

REVIEW

Speaking American: A history of English in the United States Richard W. Bailey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, xviii + 207 pp.

Reviewed by DANIEL R. DAVIS*

In this book, Richard Bailey has produced a narrative with a difference, a fitting culmination of and tribute to his lifelong devotion to the words and ways of the English language and its variant forms, particularly those in North America. Bailey has told not one, but eight stories of the English language in the United States. The following quotation explains his method, ‘But there is no “story” of English, or of any language. Rather, there are many stories, many perspectives, many points of view. And it is the same with language as a whole’ (Crystal 2009: 15, cited (vii)).

The structure of the book illustrates this point: Each chapter deals with one region or city that typifies a development during one fifty-year period in the nation’s history. This is an elegant and fruitful arrangement. In ch. 2 (16–26), ‘Chesapeake Bay, before 1650’, Bailey examines the earliest English-speaking settlements on the Atlantic seaboard, their interaction with indigenous peoples, and the problem of finding an ‘American’ form of English in a colony characterized by small isolated settlements, high mortality, and a paucity of surviving records. He takes the position that these conditions minimize the effects of the founder principle (26; compare Mufwene 2001: 60) and colonial lag (following Dillard 1992: 32–33, 228). Ch. 3 (27–47) ‘Boston 1650–1700’ looks at the speech ways of New England, as evidenced by the letters and court records of a relatively more literate and stable population. Bailey illustrates the multilingual and multidialectal character of the voices present in New England at this time (see Kytö 2004). In ch. 4 (48–71) ‘Charleston 1700–1750’, Bailey traces the influence of varying populations of settlers from Barbados, Boston, and Pennsylvania, noting that the linguistic conservatism and ‘Anglophilia’ of the upper class in Charleston reflected a social and linguistic rift between coastal and inland residents. Ch. 5 (72–97) ‘Philadelphia, 1750–1800’, explores the multilingualism of the mid-Atlantic, with Dutch, Swedish and particularly German settlement populations, and also the linguistic impact of the intellectual activity of Franklin’s chosen city, the third largest in the British Empire in 1750. As in Charleston, evidence of numerous forms of English, including Welsh, Scots Irish, and African American, is provided by advertisements for runaway indentured servants and slaves. Bailey notes that Philadelphia’s power and prestige diminished as a result of the yellow fever epidemic of 1793 and the relocation of state and federal governments, and that for this reason the city cannot be held up as the ‘hearth and origin of English for western America’ (pace MacNeil & Cran 2005: 49).

Ch. 6 (98–120) ‘New Orleans, 1800–1850’ analyzes a society with perhaps the greatest degree of multilingual input in all of the United States, with Native American languages including Choctaw and Mobilian jargon, three different French populations (from France,

*Department of Language, Culture, and Communication, University of Michigan-Dearborn, Dearborn, MI 48128, USA. E-mail: davisdr@umich.edu

Acadia, and Haiti), African American and Caribbean influences from the African diaspora, new world Spanish connections, and German and Irish immigrants. As was the case with the Chesapeake region two centuries earlier, the discontinuity caused by disease, and an absence of standardizing social institutions, precluded the dominance of one social group and the establishment of a single prestige norm. Bailey cites numerous travelers' accounts to paint a sociolinguistic picture of this complexity, and to show the importance of New Orleans as a port of trade for the entire Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio River watersheds until disrupted by the American Civil War (and doubtless the introduction of the railroads). The baton is passed back to the northeast in ch. 7 (121–138) 'New York, 1850–1900'. Bailey uses a number of literary and lexical sources to depict the linguistic creativity of immigrant New York during this period, and the concurrent temptation this creativity brought to bear on the upper class, whose gradual and selective adoption of these new language forms ran counter to the normative potential of their sociolect.

In this set of narratives, it is in ch. 8 (139–161) 'Chicago, 1900–1950', that something approaching a norm for American English emerges. Bailey outlines key components of this as they apply to the Midwestern metropolis: An industrial and commercial powerhouse, labor supplied by immigrants from overseas and from the catchment areas of the Midwest and South, public education featuring the children of these immigrants as teachers, and a complaint tradition authored by the institutional leadership, including editors and academics. This was a fertile field for literary creativity, and Bailey's exposition of literary sources (the lesser known Finley Peter Dunne and George Ade, as well as Ring Lardner, Hamlin Garland, Sherwood Anderson, James T. Farrell, Upton Sinclair, Carl Sandberg, and Langston Hughes) is a tour-de-force. Regional pride in a newly respectable Midwestern identity was one result of this process of urbanization, industrialization, and immigration; xenophobia, aggravated by 20th century political developments including the First World War and the advent of communism, was another. As Bailey (153) says, 'With alarming speed, Americans fastened onto the idea that one language—English—and one kind of English needed to prevail if division were to be avoided.' Bailey's account of Chicago is compelling and provides a useful back-story to the explanation of the prestige norm switch given in Bonfiglio (2002).

In ch. 9 (162–182) 'Los Angeles, 1950–2000', Bailey examines the competing attitudes about American English that would become the basis of the model afforded by Hollywood to the world. These include on the one hand Transatlantic English, influenced by the stage voice tradition in American theatre as well as the British expatriate community in Los Angeles, and on the other the bland and purportedly transparent 'subdialect of Iowa' promoted by Disney. As was the case with publishing in earlier generations, but in a more immediate and compelling way, the film industry could project identities through the language of its characters, and reflect the linguistic attitudes and ideologies of the audience. Drawing on the work of Lippi-Green (1997) and others, Bailey considers the implications that this projection has for a range of ethnic, professional, and subcultural identities, including surfers, Valley girls, and criminal gangs. The question of the norm dissolves, replaced by xenophobia and legislation mandating the use of English. Normative concern for variety has been replaced by normative concern for language. Bailey ends the book with a nod to the technology of the future. The possibilities held by the internet, for the development of language uprooted from local context, are suggested. Bailey feels the only sound answer is to 'wait and see' (183).

These eight narratives make it clear to a popular audience that American English is highly variable and regional in character, and originates in local, multilingual situations. If these speechways can be said to converge on a norm, this happens surprisingly late (as late as the late 19th/early 20th century), and may not hold for long. As with other varieties, it suffers from linguistic schizophrenia (Kachru 1981: 29), veering between Anglophilia on the one hand and linguistic nationalism or Anglophobia (my term, not Bailey's) on the other. Supplemented with the theorization and academic sources provided in Schneider (2006, 2007), Kretzschmar (2010), and Wolfram (2010), Bailey's outstanding primary sources and careful, scholarly interpretation will influence our understanding of American English for a long time to come.

REFERENCES

- Bonfiglio, Thomas Paul. 2002. *Race and the rise of standard American*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Crystal, David. 2009. *Just a phrase: My life in language*. New York: Routledge.
- Dillard, Joey Lee. 1992. *A history of American English*. London and New York: Longman.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1981. American English and other Englishes. In Charles A. Ferguson & Shirley Brice Heath (eds.), *Language in the USA*, 21–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kretzschmar, William A., Jr. 2010. The development of standard American English. In Andy Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes*, 96–112. London: Routledge.
- Kytö, Merja. 2004. The emergence of American English: Evidence from seventeenth-century records in New England. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *Legacies of colonial English: Studies in transported dialects*, 121–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997. *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- MacNeil, Robert, and William Cran. 2005. *Do you speak American?* New York: Nan A. Talese, Doubleday.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2006. English in North America. In Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru, & Cecil L. Nelson (eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes*, 58–73. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfram, Walt. 2010. American English since 1865. In Haruko Momma & Michael Matto (eds.), *A companion to the history of the English language*, 263–73. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

(Received 11 May 2014)

The Anglicization of European lexis. Cristiano Furiassi, Virginia Pulcini and Félix Rodríguez González (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012. ix + 356 pp.

Reviewed by PÄIVI PAHTA*

This volume is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the ways in which English influences the lexicon of other languages in non-Anglophone Europe. The 15 articles are based on papers presented at the seminar *The Anglicization of European Lexis*, held in the 10th International Conference of the European Society for the Study of English in Turin, Italy in August 2010. The volume covers considerable territory: the languages in focus in individual chapters are Armenian, Danish, French, German, Italian, Norwegian, Polish, Serbian and Spanish. In addition, in one article ten other European languages are included in a comparative study. The theme of the volume is a topical, important and controversial

*School of Language, Translation and Literary Studies, University of Tampere, FI-33014 University of Tampere, Finland. E-mail: paivi.pahta@uta.fi

one because of the wide-spread sociolinguistic and cultural implications that the pervasive impact of English has for European languages and societies.

In the introduction, the editors state that their aim in this project was to give strong emphasis to the linguistic description of lexical borrowing in language-contact situations involving English rather than to raise a language-ideological debate about the dominance of English and Anglo-American culture over other languages and cultures. Since Anglicization has become something of a loaded word, a different expression in the title of the volume for describing the process of borrowing from English could have communicated this aim more clearly to the readers from the outset. However, the aim is in fact fulfilled in the studies of the volume quite well. The focus remains on language – on lexical borrowing as a process, on the typology of borrowings, and on methods for studying borrowing. The most important methodological innovations concern the application of corpus methods, which prepare the ground for Big Data approaches in the analysis of various language-contact phenomena, making use of large and complex electronic datasets. Another important step to extend the scope of the field is taken in studies that examine the borrowing of English multi-word units and phraseology, a process that in earlier research has not received as much attention as it deserves.

The studies are organized into three sections, which are preceded by the editors' introduction. The introduction (1–24) presents a very brief overview of the role of English in Europe, probably so familiar to most potential readers of the volume that it is sufficient. The related discussion of earlier research is likewise brief and largely remains within the tradition of Anglicism research. For the benefit of the readers, to help them place the linguistic processes addressed in this volume in a broader research context, some mention could have been made here of large-scale surveys carried out in several European countries concerning the use of English, for example, the surveys of the uses and functions of English in Denmark (Preisler 1999) and Finland (Leppänen et al. 2009), or the cross-national survey carried out in Germany, the Netherlands and France (Berns et al. 2007), not to mention the special Eurobarometer surveys on *Europeans and their Languages* carried out by the European Commission (Special Eurobarometer 386. 2012; see also Pahta & Taavitsainen 2010). However, the introduction raises a number of important questions in research on lexical borrowing, starting with the crucial ontological question of what counts as a lexical borrowing, in this case an Anglicism. The editors discuss various definitions of the term, noting that the answer depends on the aim and scope of the research. They go on to present a tentative, comprehensive typology of lexical borrowing, consisting of direct and indirect borrowings, both with further subtypes that are too detailed to enumerate here but worthwhile for researchers interested in language contact phenomena to consider. The most valuable innovations of the volume – the inclusion of phraseology and the use of corpus-linguistic methods in the study of Anglicisms – each receive separate subsections in the introduction.

The first section contains seven chapters addressing theoretical and methodological issues related to the collection and analysis of Anglicisms. Ian MacKenzie (ch. 1, 27–42) discusses the impact of proficiency on types of borrowing. He predicts that the increasing English fluency in Europe will change borrowing patterns considerably, with a growing extent of Anglicization of everyday language use, 'a decrease in the coining of false Anglicisms as fluent bilinguals are more likely to borrow genuine English words' (39), and a growing number of English words appropriated to new, non-native meanings. In ch. 2 (43–64), Esme Winter-Froemel and Alexander Onysko examine the pragmatic dimension of lexical borrowings using a large corpus of Anglicisms in German. They

propose the distinction between catachrestic and non-catachrestic lexical innovations as a way to distinguish between different types of loans. Marcus Callies, Alexander Onysko and Eva Ogiermann (ch. 3, 65–89) make use of corpora and questionnaires to investigate variation in (grammatical) gender assignment to recent but established English loan words in German. Interestingly, from a methodological perspective, they conclude that different types of data yield different results: variation in gender assignment is higher in the informant data than in the corpus data. In ch. 4 (91–109), Anne-Line Graedler describes the long Norwegian research tradition in this field, and considers the comparability of results from different investigations. Her detailed analysis shows that the diachronic assessment of the volume and growth of the impact of English is not straightforward even within one language when the different studies carried out over the years differ from each other in their design with respect to important variables and data collection principles. In another highly interesting paper, Gisle Andersen (ch. 5, 111–130) discusses the challenges in developing semi-automatic approaches to Anglicism detection, using the web-based Norwegian Newspaper Corpus as his example. In two papers on Slavonic languages, Tvrtko Prčić (ch. 6, 131–148) describes a pioneering lexicographic project which resulted in a dictionary of Anglicisms in Serbian, *Du yu speak anglosrpiski?*, and Anahit Galstyan (ch. 7, 149–166) analyzes the integration of Anglicisms in Armenian. Galstyan's study shows that borrowings from English have undergone graphemic adaptation because of the writing system, but most of them have also been phonetically adapted.

Section 2 consists of five chapters dealing with English-induced phraseology and multi-word units. The first two chapters address phenomena that tend to go unnoticed as Anglicisms for the general language user. In ch. 8 (169–198), Henrik Gottlieb presents a diachronic analysis of morphosyntactic calques in Danish, based on text corpora at five-year intervals from 1990 to 2010. Ramón Martí Solano (ch. 9, 199–215) examines multi-word loan translations and semantic borrowings in French journalist discourse. The advantages of corpus-linguistic approaches are emphasized in the articles by José Oncins-Martínez (ch. 10, 217–238), who analyses newly-coined Anglicisms in Spanish, and by Sabine Fiedler (ch. 11, 239–259), investigating the influence of English on German phraseology. The final chapter of this section, by Agata Rozumko (ch. 12, 261–277), discussing the English influence on Polish proverbial language, emphasizes the cultural impact that borrowing can have on the receiving linguistic community.

The final section focuses on Anglicisms in specialized discourse. In ch. 13 (281–304), Gunnar Bergh and Sölve Ohlander report on the influence of English football lexis on 16 European languages to find out if they are similar or dissimilar in their adoption of football loans. As can be expected, the study shows in an interesting way how, '[d]ue to the complex interplay of a variety of factors, linguistic as well as sociolinguistic and cultural, different language communities have in the past hundred years or so reacted differently to the continuous influx of footballing English, where different strategies, not necessarily constant over time, have been favoured by different languages' (p. 302). The other two chapters in the section deal with Italian. Paola Gaudio (ch. 14, 305–324) examines stages in the incorporation of economics-related Anglicisms in the *Official Journal of the European Union*, while Sabrina Fusari (ch. 15, 325–342) investigates Anglicisms in the media discourse on Alitalia's bailout. Her analysis suggests that often the journalists' lexical choices consisting of new Anglicisms contributed to covering up aspects of Alitalia's crisis rather than clarifying them, deliberately or unconsciously.

The editors have brought together an interesting collection of studies that is useful for scholars in a variety of fields within English studies, including world Englishes, contact and contrastive linguistics, lexicology and lexicography, phraseology, and corpus linguistics. The careful editing does credit to the rich empirical research contained in individual studies. The volume makes a number of important contributions to scholarship in the field: it sheds light on the influence of English on languages that are still often ignored in research in this area, such as Armenian and Serbian; it broadens the scope of research on borrowing to include multi-word units and phraseology; and it shows that corpus-linguistic methods can give new valuable insights into the processes of lexical borrowing and help us trace the continuing strong impact of English on other languages.

REFERENCES

- Berns, Margie, Kees de Bot & Uwe Hasebrink (eds.). 2007. *In the presence of English: Media and the European youth*. Berlin/New York: Springer.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, Anne Pitkänen-Huhta, Tarja Nikula, Samu Kytölä, Timo Törmäkangas, Kari Nissinen, Leila Kääntä, Tiina Räisänen, Mikko Laitinen, Päivi Pahta, Heidi Koskela, Salla Lähdesmäki, & Henna Jousmäki. 2011. National survey on the English language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes. Variation, contacts and change in English (volume 5), Helsinki: VARIENG. <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/05/>. (4 May, 2014).
- Pahta, Päivi, & Irma Taavitsainen. 2010. English in intranational public discourse. In Bernd Kortmann & Johan van der Auwera (eds.), *The languages and linguistics of Europe: A comprehensive guide*, 605–620. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Preisler, Bent. 1999. Functions and forms of English in a European EFL country. In Tony Bex & Richard J. Watts (eds.), *Standard English: The widening debate*, 239–267. London: Routledge.
- Special Eurobarometer 386. 2012. Europeans and their languages. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_386_en.pdf. (4 May, 2014).

(Received 9 May 2014)