

Schneider, Edgar, ed., 1997. *Englishes around the world. Studies in honour of Manfred Görlach*, 2 vols. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Vol. 1, pp vi+320; vol. 2, pp vi+357.

Rezensioniert von Gerhard Leitner, Freie Universität Berlin

A *festschrift* is a collection of papers that reflect the interests of the contributors and the diversity of the research of the scholar who is celebrated by and in that book. A *festschrift* for a scholar of the stature of Manfred Görlach is bound to be more diverse than many, given his interest in English worldwide and historical linguistics. The editor has grouped the contributions around general, comparative themes (vol. I) and large geographic regions. Vol. I deals with the English of the British Isles and North America. Vol. II covers the Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Australia and New Zealand. There are gaps, of course. There are no papers on the South Pacific, none on Europe, except the one by C. Stephan on German students' abilities in identifying English varieties—he reports that NZE and AusE ranked low on the identification scale—and none on the internal diversity of the Antipodes. For these gaps, however sad as they are, the editor cannot be blamed. Given the context of this review, I will focus on those studies that are on or touch upon Australia. K. Hansen and A. Gupta discuss terminological issues that arise when one tries to characterize nations, speakers, functions of language and the linguistic texture of English worldwide. A. Gupta surveys the transplantation, acceptance and functions of English and suggests five types of English-using countries, *viz.* (i) monolingual ancestral English countries, (ii) monolingual contact variety countries, (iii) multilingual scholastic English countries, (iv) multilingual contact variety countries, and (v) multilingual ancestral English countries. They are exemplified (in this order) by Australia, Jamaica, India, Papua New Guinea and South Africa. It may be admissible to cast a wide net, to simplify the complex linguistic situation of a country, to overlook internal heterogeneity, yet it is unclear what application her grid may have. Two papers might have included Australia. J.-M. Gachelin looks at how the progressive and habitual aspects are expressed in non-standard Englishes in many varieties of English. He mentions non-standard Caribbean pidgins and creoles but ignores AusE and NZE. J. Holm *et al.* deal with passive-like constructions and ignores Kriol or Torres Strait creole (and the older pidgins).

Vol. II contains L. Bauer's papers on the Scottish influence on NZE and G. Tulloch's on AusE. Bauer's study, though on NZE, deals with material relevant to AusE, even if Australia had few concentrations of Scottish enclaves (mainly in Victoria). Here is a selection of features that Bauer considers as potentially deriving from ScotE that also occur in AusE; I add some comments where necessary:

- *to want out* 'to want to go out'; also available in varieties of AmE
- the phonetic distinction between *which* and *witch*, which is disappearing fast in both countries and even in BrE
- a front articulation of /u/, which sounds [to a German's ear] like [ü]
- the retention of [h] in *history*, etc.
- the voiceless quality of word-final fricative sounds, as in *bathe*, similar to a process of devoicing in German; that has apparently not been commented upon at all
- the pronunciation of words like *dance* similar to AmE (with a sound like German [ä])
- the negation of sentences with *never* instead of *not*, e.g. 'I never done that'
- the use of *yous(e)* for second person plural
- the use of words like *darg* 'an amount of money for one's daily labour', *littlie* 'small children'

Bauer rightly has some reservations about whether all these features should be seen as ScotE in origin. Some of them do, as I have implied, occur in northern English and AmE, so they could have been taken to NZ and Australia in other ways than by Scottish immigrants. S. Butler is concerned with the selection of South-East Asian words for the *Macquarie dictionary*. She shows that Australian lexicography and AusE have well advanced in carving out an English-language region of their own by defining English as an Asian language that reflects Asian cultures and by locating Australia inside that region. That may well give them a market lead. M. Clyne looks at the problem

of defining national identity in countries that rely on a pluricentric language. He retraces the main tenets of Australia's Labor policies on language and the 'sea-change' in Australia's self-perception. That, he suggests, is correlated with these factors, *viz.* the changed composition of the population; the influence of first generation migrants; and the need for reconciliation with Aboriginal Australians. His comments on the status and functions of BrE, mainstream AusE and ethnic varieties (in Australia) is informative and concludes that (to use my term) mAusE will be the national variety of the future and rest "on a nexus between language and nation and usually also on multiple identity" (1997:296). I leave out his remarks on NZE and on the role of German in Austria and Belgian Dutch. Closely related is G. Turner's paper on AusE as a national language. "To call Australian English a national language", he says (1997:339), "is to notice its double role. On the one hand it is a unifying force, bringing a collection of colonies together as a commonwealth, sinking differences (at least ideally); at the same time it is a distinguishing force, marking Australians off as culturally independent people, not transplanted Englishmen." And it is that function that highlights most the cultural values and the need to come to grips with a multicultural society.

Taking up a related theme, P. Peters and A. Delbridge look at the impact of H.W. Fowler's usage books on AusE, which they divide into *influences in principle* and *influences in detail*. As they aim to study the latter, they select a range of Fowler's topics and compare them with the BrE *Lancaster-Oslo-Bergen* and the *Australian Corpus of English*. Having shown that there are significant departures between the two varieties, only some of which are consistent with Fowler's views, they turn to Australian usage guides. These guides increasingly depart from Fowler's legacy; Fowler fades into oblivion—but, surely, not only in Australia.

These remarks cannot and were not intended to do justice to the *festschrift*, but to show the liveliness of research on features of AusE, its national and international position, and the formative input from the past. One feature cannot go unnoticed, *viz.* the enormous amount of self-praise that is visible in Peters/Delbridge's paper. They comment on *The Cambridge Australian English style guide*, which was authored by P. Peters herself:

"She [P. Peters, GL] had an excellent grounding and achievement in the languages that have contributed most to the history of English... She has long had a fruitful research and teaching interest in the history of English orthography.... so there is no need for her to claim mere amateur status in this genre [of editing, GL]." (1997:315)

We linguists know her achievements, which extend to corpus linguistics and many other fields. But should an academic really write that of herself? We can wait to see her *festschrift*, can't we?