task that she designed and used with her students to demonstrate how ELF-aware teaching can be put into practice.

Another research focus has been identities and language attitudes among ELF learner-users. In "Your Pronunciation Is Really Good", Yujong Park investigates 'The Construction of Linguistic Identities in ELF Interactions among Multilingual Speakers' in a South Korean university classroom (*IJM* [2020] <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1781131>). Naturally occurring data show that students of various nationalities negotiate their linguistic identity with inter-related constructions conventionally associated to native-speakerism, namely (standard) phonology and nationality. Park's study on normative expectations highlights how relations of power can influence the range of identities members of international (CoPs) negotiate in interaction. For this reason, he points towards the need to develop ELF-aware pedagogical tools that empower students in identity construction. In 'Study Abroad, Identity, and Attitude towards the English Language' (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 157–81), Yoko Nogami contributes to the growing research on student migration from an ELF perspective through the longitudinal study of two Japanese undergraduates staying in a non-anglophone country and an anglophone country, respectively. He observes that whether the destination is an L1 English-speaking country or not is not significant in fostering a change in language attitude and a positive sense of self as an ELF-user; what is influential is how students construct their social networking. In "No English, Korean Only", Jinsook Choi investigates 'Local Students' Resistance to English as a Lingua Franca at an "English Only" University in Korea' (*LIC* [2020] <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1845712>) using language ideology and interactive regimes as a theoretical framework. Choi's ethnographic study shows that the reluctance of Korean students to use ELF with international students comes from the perception that, first, international students should learn the local language instead of taking it for granted that locals will accommodate them by using ELF; second, in terms of efficiency, ELF is a hurdle in completing academic tasks. From the multiple interactive regimes illustrated in Choi, it can be concluded that, despite top-down language policies, expectations and norms concerning language use among students are not fixed, but emerge in different spaces. Choi's conclusion links to the question 'What Is English in the Light of Lingua Franca Usage?' (in Hall and Wicaksono, eds., pp. 233–52), to which Iris Schaller-Schwaner and Andy Kirkpatrick submit that ELF is ontologically subjective. The authors first elucidate the intrinsically multilingual, hybrid, and varied nature of ELF. Then, contrasting ELF use in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) with that in a Swiss university, they advance a four-factor model that would motivate the use of ELF. The four interweaving

factors are the speech event/genre factor, the (CoP) factor, the (self)socialization/multilingualization factor, and the habitat factor.

Shifting to ELF in academic writing, a few studies adopt a corpus approach to analysing ELF writers' style, often in comparison to L1 English users. 'Syntactic Complexity in English as a Lingua Franca Academic Writing' (*JEAP* 43[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100798>) by Xue Wu, Anna Mauranen, and Lei Lei compares academic research papers from COCA and SciELF—a subcorpus in the WrELFA corpus (Written ELF in Academic Settings). The authors identify significant differences among the papers across nine indices, including the length of the production unit, the amount of subordination, the amount of coordination, and phrasal complexity. On the one hand, ELF academic writers use longer sentences and clauses, more coordinate nouns and coordinate adjectives, and more complex nominal phrases. On the other hand, they avail themselves of less subordinated construction and fewer verbal phrases than their AmE counterparts. Wu, Mauranen, and Lei call for more investigation of the linguistic features of ELF from a syntactic complexity perspective. Also making use of COCA and WrELFA, Selahattin Yilmaz and Ute Römer carried out 'A Corpus-Based Exploration of Constructions in Written Academic English as a Lingua Franca' in comparison to American academic writing (in Ute Römer, Viviana Cortes, and Eric Friginal, eds., *Advances in Corpus-Based Research on Academic Writing: Effects of Discipline, Register, and Writer Expertise*, pp. 60–88). Situated within usage-based Construction Grammar, the analysis was conducted on repeatedly used multi-word sequences with an identifiable dominant function in the WrELFA corpus. The filtering process limited the analysis to the three most commonly used 'key function words to constructions' (p. 65) among the seven identified, i.e. *of*, *in*, and *on*. Yilmaz and Römer found that ELF academic writers rely on safe constructional choices. Not only does this strategy add sophistication to the text, it also allows considerable phrasal and clausal complexity and variability especially concerning noun phrases modified by prepositional phrases. Aiming to compare how ELF-using students and experts apply 'Hedges in Russian EAP Writing', Elizaveta Smirnova and Svetlana Strinyuk conducted 'A Corpus-Based Study of Research Papers in Management' (*JELF* 9[2020] 81–101) with a learner corpus and a reference corpus. Employing contrastive inter-language analysis, the authors found that, in terms of frequency, phraseology, and style, students tend to underuse hedges, at the same time creating novel collocations for hedging. To demonstrate the practical implications for EAP pedagogy, Smirnova and Strinyuk provide three sample classroom activities developed with the reference corpus through which teachers can help students learn academic English.

With respect to BELF, research on the (non)-use of ELF at the workplace has been multifaceted, tackling different cultural and social needs of BELF-users and the inadequacy of an English-only language policy, and even questioning if English should be taken as the default in international business. To start with, Yao Yao and Bertha Du-Babcock analyse 'English as a Lingua Franca in China-Based Workplace Communication' with 'A Mixed Approach to a Comparison of Perceived Communicative Needs' (*IbéricaR* 39[2020] 345–70). When focusing on the perceived role of culture in the use of BELF, it appears that although participants perceive they have a good command of business English and show

cultural sensitivity, they lack the skills to use language appropriately to meet different social needs, especially for building interpersonal relationships with their overseas superordinates. Yao and Du-Babcock thus argue that training for BELF-users should go beyond intercultural awareness and include cultural knowledge to help BELF-users pragmatically adjust their language use. Keiko Tsuchiya assesses the practice of ‘Mediation and Translanguaging in a BELF Casual [lunch] Meeting’ (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 255–78) at the Southeast Asian office of a Japanese company. A corpus-based conversation analysis shows that the mediators always position themselves in the multiple lingua-cultural communities that exist among the interlocutors; this positionality provides a foundation for international, multilingual BELF communication at the workplace. Akiko Otsu gives ‘An Analysis of BELF Small Talk: A First Encounter’ between a Japanese architect and a Malaysian hotel clerk (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 213–32). Informed by insights from interactional sociolinguistics and ELF research, Otsu presents how interactants explore safe topics as well as displaying their active participation in the conversation through repetitions, overlaps, and syntactic simplification. Otsu suggests that more attention should be given to developing classroom instructions for BELF small talk given its importance at workplace.

Examining the ‘Impacts and Implications of English as the Corporate Official Language Policy’ by means of ‘A Case in Japan’ (*JELF* 9[2020] 103–29), Saeko Ozawa Ujiie reports on why a top-down, rigid, English-only language policy did not work, and how the policy has evolved over four years. Based on her findings, Ujiie suggests that for a corporate language policy to succeed, first, the working environment should comprise employees from different linguacultural backgrounds; second, ELF-awareness and the global role of ELF needs to be raised among employees, including NESs; third, in focusing on the very employees who use the languages day-to-day, the emphasis should be placed on multilingualism rather than monolingualism. In ‘Bridging the Language Barrier in International Business’ through ‘BELF and Multilingual Practices’ (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 233–54), Miyuki Takino adopts a narrative approach, examining how BELF-users in Japan understand and make sense of their experience, particularly in connecting the exclusively Japanese and the exclusively English environments in the company. That the use of Japanese is found to be promoting deeper thinking, productivity, inclusive communication, and clarity in meaning suggests that a policy that asks for monolingual use of English may indeed hamper productivity in the Japanese context. Bianca E. Dijkstra, Matt Coler, and Gisela Redeker ethnographically examine ‘The Multilingual Workplace Realities of [five] Polish Truckers’ with six Dutch warehouse workers as ‘A Case Study in the Netherlands’ (*Multilingua* [2020] <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0038>). The study shows that although English is predominantly used as a lingua franca in many parts of the world, interlocutors do not necessarily prefer to use, or may not use at all, ELF in particular regional contexts, which challenges a perception often taken for granted of having English as a default lingua franca. In addition, interlocutors sometimes form negative perceptions about other interlocutors’ communicative abilities based on stereotypes of the latter’s background (such as how their English proficiency is perceived) rather than actual communicative performance.

In ‘ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) in Business: Dynamics of Teaching for Business Interactions’ (in Hajime Terauchi, Judy Noguchi, and Akira Tajino, eds., *Towards a New Paradigm for English Language Teaching English for Specific Purposes in Asia and Beyond*, pp. 301–16), Anne Kankaanranta presents a best-practice example of teaching in a leading European business school in Finland. To meet the challenges of international business communication, the institution offers a challenge-based learning programme focusing on communicative competence: students are provided with BELF practices to acquire business knowledge and intercultural understanding capitalizing on more traditional business and strategic communication skills. This approach underscores the importance of applying fluid, hybrid, and context-specific BELF resources in class praxis.

Turning to another institutional context—medicine and healthcare—Yukako Nozawa engages with the ‘Co-Construction of Cognitive Empathy between Student Doctors and Simulated Patients in English as a Lingua Franca’ (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 279–98) in a medical English classroom at a Japanese university. Combining a conversation-analytic approach and retrospective interviews, Nozawa found that doctors’ other-repetition is crucial in exhibiting acknowledgement of patients’ talk, and is thus crucial in developing cognitive empathy and eliciting important information for the diagnosis and treatment of patients. Nozawa also highlights that the interplay between other features, such as question design and repetition, is equally significant, and should be further researched.

The global use of ELF has also reached the area of translation and interpreting, where professionals have expressed concerns about their jobs possibly becoming redundant or more challenging in future. To begin with, Jing Song in ‘Relieving Effects of Prefabricated Chunks in Conference Interpreting from English to Chinese in an ELF Context’ (*APTIS* 7[2020] 214–29) points out the impact of varieties of English in ASEAN on English-to-Chinese consecutive interpreting. The study explores a four-minute-long interpreting task, from a business-related conference, approached by Chinese university students. This psychometric exploration demonstrates that the acquisition of chunks alleviates the processing burden and psychological pressure. According to the author, corpus-based means could facilitate interpreting pedagogy in a more global context.

Particularly fruitful research comes with a special issue of *JELF* edited by Michaela Albl-Mikasa and Juliane House. The issue contains six chapters which report the views of interpreters and translators and explore the challenges they face. First, Karin Reithofer explores the issue of ‘Intelligibility in English as a Lingua Franca’ from ‘the Interpreters’ Perspective’ (*JELF* 9[2020] 173–93). Her study tested an ELF-user’s intelligibility in a conference-like ELF setting, whereby a number of interpreters worked on the speech of an Italian user of English. The study deals with the influence on intelligibility of interpreters’ background knowledge, familiarity with ELF, and proficiency in English. Findings show that experience with ELF communication strongly affects intelligibility but background knowledge and English proficiency do not seem to have a strong impact. Reithofer suggests future training of interpreters in the comprehension of non-standard accents. Cristina Scardulla’s paper takes us into the political arena of ELF at the EU, where she explores ‘The Interpreters’ Point of View on ELF at

the European Commission' (*JELF* 9[2020] 195–215) and describes the negative opinions of interpreters in relation to ELF. Their attitudes, reported in a questionnaire, showed frustrations and worries concerning the detrimental effect ELF may have in relation to interlocutors' participation rights and multilingualism as a 'Completely Uneven Playing Field' (pp. 195, 213). Another issue related to this area concerns the 'Cognitive Load in Processing ELF' for 'Translators, Interpreters, and Other Multilinguals' (*JELF* 9[2020] 217–38). Maureen Ehrensberger-Dow, Michaela Albl-Mikasa, Katrin Andermatt, Andrea Hunziker Heeb, and Caroline Lehr discuss the methods (qualitative and quantitative) that can be used to assess cognitive load and effort, such as subjective, physiological, behavioural, and performance measures, as well as creating edited versions of ELF material.

The next two papers concern conference interpreting in two different European contexts. Claudio Bendazzoli discusses an online survey—with 247 respondents—on 'Translators and Interpreters' Voice on the Spread of English as a Lingua Franca in Italy' (*JELF* 9[2020] 239–64). The findings confirm previous research expressing negative views of ELF but also show positive reactions to the possibility of new opportunities in more specialized settings and with a broader range of clients. María Dolores Rodríguez Melchor and Andrew Samuel Walsh explore 'What Does ELF Mean for the Simultaneous Interpreter?' and provide 'An Overview of the Current Situation of the Spanish Interpreting Market' (*JELF* 9[2020] 265–86). Their findings in the Spanish context are similar to the previous Italian study in that the respondents (thirty-four questionnaire respondents and eight interviewees) perceive ELF as a threat to their profession and feel they are increasingly seen as dispensable.

Simo K. Määttä's study in public service translation explores 'Translating Child Protection Assessments for ELF Users: Accommodation, Accessibility, and Accuracy' (*JELF* 9[2020] 287–307) and discusses community translators' work, translating five migrant child protection assessments and decisions from Finnish into English. Määttä explores examples of translation problems and demonstrates how the target texts display accommodation strategies (explanation of terms, glossaries, formal simplifications) aimed at rendering the translations more accessible to the child's parents or custodians. In sum, the papers in this issue show that, on the one hand, the growing prevalence of ELF seems to be perceived as more of a threat to the profession, especially in the European context; on the other hand, more work tackling real examples of translation and interpreting is needed.

As for ELF in social contexts, 'On Second Language/Nonnative Speakerism in Conversation Analysis: A Study of Emic Orientations to Language in Multilingual/Lingua Franca Couple Interactions' (*JPrag* 169[2020] 136–50) by Kaisa S. Pietikäinen tackles the crucial question of data-type labelling and explores speakers' identities further than their novice/expert's role in interaction. The study was carried out from an emic perspective through repair sequences. Conversation analysis of interactions between ELF-using, multilingual married couples reveals that, rather than correcting non-standard features, producing a sequentially relevant next turn is prioritized. Moreover, the category of nativeness/nonnativeness is made redundant in this trans- or multilingual context.

Comparing the use of English between ELF-users and NESs (in addition to the research on academic writing mentioned above), Ian Walkinshaw and Andy Kirkpatrick in ‘We Want Fork but No Pork’ contrast ‘(Im)politeness in Humour by Asian Users of English as a Lingua Franca and Australian English Speakers’ (*ContPrag* 2[2020] <https://doi.org/10.1163/26660393-BJA10010>), as found in the Asian Corpus of English (ACE). The study provides a stimulating contribution to ELF pragmatics, revealing a predominant orientation to solidarity and group cohesion by ELF-users, who cautiously avoid face damage and rapport-threatening. In contrast, Anglo-Australian humour is characterized by a face-affronting stance. A number of studies have also provided examples of multilingual strategies in ELF interaction. Yang Pang, for instance, took a socio-cognitive approach in ‘The Cognitive Saliency of Word Associations of Verbs of Speech in English as a Lingua Franca Interactions’ (*IPrag* 17[2020] 417–43), comparing recurrent verb patterns (e.g. *talk*, *say*, *speak*, and *tell*) in ELF corpora—ACE and VOICE—with those in a NS corpus—COCA. It is found that similar associative patterns, which differ from NESs’ idiomatic expressions, recur among ELF speakers from different sociocultural backgrounds. Findings show that ELF interactions show fewer formulaic and idiomatic expressions and the prefabricated ELF expressions require situational co-construction to clarify their meanings among interactants.

A number of additional features of ELF spoken communication are examined in the following studies. First, Niina Hynninen highlights the implications of ELF research on the study of L2 fluency in ‘Fluency in English as a Lingua Franca Interaction’ (in Pekka Lintunen, Maarit Mutta, and Pauliina Peltonen, eds., *Fluency in L2 Learning and Use*, pp. 81–95). Expanding upon key ELF research from the perspective of fluency, Hynninen conducts her research employing Segalowitz’s three dimensions of fluency (in *Cognitive Bases of Second Language Fluency* [2010]) and concludes that fluency in ELF should be considered as an interactional phenomenon that cannot be rated solely against an L1 English model. This standpoint provides significant support to L2 speech assessment; at the same time, further research is needed to define fluent communication in ELF. Second, ‘Other-Correction in Next Position: The Case of Lexical Replacement in ELF Interactions in an Academic Setting’ (*JPrag* 169[2020] 1–12) by Jagdish Kaur investigates the relevance of accuracy in ELF interactions. A sequential analysis of naturally occurring classroom interactions in an international Malaysian university shows that other-correction appears in three scenarios: after an inaccurate use of the lexicon, subsequent to a semantic approximation, and readdressing an off-target utterance completion. The analysis demonstrates well that corrective actions in high-stakes contexts do not disturb the progress of the talk; in contrast, lexical replacement, in the form of other-correction, expresses the speakers’ communicative competence. Finally, George O’Neal in ‘Does an ELF Phonology Exist?’ (*AEnglishes* 22[2020] 282–96) examines ELF interactions focusing on pronunciation negotiations. Relying on the view that ELF-users more often belong to transient international groups than to speech communities, O’Neal advances a new nomenclature in order to describe how international speakers orient to the emically relevant phonemic status of a phone (i.e. whether a phone belongs to a phoneme or an allophone), as negotiated among interactants. In his study, O’Neal conducts segmental repair

analysis on conversational data gathered at a university in Japan from a participant-relevant perspective. Based on the findings, he proposes an ELF phonology based on isophones—phonetically different phones—through which speakers in transient international groups orient to semantically equal words.

Beyond verbal communication, Hiroki Hanamoto investigates the functions of ‘Gesture Sequences and Turn-Taking Strategies in Communication Settings in the Multilingual Philippines’ for pre-empting communication turbulence (in Guardado R. Martín and Piotr Romanowski, eds., *The Many Faces of Multilingualism: Language Status, Learning and Use Across Contexts*, pp. 63–83). A multimodal analysis of two dyadic interactions between a Japanese university student and a Filipina English instructor shows that gestures are used for accomplishing different linguistic functions. For instance, iconic, beat, and deictic can fill in details, enhance explicitness, build rapport, and make correction explicit. Mayu Konakahara conducts ‘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) to highlight the interplay of verbal and non-verbal semiotic resources in two types of overlapping sequences—a floor-taking overlap and a floor-attempting overlap—among international students in British universities. Konakahara’s study confirms the high sensitivity of participants in translanguaging ELF settings. In fact, they deftly exploit a wide range of semiotic resources (e.g. turn-taking, participation roles, and topical development) to enhance interaction and construct intersubjectivity in situ. Adopting a multimodal conversation-analytic approach, Yumi Matsumoto and Suresh Canagarajah scrutinize ‘The Use of Gesture, Gesture Hold, and Gaze in Trouble-in-Talk among Multilingual Interlocutors in an English as a Lingua Franca Context’ (*JPrag* 169[2020] 245–67). The authors observe that ELF-users act collaboratively to signal and repair trouble-in-talk instances through various embodied actions. The study contributes to ELF pragmatic research by exemplifying understanding attained through embodied means (e.g. gestures, gesture holds, and gaze) and negotiation carried out with various interactional resources—i.e. linguistic and cultural knowledge. Finally, the study shows that interactional moves can reveal differences in interlocutors’ epistemic primacy and imbalances in their epistemic authority. Seval Birlik and Jagdish Kaur encapsulate how ‘BELF Expert Users: [Make] Understanding Visible in Internal BELF Meetings through the Use of Nonverbal Communication Strategies’ (*ESPJ* 58[2020] 1–14). Combining frameworks of conversation analysis and CoP, Birlik and Kaur observe that head nods, hand-pointing gestures, and, most importantly, eye gaze fulfil a range of functions, from displaying active listening and acknowledgement and enhancing clarity to regulating participation. The roles of these nonverbal strategies are so significant that verbal communication at times becomes redundant.

Mass media has emerged as a resource through which the use of ELF in society and through which general discourse about English (as a lingua franca) can be observed—reflecting the usefulness of mass media as a tool to explore naturally occurring ELF usage as well as the power of mass media in influencing language attitudes. Hyejeong Ahn, Naya Choi, and Jieun Kiaer investigate ‘South Korean Perceptions of “Native” Speaker of English in Social and News Media via Big Data Analytics’ (*JELF* 9[2020] 33–56), a rare method in ELF research.

Results from two data-mining programmes show that the South Korean society, as portrayed by its media, possesses a ‘highly flawed’ (p. 49) conceptualization of NESs. For instance, only white people from anglophone countries, and ideally white Americans, are recognized as NESs. This results in an uncritical pursuit of AmE in education, and social injustice such as job discrimination against non-white professionals. The article reflects a gap between research, where the pluricentricity of English is much discussed, and reality, where native-speakerism prevails. Masaki Oda uses ‘Learning English Because of the Olympics?’ as a lead-up to ‘A Critical Inquiry’ into Japan’s English education policy (in Konakahara and Tsuchiya, eds., pp. 301–11). He argues that the Japanese government and media discourses play a large role in influencing learners’ beliefs and the norm of ELT in Japan, which lack awareness of multilingualism and ELF. Therefore, critical discourse analysis of the media would be important to make the public more conscious of issues surrounding language learning.

Antje Wilton in “‘We have a grandios saison gespielt’—English as a Lingua Franca in Media Sports Interviews’ (*JELF* 9[2020] 1–31), delves into the interactional resources and strategies that German football players employ in post-match interviews. Unlike other ELF interactions, post-match interviews constitute a specific genre which is highly pre-structured, and whose aim is not to maximize understanding, but to present players’ perspectives. This difference from other ELF interactions justifies the selection of strategies; it also highlights why ELF use in media settings, which has hitherto received little attention, offers great potential for ELF research. ‘A Corpus Analysis of Hedges in Lingua Franca English’ (*SJK* 28[2020] 227–48) by Jee-Won Hahn investigates the differences between ELF- and ENL-users’ pragmatic competence by examining how three hedging devices—modal verbs, modal adverbs, and pronouns—are used in press briefings by the World Health Organization and the US government. An analysis of the videos of these briefings by the concordance programme Antcon shows similarities between the pragmatic competence of ELF-users and native speakers, while developmental patterns from learner English are also found. These findings suggest integrating sociolinguistic concepts into pragmatics in an SLA context.

Finally, the use and spread of ELF in Asia, and its impact, remain the focus of some ELF researchers. Andy Kirkpatrick discusses the multilingual context of ASEAN, and the history, presence, and future prospects of ‘English as an ASEAN Lingua Franca’ (in Bolton, Botha, and Kirkpatrick, eds., pp. 725–40). Kirkpatrick predicts that the increasing dominance of ELF in ASEAN, especially in education, will lead to the diminishing status and role of many local (but not national) languages in the region, negatively impacting its linguistic diversity. For ELF in China, Ying Wang’s monograph *Language Ideologies in the Chinese Context: Orientations to English as a Lingua Franca* centres around the notion of Chinese English as a Lingua Franca (ChELF)—referring to ‘the phenomenon that Chinese speakers use ELF to communicate with non-Chinese speakers for international communication’ (p. 13). After thoroughly discussing the conceptualization of ChELF and language ideologies, Wang presents her findings—gathered from a questionnaire with 769 respondents, interviews, and focus groups—with respect to three research questions. First, how do Chinese speakers perceive ChELF? Second, how do Chinese speakers see their identities in relation to

English and ChELF? Third, how are power relations that lead to the preponderance of native English norms in China debated among Chinese speakers? The monograph ends by pointing towards an expansion of ELF research, particularly on ChELF-informed language awareness, language policy, and pedagogy. Echoing the chapter from Lange and Leuckert mentioned at the beginning of this section, ChELF potentially offers a chance to explore how ELF and WE could overcome the divide between them.

Attending especially to the Japanese context are a research article and an edited volume. Analysing ‘English as a Lingua Franca from an Applied Linguistics Perspective: In the Context of Japan’ (*RJL* 24[2020] 633–48), Nobuyuki Hino expounds how the significant pedagogical implications of early ELF studies, particularly those on the Lingua Franca Core proposed by Jennifer Jenkins (*The Phonology of English as an International Language* [2000]), for ELT in the Expanding Circle have been much overlooked. Hino explicates that non-core features as well as core features of the Lingua Franca Core are indeed crucial for ELT in the Asian Expanding Circle in order to maintain ELF-users’ intelligibility and identity. Hino ends by offering four ways of incorporating ELF concepts into ELT in Japan.

English as a Lingua Franca in Japan: Towards Multilingual Practices edited by Mayu Konakahara and Keiko Tsuchiya starts with an ‘Introduction: English as a Lingua Franca in Japan—Towards Multilingual Practices’ by the editors (pp. 1–23). They discuss developments in research in ELF, and developments in Japan and in applied linguistics, in relation to multilingualism, translanguaging, and transcultural communication, and how these developments could affect the sociolinguistic dynamics in Japan. (Other chapters from this volume are discussed elsewhere in this section; research devoted to the Japanese context is discussed here.) In ‘ELF Education for the Japanese Context’ (pp. 27–45), Nobuyuki Hino first explicates four linguacultural values of Japan that he believes would be beneficial to ELF education in the country: awareness of internationalization, the quest for equality, orientation towards indigenization, and the need of models. He then proposes eclecticism, which integrates these four values, as a ‘Japanese solution’ (p. 37) for teaching ELF in Japan. He even envisages a fourth stage of ELF research (ELF4) which would involve ‘interdenominational integration’ (p. 40) with WE. ‘Revisiting LPP (Language Policy and Planning) Frameworks from an ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) Perspective’ (pp. 47–70), Masakazu Iino makes a case for locating ELF in the LPP framework, which would be especially useful in Japan, where native-speakerism prevails. Iino also discusses the importance of enhancing the applications, in addition to implications, of ELF research, for instance by establishing ELF-informed LPP, which would require collaboration among researchers (from and beyond social sciences), educators, administrators, and politicians across disciplines and fields. In ‘ELF for Global Mindsets? Theory and Practice of ELT in Formal Education in Japan’ (pp. 71–89), Ayako Suzuki details how, with regard to developing global citizenship and attaining competency-based education, there has been a theoretical but not a practical paradigm shift from EFL education to ELF education in Japanese ELT. To overcome this inconsistency, Suzuki suggests that ELT practitioners, ranging from individual teachers to policymakers, need to ‘unlearn their conventional ideas about ELT’ (p. 85) and adopt a multilingual approach for and

in classroom teaching. Enquiring into native-speakerism in Japan, Yasukata Yano first describes how the ideology is deep-rooted and uncritically accepted in Japan both in historical and in modern times. He then maintains that 'ELF Research Can Liberate the Japanese from Native-Speakerism' (pp. 313–22), citing four reasons, particularly regarding the ownership of English. Finally, Keiko Tsuchiya offers a 'Conclusion' that recapitulates all the chapters in the edited volume with reference to 'ELF Research as a Pedagogic Device' (pp. 335–54)—in particular concerning the distribution, recontextualization, and evaluation of ELF practices. Tsuchiya introduces a triad model comprising performativity, creativity, and reflexivity as a way forward towards implementing ELF-oriented pedagogy in Japan. Although the volume's research and the theoretical discussions are situated in Japan, dealing with Japanese speakers and Japanese culture, the implications of the studies can be transferred to other geonational contexts that share similar sociolinguistic features.

Three monographs were not reviewed in this section because access to the books was not obtained. They are: *Interpersonal Positioning in English as a Lingua Franca Interactions* by Svitlana Klötzl and Birgit Swoboda, *Business Negotiations in ELF from a Cultural Linguistic Perspective* by Milene Mendes de Oliveira, and *Identity and Pragmatic Language Use: A Study on Japanese ELF Users* by Yoko Nogami.

13. Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis

It has been another good year for publications on research in English pragmatics and discourse analysis, publications which often cut across disciplines and stretch the boundaries of past approaches. My review centres on monographs, edited volumes (including two handbooks), and special issues which tend to stand for major research trends this year, including but not limited to language and cognition, computer-mediated communication (CMC), traditional media discourse, forensic linguistics, policing, social interaction with children, quotations, motherhood and marriage as well as political discourse, and also expanding on some of the topics addressed in the two handbooks referenced below.

I begin with *The Cambridge Handbook of Discourse Studies*, edited by Anna De Fina and Alexandra Georgakopoulou. While offering chapters on established research traditions, methods and topics in the field, the handbook contains several noteworthy contributions on rather innovative, cutting-edge strands. The editors' 'aim with this handbook has not been to superimpose either artificial boundaries or some kind of coherence on a heterogeneous field but, instead, to offer readers a panorama of current areas of engagement and cross-fertilization' (p. xxiii). Following a preface, the handbook falls into six parts, each of which opens with a short introduction by the editors, and comprises thirty-two chapters in total. Part I, '(Con)Textualizing Discourses', contains the chapters 'Registers, Styles, Indexicality' (pp. 9–31) by Robert Moore; 'Situating Discourse Analysis in Ethnographic and Sociopolitical Context' (pp. 32–51) by Jennifer Roth-Gordon; 'Context and Its Complications' (pp. 52–69) by Jan Blommaert (with Laura Smits and Noura Yacoubi); 'Historicity, Interdiscursivity and Intertextuality

in Discourse Studies' (pp. 70–90) by Branca Falabella Fabricio and Luiz Paulo Moita-Lopes; 'Rethinking Narrative: Tellers, Tales and Identities in Contemporary Worlds' (pp. 91–114) by the editors. The contributions to Part II, 'Rethinking Narrative: Tellers, Tales and Identities in Contemporary Worlds', address 'Sequence Organization: Understanding What Drives Talk' (pp. 121–42) by Emily Hofstetter; 'Doing Micro-Analysis of Discourse: The Case of Ageing and Wellbeing' (pp. 143–64) by Rachel Heinrichsmeier; 'Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies' (pp. 165–85) by Clyde Ancarno; 'Cognitive Linguistic and Experimental Methods in Critical Discourse Studies' (pp. 186–212) by Christopher Hart; 'Metaphor, Metonymy and Framing in Discourse' (pp. 213–34) by Zsófia Demjén and Elena Semino; 'Poststructuralist Discourse Studies: From Structure to Practice' (pp. 235–54) by Johannes Angermüller. Part III, 'Discourse Materialities and Embodiment', consists of papers on 'Multimodality' (pp. 263–81) by Sabine Tan, Kay O'Halloran and Peter Wignell; 'Sign Theory and the Materiality of Discourse' (pp. 282–305) by Jack Sidnell; 'Discourse and the Linguistic Landscape' (pp. 306–26) by Philip Seargeant and Korina Giaxoglou; 'Discourse, Emotions and Embodiment' (pp. 327–49) by Brigitta Busch; 'Posthumanism and Its Implications for Discourse Studies' (pp. 350–70) by Gavin Lamb and Christina Higgins. Part IV, '(Trans)Locations and Intersections', includes chapters on 'Transnationalism, Globalization and Superdiversity' (pp. 377–93) by Zane Goebel; 'Translanguaging and Momentarity in Social Interaction' (pp. 394–416) by Tong King Lee and Li Wei; 'Intersectionality, Affect and Discourse' (pp. 417–36) by Kristine Köhler Mortensen and Tommaso M. Milani; 'Expanding Academic Discourses: Diverse Englishes, Modalities and Spatial Repertoires' (pp. 437–56) by Brooke R. Schreiber, Mohammad Naseh Nasrollahi Shahri, and Suresh Canagarajah. Part V, 'Ethics, Inequality and Inclusion', comprises contributions on 'Ethics and the Study of Discourse' (pp. 465–86) by Martyn Hammersley; 'Migrants, Citizenship and Language Rights' (pp. 487–504) by Lionel Wee; 'Diversity and Inclusion in Education' (pp. 505–26) by Yi-Ju Lai and Kendall A. King; 'Discourse and Racialization' (pp. 527–46) by Virginia Zavala and Michele Back; 'Discourse and Narrative in Legal Settings: The Political Asylum Process' (pp. 547–70) by Amy Shuman and Carol Bohmer; 'Discourse and Religion in Educational Practice' (pp. 571–92) by Vally Lytra. Part VI, 'Discourses, Publics and Mediatization', offers papers on 'The Critical Analysis of Genre and Social Action' (pp. 601–21) by Anders Björkqvall; 'Rhetorics, Discourse and Populist Politics' (pp. 622–43) by Markus Rheindorf; 'The Discourses of Money and the Economy' (pp. 643–65) by Annabelle Mooney; 'Corporate Discourse' (pp. 666–86) by Sylvia Jaworska; 'Mediatized Communication and Linguistic Reflexivity in Contemporary Public and Political Life' (pp. 687–707) by Cedric Deschrijver; 'Discourse Analysis and Digital Surveillance' (pp. 708–31) by Rodney H. Jones.

Different in its scope and topics but similar in its aims, the handbook of *Developmental and Clinical Pragmatics*, edited by Klaus P. Schneider and Elly Ifantidou, addresses the development of pragmatic competence in a first language, in a second language, and in pragmatic disorders. It intends to '[facilitate] cross-fertilization and cooperation across the three perspectives addressed ... and the research communities involved' (p. 27). The handbook begins with a 'Preface to the Handbook Series' by Wolfram Bublitz, Andreas H. Jucker, and

Klaus P. Schneider, a 'Preface' by the editors, as well as a first, introductory, chapter 'Pragmatic Competence: Development and Impairment' (pp. 1–29) by the editors. The volume is divided into three parts and comprises twenty-one thematic contributions. Part I, 'Pragmatic Development in a First Language', first provides 'An Overview' (pp. 33–60) by Sandrine Zufferey; it is followed by 'Communicative Act Development' (pp. 61–88) by Marisa Casillas and Elma Hilbrink; 'Acquisition of Epistemic and Evidential Expressions' (pp. 89–118) by Tomoko Matsui; 'Acquiring Implicatures' (pp. 119–48) by Elspeth Wilson and Napoleon Katsos; 'Acquiring Irony' (pp. 149–75) by Deirdre Wilson; 'Acquiring Prosody' (pp. 177–208) by Tim Wharton; 'Pragmatic Development in the (Middle and) Later Stages of Life' (pp. 209–34) by Annette Gerstenberg. Part II, 'Pragmatic Development in a Second Language', starts again with 'An Overview' (pp. 237–67) by Marta González-Lloret; followed by 'Teaching Speech Acts in a Second Language' (pp. 269–99) by Alicia Martínez-Flor and Esther Usó-Juan; 'Learning How to Interpret Indirectness in an L2' (pp. 301–30) by Helen Woodfield; 'Comprehension of Implicatures and Humor in a Second Language' (pp. 331–59) by Naoko Taguchi and Nancy D. Bell; 'Pragmatic Transfer' (pp. 361–91) by César Félix-Brasdefer; 'Developing Pragmatic Awareness' (pp. 393–427) by Troy McConachy and Helen Spencer Oatey; 'Developing Pragmatic Competence in a Study Abroad Context' (pp. 429–74) by Anne Barron; 'Testing Pragmatic Competence in a Second Language' (pp. 475–95) by Carsten Roever and Naoki Ikeda. Part III, 'Pragmatic Disorders', starts again with 'An Overview' (pp. 499–522) by Louise Cummings and next offers papers on 'Pragmatic Competence in Autism Spectrum Disorders' (pp. 523–44) by Livia Colle; 'Pragmatic Competence in Down Syndrome' (pp. 545–79) by Susan H. Foster-Cohen and Anne K. van Bysterveldt; 'Pragmatic Competence in Aphasia' (pp. 581–610) by Gloria Streit Olness and Hanna K. Ulatowska; 'Pragmatics and Dementia' (pp. 611–46) by Heidi E. Hamilton; 'Assessing Pragmatic Competence in Developmental Disorders' (pp. 647–79) by Jenny Louise Gibson and Michelle C. St Clair.

A well-organized, clearly written textbook is *Cognition: Introduction to Cognitive Discourse Analysis* by Thora Tenbrink, which offers an introduction to 'the study of language in relation to thought' (p. 8). Divided into nine chapters, it discusses the motivation, background, theory, methodology, and perspectives taken in cognitive discourse analysis (CODA), offering plenty of examples from and references to relevant past research. The detailed, hands-on guide to 'CODA procedures' (chapter 8, pp. 194–225) and the practical 'Register of Linguistic Features' are the real forte of this valuable introduction addressed to graduate students, early-career, and more experienced researchers.

Several books in CMC have appeared. *Complimenting Behavior and (Self-)Praise across Social Media*, edited by María Elena Placencia and Zohreh R. Eslami, assembles state-of-the-art studies in a rich, thematically coherent volume, which approaches the topic assembling studies across linguistic and digital contexts. I focus here on discourse-analytic contributions concerned with English. Zohreh R. Eslami, Lu Yang, and Chang Qian present 'A Comparative Study of Compliment Responses among Chinese Renren Users and American Facebook Users' (pp. 21–47), which finds that while users' compliment responses still show cultural differences, there is a tendency towards some sort of

'cultural homogenization' (p. 42), with Chinese users adopting English norms. Marina Ruiz-Tada, Marta Fernández-Villanueva, and Elsa Tragant's findings on Facebook posts on the topic of manicures illustrate that the lack of a response to a compliment represents an accepted strategy, revealing a change in pragmatic practices; this is explained as a consequence of the increasing influence of English as a lingua franca ('Compliment Response Behavior among Japanese-English Bilinguals on Facebook', pp. 121–41). Roni Danziger and Zohar Kampf's study on Hebrew, Arabic, and English Twitter posts of political and foreign-policy actors demonstrates that online communication in the diplomatic arena '[blurs] differences in the cultural speaking styles of the international actors' ('#Lovely Country, #Wonderful People: Diplomatic Compliments and Praise on Twitter', pp. 165–85). Examining web forums on smoking cessation in the UK, Marie-Thérèse Rudolf von Rohr and Miriam A. Locher show that complimenting and self-praise are welcomed among members, which contrasts with an avoidance of such speech-acts among professional health experts ('The Interpersonal Effects of Complimenting Others and Self-Praise in Online Health Settings', pp. 189–211). In "'I Want Your Brain" Complimenting Behavior in Online Over by Over Cricket Commentary', Dermot Brendan Heaney identifies patterned uses of direct and indirect compliments, which show differences with respect to linguistic form and reciprocity (pp. 237–61).

Positioned at the interface of CMC and forensic linguistics, the remarkable monograph *Language and Online Identities—The Undercover Policing of Internet Sexual Crime* by Tim Grant and Nicci MacLeod aims to develop a theory of language and identity and 'explain how this theoretical position on language and identity assists in understanding the varied tasks of forensic linguistic case work in the area of authorship studies' (pp. 24–5). Positioning the study in an interdisciplinary, multidimensional framework, the authors draw on multiple datasets (i.e. recordings of naturally occurring interaction and experimental data) as well as a mixed methodological approach in order to understand how online identities can be assumed through linguistic and interactional practices, and how this knowledge can be operationalized for the persecution of internet sexual crime, specifically of child sexual abuse offenders.

In another contribution to forensic linguistics, *The Discourse of Police Interviews*, the editors Marianne Mason and Frances Rock provide a collection of fifteen chapters 'designed to provide the reader with a backstage view . . . of the discursive features and institutional applications of police interviews in various jurisdictions, such as in Australia, Belgium, the Netherlands, United Kingdom, and the United States' (p. 7). Following an introduction by the first editor, Section 1, entitled 'The Discourse of Reid and PEACE', begins with a chapter on 'When Police Interview Victims of Sexual Assault: Comparing Written Guidance to Interactional Practice' by Elizabeth Stokoe, Charles Antaki, Emma Richardson, and Sara Willott (pp. 21–41). Next follow chapters on 'Obtaining Valid Discourse from Suspects PEACE-Fully: What Role for Rapport and Empathy?' by Ray Bull and Bianca Baker (pp. 42–64); 'The Guilt-Presumptive Nature of Custodial Interrogations in the United States: The Use of Confrontation, Appeals to Self-Interest, and Sympathy/Minimization in the Reid Technique' by Marianne Mason (pp. 65–84); 'The Discourse Structure of Blame Mitigation in a Police Interrogation' by Philip Gaines (pp. 85–110). Section 2 on

'Police Interview Dynamics and Negotiation' includes the papers 'Now the Rest of the Story: The Collaborative Production of Confession Narratives in Police Interrogation' by Gary C. David and James Trainum (pp. 113–35); 'Patterns of Cooperation between Police Interviewers with Suspected Sex Offenders' by Tatiana Tkacukova and Gavin E. Oxburgh (pp. 136–55); 'Supporting Competing Narratives: A Membership Categorization Analysis of Identity Work in Police-Detainee Talk' by David Yoong and Ayesha Syed (pp. 156–76). Section 3 on 'Discursive Transformations in Bilingual Police Interviews' contains contributions on 'Narrative Construction in Interpreted Police Interviews' by Ikuko Nakane (pp. 179–99); 'Interactional Management in a Simulated Police Interview: Interpreters' Strategies' by Sandra Hale, Jane Goodman-Delahunty, and Natalie Martschuk (pp. 200–26); 'Non-Native Speakers, Miranda Rights, and Custodial Interrogation' by Bethany K. Dumas (pp. 227–46). Section 4, 'The Discursive Journey and Institutional Applications of Police Interviews' includes the chapters "'Tell Me in Your Own Words...': Reconciling Institutional Salience and Witness-Compatible Language in Police Interviews with Women Reporting Rape' (pp. 249–67) by Nicci MacLeod, "'Are You Saying You Were Stabbed ...?': Multimodality, Embodied Action, and Dramatized Formulations in "Fixing" the Facts in Police Interviews with Suspects' (pp. 268–98) by Alison Johnson, 'Functions of Transmodal Metalanguage for Collaborative Writing in Police-Witness Interviews' (pp. 299–328) by Frances Rock, 'Reconstructing Suspects' Stories in Various Police Record Styles' (pp. 329–48) by Tessa (T.C.) van Charldorp, and finally 'Police Records in Court: The Narrative Fore- and Backgrounding of Information by Judges in Inquisitorial Criminal Court' (pp. 349–65) by Fleur van der Houwen.

Continuing with the study of children in social interaction, the special issue of the Society for Text and Discourse Conference (*DPr* 57[2020]) includes two articles relevant to the present review. Eve Clark's 'Conversational Repair and the Acquisition of Language' (*DPr* 57[2020] 441–59) examines how repair is used as an interactional resource in first-language acquisition. Allison Gabouer, John Oghalai, and Heather Bortfeld are concerned with parents' interactional practices to establish joint attention with their hearing and deaf children in 'Parental Use of Multimodal Cues in the Initiation of Joint Attention as a Function of Child Hearing Status' (*DPr* 57[2020] 491–506).

A special issue of *T&T*, edited by Asta Cekaite and Ann-Carita Evaldsson, is opened by the editors' introduction 'The Moral Character of Emotion Work in Adult–Child interactions' (*T&T* 40[2020] 563–72) and further contains original research on English and Swedish interaction. The contributions on English comprise Marjorie H. Goodwin and Heather Loyd's, 'The Face of Noncompliance in Family Interaction' (*T&T* [2020] 573–98), which investigates how parents and children manage family disputes in interaction; Amy Kyratzis and Bahar Köymen's 'Morality-in-Interaction: Toddlers' Recyclings of Institutional Discourses of Feeling during Peer Disputes in Daycare' (*T&T* [2020] 623–42) studies how emotion talk is used in two Californian daycare centres to shape the moral order; Amanda Bateman's 'Young Children's Affective Stance through Embodied Displays of Emotion during Tellings' (*T&T* [2020] 643–68) shows how stories are responded to and interactively constructed through affect-laden responses in early childhood kindergartens in New Zealand.

Two special (or thematic) issues were devoted to the study of quotations. A special issue of *JPrag* on 'How To Do Things With Quotes', edited by Anita Fetzer and Daniel Weiss, argues that quotation represents expositive speech acts. The contributions present studies on English, French, Hebrew, and Russian across discourse contexts. With respect to English, Anita Fetzer shows that quotations serve argumentative functions in parliamentary question time: "'And I quote': Forms and Functions of Quotations in Prime Minister's Questions' (*JPragm* 157[2020] 89–100). Sonja Kleinke analyses the forms and micro-level functions of Wikipedia entries on Brexit and Nation in 'Wikipedia: Quotations at the Interface of Encyclopedic and Participatory Practices' (*JPragm* 157[2020] 119–30). Andreas Musolff demonstrates how the quotation of the proverb 'to have one's cake and eat it' is deployed for multiple socio-pragmatic functions in the political discourse on Brexit in 'How (not?) to Quote a Proverb: The Role of Figurative Quotations and Allusions in Political Discourse' (*JPragm* 157[2020] 135–44). Monika Kirner-Ludwig presents a case study of a fake quote ascribed to Donald Trump on Facebook and its uptake by users in 'Creation, Dissemination and Uptake of Fake-Quotes in Lay Political Discourse on Facebook and Twitter' (*JPragm* 157[2020] 101–18).

The innovative thematic issue of *AILA Review*, edited by Lauri Haapanen and Daniel Perrin, comprises papers concerned with what the editors call 'Linguistic Recycling', involving 'The Process of Quoting in Increasingly Mediatized Settings', i.e. 'practices of quoting by which language is recycled in new contexts, transgressing formerly clear boundaries in environments of increasing mediatization'. As regards the discourse-analytic contributions on English, Jen Cope presents, in 'Quoting to Persuade', 'A Critical Linguistic Analysis of Quoting in US, UK, and Australian Newspaper Opinion Texts' (*AILA Review* 33[2020] 136–56). Elisabeth Reber studies the ways in which Members of the British House of Commons accomplish what is called 'literalized' reported speech through vocal, verbal, and visual cues, recruiting 'original' documents for rhetorical effect: 'Visuo-Material Performances: "Literalized" Quotations in Prime Minister's Questions' (*AILA Review* 33 [2020] 176–203).

The discourses of motherhood and marriage are explored in two special issues. A special issue of *DC&M* edited by Jai Mackenzie and Sumin Zhao explores 'Doing Motherhood Online: Parenting, Identity and Digital Interaction'. The contributions to this special issue were largely published in 2020 (with two appearing in 2021), and I therefore include them in this year's section. Reference will be made to all papers relating to English. The volume begins with an introduction by the editors, 'Motherhood Online: Issues and Opportunities for Discourse Analysis' (*DC&M* 40[2021] 100472). Agnieszka Lyons's paper takes a discourse-ethnographic perspective on 'Negotiating the Expertise Paradox in New Mothers' WhatsApp Group Interactions' (*DC&M* 40[2020] 100427). In "'Your Mind is Part of Your Body": Negotiating the Maternal Body in Online Stories of Postnatal Depression on Mumsnet', Karen Kinloch and Sylvia Jaworska are concerned with motherhood and online illness narratives (*DC&M* 40[2021] 100456). Similarly, David Matley studies how negative feelings associated with motherhood are shared and negotiated on Mumsnet in "'I Miss My Old Life": Regretting Motherhood On Mumsnet' (*DC&M* 40[2020] 100417). Laura Coffey-Glover's paper takes a feminist discourse-analytical

approach to ‘The Boob Diaries: Discourses of Breastfeeding in “Exclusive Pumping” Blogs’ (*DC&M* 40[2020] 100446). Finally, Helen Ringrow’s paper “‘I Can Feel Myself Being Squeezed and Stretched, Moulded and Grown, and Expanded in My Capacity to Love Loudly and Profoundly’” investigates ‘Metaphor and Religion in Motherhood Blogs’ (*DC&M* 40[2020] 100429).

A special issue of *CDS*, edited by Laura L. Paterson and Georgina Turner, presents ‘Approaches to Discourses of Marriage’, drawing on German, Taiwanese, Belgian, and English discourse. The focus here is on English. The volume is opened with a short introduction by the editors (*CDS* 17[2020] 133–7). Valerie Hobbs investigates ‘The Discourse of Divorce in Conservative Christian Sermons’ taken from SermonAudio (*CDS* 17 [2020] 193–210). Sergio A. Silverio and Laura K. Soulsby’s contribution analyses unmarried women’s constructions of self in semi-structured interviews, ‘Turning That Shawl into a Cape: Older Never Married Women in Their Own Words—the “Spinsters”, the “Singletons”, and the “Superheroes”’ (*CDS* 17[2020] 211–28).

A topic of continued interest remains political discourse, also addressed in some of the above-mentioned references. The special issue on ‘Hate Speech. Definitions, Interpretations and Practices’ of *P&S*, edited by Fabienne Baider, Sharon Millar, and Stavros Assimakopoulos, contains a range of theoretical and empirical papers. Following an ‘Introduction: Defining, Performing and Countering Hate Speech’ authored by the editors (*P&S* 11[2020] 171–6), Stavros Assimakopoulos discusses the relation between ‘Incitement to Discriminatory Hatred, Illocution and Perlocution’ (*P&S* 11[2020] 177–95). In ‘Pragmatics Lost?’, Fabienne Baider defines online hate speech as a speech act in social context (*P&S* 11[2020] 196–218). Björn Technau proposes ‘The Multi-Component Model for the Semantic Analysis of Slurs’ (*P&S* 11[2020] 219–40). Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk analyses ‘Culture-Driven Emotional Profiles and Online Discourse Extremism in English and Polish Online Comments Slurs’ (*P&S* 11 [2020] 262–91). Cristina Mayor-Goicoechea and Jesús Romero-Trillo’s contribution, “‘They Cowardly Attack US, So We Nobly Eliminate Them’: The Emergence of the Translocal Group in the Propaganda of the Islamic State’ examines the ISIS online propaganda magazine *Dabiq*, using CDA and Corpus Linguistics (*P&S* 11[2020] 292–315). Paul Iganski argues for a view of ‘Civil Courage as a Communicative Act: Countering the Harms of Hate Violence’ (*P&S* 11[2020] 316–35).

As regards research concerned with the pragmatics and discourses of the pandemic, 2020 only saw a few studies, e.g., the multimodal analysis ‘Doing Paying during the Covid-19 Pandemic’ by Lorenza Mondada, Julia Bänninger, Sofian A. Bouaouina, Guillaume Gauthier, Philipp Hänggi, Mizuki Koda, Hanna Svensson, and Burak S. Tekin (*DisS* 22[2020] 720–52). Next year’s section on pragmatics and discourse analysis will reflect an increased research output on the topic.

14. Stylistics

We hope to find a new contributor next year for the stylistics section.

Books Reviewed

- Aarts, Bas, April McMahon, and Lars Hinrichs, eds. *The Handbook of English Linguistics*. 2nd edn. Wiley-Blackwell. [2020] pp. xv + 682. £135 ISBN 9 7811 1954 0564.
- Aarts, Bas, Jill Bowie, and Gergana Popova, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of English Grammar*. OUP. [2020] pp. xxii + 824. £125 ISBN 9 7801 9875 5104.
- Adolphs, Svenja, and Dawn Knight, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of English Language and Digital Humanities*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xxi + 605. £190 ISBN 9 7811 3890 1766, e-book £39.99 ISBN 9 7810 0303 1758.
- Amador-Moreno, Carolina P. *Orality in Written Texts: Using Historical Corpora to Investigate Irish English 1700–1900*. Routledge. [2019] pp. xviii + 211. £120 ISBN 9 7811 3880 2346, e-book £36.99 ISBN 9 7813 1575 4321.
- Asudeh, Ash, and Gianluca Giorgolo. *Enriched Meanings: Natural Language Semantics with Category Theory*. OUP. [2020] pp. xix + 179. hb £65 ISBN 9 7801 9884 7854, pb £29.99 ISBN 9 7801 9884 7861.
- Ayres-Bennett, Wendy, and Helena Sanson, eds. *Women in the History of Linguistics*. OUP. [2020] pp. x + 648. £110 ISBN 9 7801 9875 4954.
- Bäuerle, Rainer, Christoph Schwarz, and Arnim von Stechow, eds. *Meaning, Use, and Interpretation of Language*. MGruter. [1983] pp. ix + 490. €189.95 ISBN 9 7831 1008 9011.
- Bech, Kristin, and Ruth Möhlig-Falke, eds. *Grammar—Discourse—Context: Grammar and Usage in Language Variation and Change*. MGruter. [2019] pp. viii + 375. €102.95 ISBN 9 7831 1068 2496.
- Blades, Andrew, and Piers Pennington, eds. *Poetry & the Dictionary*. LiverUP. [2020] pp. xi + 296. £90 ISBN 9 7817 8962 0566.
- Bolton, Kingsley, Werner Botha, and Andy Kirkpatrick, eds. *The Handbook of Asian Englishes*. Wiley. [2020] pp. xvii + 909. £108.17 ISBN 9 7811 1879 1806, e-book £102.76 ISBN 9 7811 1879 1882.
- Brentari, Diane. *Sign Language Phonology*. CUP. [2019] pp. xviii + 296. £95 ISBN 9 7811 0711 3473, e-book \$100.13 ISBN 9 7811 0876 1925.
- Buschfeld, Sarah. *Children's English in Singapore: Acquisition, Properties, and Use*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xv + 300. hb £120 ISBN 9 7811 3870 8877, pb £36.99 ISBN 9 7810 3208 2028, e-book £36.99 ISBN 9 7813 1520 1030.
- Buschfeld, Sarah, and Alexander Kautzsch, eds. *Modelling World Englishes: A Joint Approach to Postcolonial and Non-Postcolonial Varieties*. EUP. [2020] pp. xii + 428. hb £95 ISBN 9 7814 7444 5863, pb £24.99 ISBN 9 7814 7444 5870, e-book £100 ISBN 9 7814 7444 5887.
- Carr, Philip. *English Phonetics and Phonology: An Introduction*. 3rd edn. Wiley-Blackwell. [2019] pp. xxv + 216. pb \$42.95 ISBN 9 7811 1953 3740, e-book \$34 ISBN 9 7811 1953 3771.
- Cetinkaya, Yesim Bektas, ed. *Intercultural Competence in ELT: Raising Awareness in Classrooms*. Lang. [2020] pp. 194. £20 ISBN 9 7836 3182 0148, e-book £20 ISBN (pdf) 9 7836 3182 0155, ISBN (epub) 9 7836 3183 4305, ISBN (mobi) 9 7836 3183 4312.

- Chapman, Don, and Jacob D. Rawlins, eds. *Language Prescription: Values, Ideologies and Identity*. Multilingual Matters. [2020] pp. x + 315. £119.95 ISBN 9 7817 8892 8373, e-book £3 ISBN 9 7817 8892 8380.
- Cohen, Ariel. *Something out of Nothing: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Implicit Quantification*. Brill. [2020] pp. ix + 173. €110 ISBN 9 7890 0443 1485.
- Davydova, Julia. *Quotation in Indigenised and Learner English: A Sociolinguistic Account of Variation*. MGrutter. [2019] pp. xi + 254. hb £94 ISBN 9 7815 0151 5651, e-book £94 ISBN 9 7815 0150 7069.
- De Fina, Anna, and Alexandra Georgakopoulou, eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Discourse Studies*. CUP. [2020] pp. xxvi + 762. £120 ISBN 9 7811 0842 5148.
- Dodsworth, Robin, and Richard Benton, eds. *Language Variation and Change in Social Networks: A Bipartite Approach*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xi + 194. hb £120 ISBN 9 7811 3818 8891, pb £36.99 ISBN 9 7803 6777 7500, e-book £36.99 ISBN 9 7813 1564 2000.
- Dworkin, Craig. *Dictionary Poetics: Toward a Radical Lexicography*. FordUP. [2020] pp. 272. hb \$125 ISBN 9 7808 2328 7987, pb \$35 ISBN 9 7808 2328 7963.
- Edelstein, Elspeth. *English Syntax: A Minimalist Account of Structure and Variation*. EdinUP. [2020] pp. xxiii + 256. hb £95 ISBN 9 7814 7442 5513, pb £24.99 ISBN 9 7814 7442 5520, e-book £24.99 ISBN 9 7814 7442 5544.
- Fedriani, Chiara, and Maria Napoli, eds. *The Diachrony of Ditransitives*. MGrutter. [2020] pp. x + 317. €99.95 ISBN 9 7831 1070 1272.
- Fernández-Pena, Yolanda. *Reconciling Synchrony, Diachrony and Usage in Verb Number Agreement with Complex Collective Subjects*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xiv + 212. £120 ISBN 9 7803 6741 7154.
- Freidin, Robert. *Adventures in English Syntax*. CUP. [2020] pp. xiv + 202. hb £74.99 ISBN 9 7811 0848 7726, pb £24.99 ISBN 9 7811 0873 7807.
- Fridland, Valerie, Alicia Beckford Wassink, Lauren Hall-Lew, and Tyler Kendall, eds. *Speech in the Western States*. DukeUP. [2020] pp. vii + 152. \$30 ISBN 9 7814 7801 1613.
- Gandón-Chapela, Evelyn. *On Invisible Language in Modern English: A Corpus-Based Approach to Ellipsis*. Bloomsbury. [2020] pp. xvi + 289. hb £95 ISBN 9 7813 5006 4515, pb £28.99 ISBN 9 7813 5027 3085.
- Gentens, Caroline. *The Factive-Reported Distinction in English*. MGrutter. [2020] pp. xvii + 253. €99.95 ISBN 9 7831 1066 6076.
- Gorzycka, Dorota. *Diminutive Constructions in English*. Lang. [2020] pp. 300. £46 ISBN 9 7836 3181 2518.
- Grant, Anthony P., ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Language Contact*. OUP. [2020] pp. xxix + 757. £125 ISBN 9 7801 9994 5092.
- Grant, Tim, and Nicci MacLeod, eds. *Language and Online Identities—The Undercover Policing of Internet Sexual Crime*. CUP. [2020] pp. xviii + 212. £85 ISBN 9 7811 0848 7306, e-book \$89.35 ISBN 9 7811 0880 1300.
- Griffiths, Carol, and Zia Tajeddin, eds. *Lessons from Good Language Teachers*. CUP. [2020] pp. xxx + 348. Hb £72.35 ISBN 9 7811 0848 9263, pb £26.99 ISBN 9 7811 0870 2218, e-book £22 ISBN 9 7811 0877 4390.

- Hall, Christopher J., and Rachel Wicaksono, eds. *Ontologies of English: Conceptualising the Language for Learning, Teaching, and Assessment*. CUP. [2020] pp. xx + 382. £85 ISBN 9 7811 0848 2530, e-book \$88 ISBN 9 7811 0862 3070.
- Hallman, Peter. *Interactions of Degree and Quantification*. Brill. [2020] pp. 381. €136 ISBN 9 7890 0443 1119.
- Hazen, Kirk, ed. *Appalachian Englishes in the Twenty-First Century*. WVUP. [2020] pp. xxiv + 203. hb \$99.99 ISBN 9 7819 4919 9543, pb \$29.99 ISBN 9 7819 4919 9550, e-book \$29.99 ISBN 9 7819 4919 9567.
- Hickey, Raymond, ed. *English in the German-Speaking World*. CUP. [2019] pp. xxii + 414. hb £85 ISBN 9 7811 0848 8099, e-book \$88 ISBN 9 7811 0878 1831.
- Hickey, Raymond, ed. *The Handbook of Language Contact*. 2nd edn. Wiley-Blackwell. [2020] pp. xvii + 779. £135 ISBN 9 7811 1948 5025.
- Hickey, Raymond, and Carolina P. Amador-Moreno, eds. *Irish Identities: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Mouton. [2020] pp. viii + 306. €102.95 ISBN 9 7815 0151 6108, e-book €102.95 ISBN 9 7815 0150 7663.
- Hodges, Adam. *When Words Trump Politics: Resisting a Hostile Regime of Language*. StanfordUP. [2020] pp. xi + 181. pb \$14 ISBN 9 7815 0361 0798.
- Honeybone, Patrick, and Warren Maguire, eds. *Dialect Writing and the North of England*. EdinUP. [2020] pp. xii + 356. £95 ISBN 9 7814 7444 2565, e-book £95 ISBN 9 7814 7444 2589.
- Honkanen, Mirka. *World Englishes on the Web: The Nigerian Diaspora in the USA*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. vii + 338. €105 ISBN 9 7890 2720 7395, e-book €105 ISBN 9 7890 2726 0888.
- Illés, Éva. *Understanding Context in Language Use and Teaching: An ELF Perspective*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xii + 162. hb £96 ISBN 9 7803 6722 3779, pb £27.99 ISBN 9 7803 6722 3793, e-book £27.99 ISBN 9 7804 2927 4589.
- Iwata, Seizi. *English Resultatives: A Force-Recipient Account*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. xx + 549. €99 ISBN 9 7890 2720 4912.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. *The Phonology of English as an International Language: New Models, New Norms, New Goals*. OUP. [2000] pp. 258. pb €69.15 ISBN 9 7801 9442 1645.
- Jonsson, Ewa, and Tove Larsson, eds. *Voices Past and Present: Studies of Involved, Speech-Related and Spoken Texts*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. xiii + 348. €99 ISBN 9 7890 2720 7654, e-book €99 ISBN 9 7890 2726 0642.
- Kagan, Olga. *The Semantics of Case*. CUP. [2020] pp. xiv + 289. €85 ISBN 9 7811 0841 6429.
- Katz, Seth. *American English Grammar: An Introduction*. Routledge. [2020] pp. vi + 320. hb £120 ISBN 9 7803 6721 9352, pb £34.99 ISBN 9 7803 6721 9406, e-book £31.49 ISBN 9 7804 2926 8885.
- Kiaer, Jieun. *Delicious Words: East Asian Food Words in English*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xi + 143. £44.99 ISBN 9 7803 6733 7704.
- Kim, Jong-Bok, and Laura A. Michaelis. *Syntactic Constructions in English*. CUP. [2020] pp. xii + 356. hb £79.99 ISBN 9 7811 0847 0339, pb £ 26.99 ISBN 9 7811 0845 5862.

- Kokkos, Alexis, ed. *Expanding Transformation Theory: Affinities Between Jack Mezirow and Emancipatory Educationalists*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xvii + 234. hb £120 ISBN 9 7813 5103 8300, pb £36.99 ISBN 9 7810 3223 7503, e-book £33.29 ISBN 9 7811 3848 9226.
- Konakahara, Mayu, and Keiko Tsuchiya, eds. *English as a Lingua Franca in Japan: Towards Multilingual Practices*. Palgrave. [2020] pp. xxvi + 358. hb £109 ISBN 9 7830 3033 2877, pb £79.99 ISBN 9 7830 3033 2907, e-book £63.99 ISBN 9 7830 3033 2884.
- Körtvélyessy, Lívía, Alexandra Bagasheva, and Pavol Štekauer, eds. *Derivational Networks Across Languages*. MGruter. [2020] pp. xi + 610. €119.95 ISBN 9 7831 1068 6494.
- Kytö, Merja, and Erik Smitterberg, eds. *Late Modern English: Novel Encounters*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. vii + 359. €99 ISBN 9 7890 2720 5087.
- Landman, Fred. *Iceberg Semantics for Mass Nouns and Count Nouns: A New Framework for Boolean Semantics*. Springer. [2020] xiii + 381. hb €96.29 ISBN 9 7830 3042 7108, pb €69.54 ISBN 9 7830 3042 7139.
- Lange, Claudia, and Sven Leuckert. *Corpus Linguistics for World Englishes: A Guide for Research*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xv + 236. hb £96 ISBN 9 7811 3859 3411, pb £27.99 ISBN 9 7811 3859 3459, e-book £27.99 ISBN 9 7804 2948 9433.
- Le, Van Canh, Hoa Thi Mai Nguyen, Thi Thuy Minh Nguyen, and Roger Barnard, eds. *Building Teacher Capacity in English Language Teaching in Vietnam*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xxii + 224. hb £96.00 ISBN 9 7811 3831 3866, pb £29.59 ISBN 9 7810 3209 0672, e-book £29.59 ISBN 9 7804 2945 7371.
- Lintunen, Pekka, Maarit Mutta, and Pauliina Peltonen, eds. *Fluency in L2 Learning and Use*. MIMBr. [2020] pp. 216. hb £99.95 ISBN 9 7817 8892 6300, pb £29.95 ISBN 9 7817 8892 6294, e-book (pdf) £20 ISBN 9 7817 8892 6317, e-book (epub) £20 ISBN 9 7817 8892 6324.
- Mackelberghe, Charlotte. *The Present-Day English Gerund System: A Cognitive-Constructionist Account*. MGruter. [2020] pp. ix + 276. €99.95 ISBN 9 7831 1068 6500.
- Maguire, Warren. *Language and Dialect Contact in Ireland: The Phonological Origins of Mid-Ulster English*. EdinUP. [2020] pp. x + 206. £75 ISBN 9 7814 7445 2908, e-book £75 ISBN 9 7814 7445 2939.
- Martín, Guardado R., and Piotr Romanowski, eds. *The Many Faces of Multilingualism: Language Status, Learning and Use Across Contexts*. MGruter. [2020] pp. xii + 234. £91 ISBN 9 7815 0151 8607, e-book £91 ISBN 9 7815 0151 4692.
- Mason, Marianne, and Frances Rock, eds. *The Discourse of Police Interviews*. UChicP. [2020] pp. 336. hb \$120 ISBN 9 7802 2664 7654, pb \$40 ISBN 9 7802 2664 7791, e-book \$39.99 ISBN 9 7802 2664 7821.
- Matras, Yaron. *Language Contact*. 2nd edn. CUP. [2020] pp. xx + 410. hb £84.99 ISBN 9 7811 0842 5117, pb £29.99 ISBN 9 7811 0844 0080.
- McColl Millar, Robert. *A Sociolinguistic History of Scotland*. EdinUP. [2020] pp. xiii + 252. £80 ISBN 9 7814 7444 8543, e-book £19.95 ISBN 9 7814 7444 8574.

- McIntosh, Janet, and Norma Mendoza-Denton, eds. *Language in the Trump Era: Scandals and Emergencies*. CUP. [2020] pp. xx + 302. hb £59.99 ISBN 9 7811 0884 1146, pb £19.99 ISBN 9 7811 0874 5031.
- McMahon, April. *An Introduction to English Phonology*. 2nd edn. EdinUP. [2020] pp. xiv + 194. hb £95 ISBN 9 7814 7446 3683, pb £19.99 ISBN 9 7814 7446 3690, e-book £95 ISBN 9 7814 7446 3706.
- Mel'čuk, Igor, and Jasmina Milićević. *An Advanced Introduction to Semantics: A Meaning-Text Approach*. CUP. [2020] pp. xxvi + 421. hb £89.99 ISBN 9 7811 0848 1625, pb £29.99 ISBN 9 7811 0872 3046.
- Moessner, Lilo. *The History of the Present English Subjunctive: A Corpus-Based Study of Mood and Modality*. EdinUP. [2020] pp. xx + 271. £90 ISBN 9 7814 7443 7998.
- Mühlhäusler, Peter. *Pitkern-Norf'k: The Language of Pitcairn Island and Norfolk Island*. McGruyter. [2020] pp. xx + 416. €99.95 ISBN 9 7815 0151 0465, e-book €99.95 ISBN 9 7815 0150 1418.
- Núñez-Pertero, Paloma, María José López-Couso, Belén Méndez-Naya, and Javier Pérez-Guerra, eds. *Crossing Linguistic Boundaries: Systemic, Synchronic and Diachronic Variation in English*. Bloomsbury. [2020] pp. xiv + 269. hb £100 ISBN 9 7813 5005 3854, pb £28.99 ISBN 9 7813 5026 7459.
- Ockey, Gary J., and Brent A. Green, eds. *Another Generation of Fundamental Considerations in Language Assessment: A Festschrift in Honor of Lyle F. Bachman*. Springer. [2020] pp. xxiv + 256. hb £109.99 ISBN 9 7898 1158 9515, pb £89.99 ISBN 9 7898 1158 9546, e-book £87.50 ISBN 9 7898 1158 9522.
- O'Dwyer, Fergus. *Linguistic Variation and Social Practices of Normative Masculinity: Authority and Multifunctional Humour in a Dublin Sports Club*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xvi + 242. £120 ISBN 9 7802 6785 6472, e-book £36.99 ISBN 9 7810 0301 4140.
- Ogilvie, Sarah, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to English Dictionaries*. CUP. [2020] pp. xxvii + 345. hb £70 ISBN 9 7811 0842 8903, pb £22.99 ISBN 9 7811 0845 1680.
- Ogilvie, Sarah, and Gabriella Safran, eds. *The Whole World in a Book: Dictionaries in the Nineteenth Century*. OUP. [2020] pp. xxiv + 328. £25.49 ISBN 9 7801 9091 3199.
- O'Sullivan, Joan, ed. *Corpus Linguistics and the Analysis of Sociolinguistic Change: Language Variety and Ideology in Advertising*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xvi + 250. £120 ISBN 9 7811 3855 6881, e-book £36.99 ISBN 9 7814 2935 6827.
- Paraskevas, Cornelia. *Exploring Grammar Through Texts: Reading and Writing the Structure of English*. Routledge [2020] pp. xiii + 206. hb £120 ISBN 9 7803 6756 2267, pb £32.99 ISBN 9 7803 6756 2236.
- Perry Williams, Cara. *Folklinguistics and Social Meaning in Australian English*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xxiii + 192. hb £120 ISBN 9 7803 6702 9333, pb £36.99 ISBN 9 7810 3208 9485, e-book £36.99 ISBN 9 7804 2900 1116.

- Placencia, María Elena, and Zohreh R. Eslami, eds. *Complimenting Behavior and (Self-)Praise across Social Media*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. 315 + xi. €95 ISBN 9 7890 2720 7579, e-book €95 ISBN 9 7890 2726 0727.
- Przewozny, Anne, Cécile Viollain, and Sylvain Navarro, eds. *The Corpus Phonology of English: Multifocal Analyses of Variation*. EdinUP. [2020] pp. xvi + 279. hb £100 ISBN 9 7814 7446 6998, pb £24.99 ISBN 9 7814 7446 7001, e-book £100 ISBN 9 7814 7446 7018.
- Rautionaho, Paula, Arja Nurmi, and Juhani Klemola, eds. *Corpora and the Changing Society: Studies in the Evolution of English*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. xii + 305. €99 ISBN 9 7890 2720 5438, e-book €99 ISBN 9 7890 2726 1311.
- Römer, Ute, Viviana Cortes, and Eric Friginal, eds. *Advances in Corpus-Based Research on Academic Writing: Effects of Discipline, Register, and Writer Expertise*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. vi + 358. € 99 ISBN 9 7890 2720 5063, e-book € 99 ISBN 9 7890 2726 1458.
- Salmon, William. *Negative Inversion, Social Meaning, and Gricean Implicature: A Study across Three Texas Ethnolects*. Mouton. [2020] pp. xiv + 218. €99.95 ISBN 9 7815 0151 9277, e-book €99.95 ISBN 9 7815 0151 2346.
- Schneider, Klaus P., and Elly Ifantidou, eds. *Developmental and Clinical Pragmatics*. MGruter. [2020] pp. xii + 725. €249 ISBN 9 7831 1043 9717, e-book €249 ISBN 9 7831 1043 1056.
- Scholar, Richard. *Émigrés: French Words That Turned English*. PrincetonUP. [2020] pp. x + 256. hb £25 ISBN 9 7806 9119 0327, pb £14.99 ISBN 9 7806 9123 4007.
- Schreier, Daniel, Marianne Hundt, and Edgar W. Schneider, eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes*. CUP. [2020] pp. xxiv + 706. hb £120 ISBN 9 7811 0842 5957, e-book \$124 ISBN 9 7811 0855 5180.
- Segalowitz, Norman. *Cognitive Bases of Second Language Fluency*. Routledge. [2010] pp. 258. hb £120 ISBN 9 7808 0585 6613, pb. £42.99 ISBN 9 7808 0585 6620, e-book £38.69 ISBN 9 7802 0385 1357.
- Setter, Jane. *Your Voice Speaks Volumes: It's Not What You Say but How You Say It*. OUP. [2019] pp. 229. hb £20 ISBN 9 7801 9881 3842, pb £12.99 ISBN 9 7801 9284 3029.
- Smith, Norval, Tonjes Veenstra, and Enoch O. Aboh, eds. *Advances in Contact Linguistics: In Honour of Pieter Muysken*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. ix + 400. €105 ISBN 9 7890 2720 7562, e-book €105 ISBN 9 7890 2726 0734.
- Sommerer, Lotte, and Elena Smirnova, eds. *Nodes and Networks in Diachronic Construction Grammar*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. vi + 355. €99 ISBN 9 7890 2720 5445.
- Staicov, Adina. *Creating Belonging in San Francisco Chinatown's Diasporic Community: Morphosyntactic Aspects of Indexing Ethnic Identity*. PalMac Springer. [2020] pp. xiii + 182. hb £69.99 ISBN 9 7830 3024 9922, pb £49.99 ISBN 9 7830 3024 9953, e-book £39.99 ISBN 9 7830 3024 9939.
- Stanford, James N. *New England English: Large-Scale Acoustic Sociophonetics and Dialectology*. OUP. [2019] pp. xii + 351. \$78 ISBN 9 7801 9062 5658.

- Tenbrink, Thora. *Cognition: Introduction to Cognitive Discourse Analysis*. CUP. [2020] pp. x + 280. hb £74.99 ISBN 9 7811 0842 2666, pb £22.99 ISBN 9 7811 0843 6847, e-book \$23.75 ISBN 9 7811 0853 4185.
- Terauchi, Hajime, Judy Noguchi, and Akira Tajino, eds. *Towards a New Paradigm for English Language Teaching English for Specific Purposes in Asia and Beyond*. Routledge. [2019] pp. 226. hb £120 ISBN 9 7811 3838 9342, pb £36.99 ISBN 9 7810 3208 5579, e-book £33.29 ISBN 9 7804 2942 3963.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Ingrid. *Describing Prescriptivism: Usage Guides and Usage Problems in British and American English*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xiv + 274. £12 ISBN 9 7803 6720 7182, e-book £36.99 ISBN 9 7804 2926 3088.
- Toupin, Fabienne, Sylvain Gatelais, and Ileana Sasu, eds. *Studies in Linguistic Variation and Change 3: Corpus-Based Research in English Syntax and Lexis*. CambridgeSP. [2020] pp. xiv + 179. £58.99 ISBN 9 7815 2754 5373.
- Tusting, Karin, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Ethnography*. Routledge. [2019] pp. 406. £190 ISBN 9 7811 3893 8168, e-book £35.99 ISBN 9 7813 1567 5824.
- Wang, Ying. *Language Ideologies in the Chinese Context: Orientations to English as a Lingua Franca*. MGruyter. [2020] pp. xii + 314. £91 ISBN 9 7815 0151 1684, e-book £91 ISBN 9 7815 0150 3702.
- White, E.J. *You Talkin' to Me? The Unruly History of New York English*. OUP. [2020] pp. x + 296. £14.99 ISBN 9 7801 9065 7215.
- Wiegand, Viola, and Michaela Mahlberg, eds. *Corpus Linguistics, Context and Culture*. MGruyter. [2020] pp. vii + 492. €113.95 ISBN 9 7831 1048 6728.
- Willoughby, Louisa, and Howard Manns, eds. *Australian English Reimagined: Structure, Features and Developments*. Routledge. [2020] pp. xiii + 259. hb £120 ISBN 9 7803 6702 9395, pb £36.99 ISBN 9 7810 3208 5753, e-book £36.99 ISBN 9 7804 2901 9692.
- Winters, Margaret E. *Historical Linguistics: A Cognitive Grammar Introduction*. Benjamins. [2020] pp. xvii + 241. hb €99 ISBN 9 7890 2720 5506, pb €36 ISBN 9 7890 2720 5513, e-book €99 ISBN 9 7890 2726 1236.
- Woods, Rebecca, and Sam Wolfe, eds. *Rethinking Verb Second*. OUP. [2020] pp. xxii + 956. £132.50 ISBN 9 7801 9884 4303.