Review: The Evolution of Englishes: The Dynamic Model and Beyond

SUMMARY

The edited volume “The Evolution of Englishes: The Dynamic Model and beyond” is a “birthday present” dedicated to the scholarly contribution of Edgar W. Schneider, specifically his Dynamic Model (Schneider 2007). It is comprised of 27 chapters, each concerned with an aspect of the English language that pays tribute to Edgar W. Schneider’s extensive body of research.

The volume starts with two prefaces, one from the series editor and one from the editors themselves, to honour the commitment and achievements of this distinguished scholar as a teacher, supervisor, scholar, globetrotter, and a local ‘Regensburger’. In the introductory section, the editors of the volume highlight the usefulness of Schneider’s Model in contrast with previous models, and offer a detailed summary of the model.

Part I – called The Dynamic Model – situates various sociolinguistic realities within the Dynamic Model, discusses implications and adaptations, and proposes addendums and potential modifications to the model.

Bertus van Rooy in his study “Convergence and endonormativity at Phase 4 of the Dynamic Model” argues that multiple contact settings as exemplified by English in South Africa and America may not necessarily lead to one homogenous variety as posited in Schneider’s Model, but could result in different Postcolonial Englishes (PCE) within the same country. He thus calls for a separation of the processes that lead to endonormativity and those that lead to homogeneity in Phase 4 of the Model.

Also focusing on South African English, Susan Coetzee-Van Rooy’s contribution “The identity issue in bi- and multilingual repertoires in South Africa: Implications for Schneider’s Dynamic Model” adds to the discussion of situating South African English in Schneider’s Model. Using findings from questionnaires and interviews she mainly argues that South African English will probably never progress beyond Phase 3 of the Model since English is not the major identity carrier for identity construction. Rather, multilingualism seems to become a marker of South African identity.

With a similar perspective, Rajend Mesthrie’s paper “The sociophonetic effects of ‘Event X’: Post-apartheid Black South African English in multicultural contact with other South African Englishes” explores the sociophonetic effects of multicultural contact between Black South Africans and Coloured and Indian speakers in South Africa. He argues that, as evidenced by two case studies, some Black South African speakers seem to adopt Indian South African and/or Coloured South African phonetic variants. While his findings thus show that increased post-apartheid contact (after 1994) between the previously segregated sociolinguistic groups might increase diffusion, it will not eventually give rise to a single unified model since the distinctive five varieties of English spoken in South Africa seem to remain largely unaffected by the changes in the sociolinguistic landscape of the past 20 years.
Moving eastwards, Isabel Pefianco Martin’s study “Beyond Nativization? Philippine English in Schneider’s Dynamic Model” elaborates on the linguistic and sociopolitical development of this variety from the phase of Foundation and Stabilization, to Nativization. She demonstrates that despite the fact that Philippine English shows signs of Endonormative Stabilization (Phase 4) – in the creation of dictionaries and grammars and increasing literary creativity – there is still a strong orientation towards American English.

Focusing on Educated Ghanaian English in his paper “Stylistic and sociolinguistic variation in Schneider’s Nativization Phase: T-affrication and relativization in Ghanaian English”, Magnus Huber provides evidence for stylistic and gender-related differentiation in Ghanaian English, despite the fact that such differentiation is theoretically only expected in Phase 5 of the Model. Investigating t-affrication and relativizer choice in data from sociolinguistic interviews and from the Ghanaian and British component of the International Corpus of English (ICE), he proposes that such sociolinguistic variation may be present from very early on in the development of new English varieties.

Pam Peters’ study “Differentiation in Australian English” shows that sociolectal differences in that variety exceed regional ones despite the fact that Australian English can be situated in Phase 5 of Schneider’s Model. Immigrant adstrats seem to contribute little to internal differentiation and are generally assimilated. Aboriginal English, however, is a widely recognized ethnolect, increasingly a carrier of Aboriginal identity, and displays relative homogeneity across the whole country. According to Peters, the greatest degree of differentiation exists thus between the former settler variety and the indigenous strand.

Going beyond Phase 5, Lionel Wee’s contribution “The evolution of Singlish in late modernity: Beyond Phase 5?” explores the sociolinguistic status of Singlish in today’s globalizing world and argues for the inclusion of additional linguistic factors in the last phase of Schneider’s Model, namely linguistic sophistication, migration and commodification. Additionally, the sociolinguistic precepts underlying the model (i.e. our understanding of ‘identity’, ‘community’, etc.) might need to be reconsidered in the light of recent theoretical changes of these concepts in late modernity.

Taking a more theoretical perspective, William A. Kretzschmar, Jr., in his paper “Emergence of “new varieties” in speech as a complex system”, aims to explain the coexistence of different linguistic systems and linguistic variability in regional and social groups by drawing on complex system models. Taking lexical evidence from the Linguistic Atlas of the Middle and South Atlantic States (LAMSAS) survey, he illustrates that speakers of any linguistic system have an extensive variable feature pool at their disposal at all times, ranking the variants according to the success they have in interactions. Kretzschmar thus postulates that linguists should not derive their descriptions based on the top-ranked feature variants when describing new varieties, but instead take the whole complex system into account.

In a similar theoretical spirit, Thomas Hoffmann makes a case for a Construction Grammar approach when analyzing postcolonial varieties. His contribution “The cognitive evolution of Englishes: The role of constructions in the Dynamic Model”
provides a cognitive explanation for the emergence of structural innovations in the lexicon-syntax interface in the phase of Nativization. He illustrates that these innovations take place on the meso-constructional level, i.e. in partly schematic, partly substantive (one form-one meaning) structures, whereby new syntagmatic combinations emerge. Analyzing comparative correlates in 12 ICE-corpora, Hoffmann demonstrates that less-advanced varieties exhibit far more meso-constructions, whereas more advanced varieties, such as British English, have a greater share of macro-constructions (completely schematic). Thus, the evolutionary status of postcolonial varieties of English can be correlated with the abstractness of constructional representations (p. 176).

Moving on to “learner Englishes”, Sarah Buschfeld in her study entitled “English in Cyprus and Namibia: A critical approach to taxonomies and models of World Englishes and Second Language Acquisition research” sketches the political and sociolinguistic background of English in Cyprus and in Namibia. She shows how these varieties can be identified as evolutionary in Schneider’s Model despite the lack of a colonizing power, and proposes some necessary modifications to the model in order to account for the missing settler strand. Hence, it is not necessary for a full-fledged variety to have come from a colonial past since extra-territorial (e.g. Internet) and intra-terrestrial (e.g. language policy) forces trigger mechanisms comparable to those in postcolonial varieties.

Similarly, Alexander Kautzsch’s contribution “English in Germany: Spreading bilingualism, retreating exonormative orientation and incipient nativization?” demonstrates the usefulness of the model for the categorization of Englishes spoken in non-postcolonial settings. Drawing on the checklist from Buschfeld (2013) and adopting the same modifications to Schneider’s Model as proposed in her contribution to the volume, he assesses the status of this particular variety of English with regard to bilingualism, exonormative orientation, and nativization, and argues that despite its non-postcolonial past, English in Germany is moving beyond its status of “learner English” due to intra- and extra-territorial forces.

Part II of the volume – “Beyond the Dynamic Model: Empirical and theoretical perspectives on World Englishes” looks beyond the Dynamic Model and contributes to the discussion by considering various other theoretical approaches. It is divided into five focus sections, namely 1) Contributions with a theoretical focus, 2) Cross-varietal contributions, 3) United States, 4) Asia and Africa, and 5) Old varieties, new perspectives.

The first focus section contains theoretical contributions. Daniel Schreier’s study “On cafeterias and new dialects: The role of primary transmitters” calls for a revision and refinement of the feature pool during the process of new dialect formation in PCEs. Based on data from Tristan da Cunha English, he argues for the importance of adult speakers (called primary transmitters) in new-dialect formation processes. Some members of the community are shown to be more influential than others, not because their linguistic features are more widespread but because they spend the most time with the first generation of native speakers (the children).
Christian Mair’s paper “Does money talk, and do languages have price tags? Economic perspectives on English as a global language” offers a fresh perspective on the research on World Englishes. Reviewing several (non-linguistic) publications concerned with English as a global language, Mair illustrates how we could gain important insights into World Englishes if we consider the political-economic nature of language.

In “Language variation and education: A focus on Pakistan”, Ahmar Mahboob presents a three-dimensional model that circumscribes the different strands of research in language variation and places them in relation to each other. He argues that language varies according to “user” (local vs. global), “use” (specialized vs. casual discourse), and “mode” (written vs. spoken), and he exemplifies his approach by exploring Pakistani English language textbooks. He thereby highlights the limitations of students’ linguistic abilities in those educational contexts where the government employs local (here Pakistani English) instead of global variations in English textbooks.

The last paper in this focus section, Stephanie Hackert’s “The evolution of English(es): Notes on the history of an idea” employs a discourse-historical approach and presents the reader with insights into the historical origins and fundamental principles on which research in World Englishes is founded. The reception of evolutionary theory in linguistics has led to classifications of languages according to the degree of civilization of its speakers and to a hierarchization that favours English. With her overview, Hackert illustrates the importance of considering the historical origins to understand contemporary ideologies of language.

The second focus section – “Cross-varietal contributions” – starts with Heinrich Ramisch’s study “At the crossroads of variation studies and corpus linguistics: The analysis of past tense and past participle forms”. Ramisch explores the relationship between the spelling and writing of past tense and past participle forms, using examples from dictionaries and dialectological studies of both British and American English. Based on an additional pilot study with American students, he concludes that the observed differences between spoken and written levels of grammar call for the use of more spoken data to explore variational differences between standard British and American English.

Thomas Biermeier’s contribution “Compounding and suffixation in World Englishes” analyses these two word formation processes in 12 Asian and African varieties of English (ICE-corpora), focusing on frequencies and lexical creativity. His findings exhibit no clear L1-L2 distinction. However, intra-regional diversity in word formation exists: African Englishes, as well as Philippine and Indian Englishes, tend to stick to more conservative types (of word formation) and display a higher token frequency. On the other hand, Singapore and Hong Kong English seem to be more creative in constructing new coinages.

In the third focus section – “United States” – attention is shifted to North America. In “When did Southern American English really begin? Testing Bailey’s hypothesis”, Michael Montgomery, Michael Ellis, and Brandon Cooper explore the development of white Southern American English (SAE) in the 19th century. Using the new Corpus
of American Civil War Letters (CACWL), the authors show that Guy Bailey’s hypothesis, namely that features of SAE diffused rapidly and radically in the last decades of the 19th century, was wrongly inferred due to limitations of his corpus data. Their re-analysis of several grammatical features shows that some of the features had already existed in earlier decades and were not always distinctively Southern American.

Paying tribute to Edgar W. Schneider’s contribution to the study of African American Vernacular English (AAVE), the last two papers of this focus section take a historical perspective on AAVE.

In “The English origins of African American Vernacular English: What Edgar W. Schneider has taught us”, Salikoko S. Mufwene finds arguments for the English origins of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) in the sociolinguistic contact scenario between African slaves and European colonists in the American Southeast. Structural similarities between AAVE and white Southern American English, and subsequently linguistic inheritance from a common ancestor, as well as congruent influences from substrate languages, have been repeatedly highlighted in Edgar W. Schneider’s research (e.g. Schneider 1989; Schneider and Montgomery 2001). Today’s differences between AAVE and other American varieties can be attributed to race segregation and the Great Migration, which – due to the ghettoization of African Americans – has enforced the separation of AAVE speakers from other immigrants in the North.

Ulrich Miethaner’s paper, “Innovation in pre-World War II African American Vernacular English: Evidence from BLUR” tests the “divergence hypothesis” postulated for AAVE, which is said to have diverged significantly from white varieties after World War II. Analyzing data from transcriptions of blues recordings produced by singers/speakers born between the period of Reconstruction and World War II and analyzing the postulated “innovative” features of AAVE, Miethaner provides evidence for the early existence and restructuring of these innovative features, thus countering the claim of “divergence”.

Shifting the focus to Asia and Africa, the next section starts with Andy Kirkpatrick and Sophiaan Subhan’s study “Non-standard or new standards or errors? The use of inflectional marking for present and past tenses in English as an Asian lingua franca”. Taking data from the Asian Corpus of English (ACE) – a corpus of English used as a ‘lingua franca’ between speakers of different L1 languages in Asia –, they analyze the influence of L1 tense marking of Malay speakers on their L2 English variety. The authors demonstrate that the amount of tense marking in the substrate is not an indicator of the same feature in the English they speak. Rather, the level of formality (i.e. register) needs to be considered.

Lisa Lim, in her contribution “Yesterday’s founder population, today’s Englishes: The role of the Peranakans in the (continuing) evolution of Singapore English”, highlights the significant influence of Peranakan English speakers in the highly multilingual and multicultural contact situation that led to the evolution of Singapore English. She thus stresses the importance of recognizing the complex contact scenarios involved in the emergence of new varieties of English.
In “The evolution of Brunei English: How it is contributing to the development of English in the world”, David Deterding situates Brunei English within Schneider’s Model and discusses its status in today’s globalization. By describing salient phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical features of Brunei English, he highlights the similarities between Brunei English and other emerging new varieties, including idiosyncratic features, thus positing this variety in Phase 3 (Nativization) of Schneider’s Model.

In the last paper of this section, Aloysius Ngefac traces the sociolinguistic evolution of Cameroonian Creole based on the different names given to that contact language. In his paper, titled “The evolutionary trajectory of Cameroonian Creole and its varying sociolinguistic statuses”, he argues for the name “Cameroonian Creole” against previous names such as “Pidgin English”, “Neger Englisch”, “Cameroons Creole”, “Cameroonian”, and “Cameroon Pidgin English”. This preferred term reflects the creole properties of the language, highlights the fact that English is not the only lexifier, and emphasizes the national scope of the language.

In the last focus section – “Old varieties, new perspectives” – we move on to more current developments of English in a globalized world.

Roswitha Fischer, in “Lexical institutionalization reconsidered: GUI, cyborg, cred, pay-per-view, techno- and cyber-“, reinvestigates the use of neologisms in the London Guardian from the 1980s to 2012 to postulate a re-evaluation of the institutionalization process as developed in Fischer (1998), thus paying tribute to the complex process of institutionalization, “in which socio-pragmatic, cognitive and structural factors are closely entwined” (p. 467).

Focusing on a more technical vocabulary, Clive Upton, in “The language of butchery, the UK’s last public craft”, explores the etymology and classification of meat terms to show that the use of French- or English-derived terms are selected on a quality-oriented basis, thus calling for more fine-grained terminology in the lexicon. What is more, butchers still employ their own language – back-slang – as a way of interacting and displaying their affiliation with the trade.

In the last paper, “A new Old English? The chances of an Anglo-Saxon revival on the Internet”, Christina Neuland and Florian Schleburg look into the linguistic competence of Old English (OE) article contributors on the Internet. After introducing the array of OE texts found online, and analyzing a selection of entries from OE Wikipedia, they come to the conclusion that the international community of OE users lack the knowledge to revive this language, and that if they ever do, the new OE will be much different from what it used to be.

EVALUATION

The book is a substantial contribution to the body of research dealing with the Dynamic Model. Not only do the studies provide extensive exemplification of the potential of Schneider’s Model, they also point out important elements of the Model in need of modification and stress essential adaptations in order to take the
sociolinguistic reality of specific varieties into account. While the first part of the
volume focuses on different varieties and their classification within Schneider’s
Model and proposes refinements in certain respects, the second part offers exciting
new theoretical approaches and possible extensions of Schneider’s Model. A great
number of the contributions point towards new avenues for research and emphasize
the need to keep in mind “the big picture”. Researchers should not restrict themselves
to one theory/one model but consider all possible ways of extending their perspective
and gaining new insights into the English language system.

The editors have clearly reached their goal in calling this volume a “birthday present”
for Edgar W. Schneider. The studies highlight Edgar Schneider’s broad research
interests and pay homage to his achievements by touching on issues raised in his
work. The papers of the volume thus fit in with research on World Englishes,
variational linguistics in general, studies in English for specific purposes,
sociolinguistics, the history of English, and/or work on processes of language contact
and change. Happy Birthday.
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