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Preface

This book is intended for undergraduate students throughout the world, whether or not they have English as their first language, use English as their medium of education outside Europe, or are like most of our own students and use English as a foreign or international language. The Englishes of all three types of user are covered within this second edition, which aims to present and describe global variation and change in the vocabulary, grammar, phonology, and pragmatics of English. We also try to set the linguistic variation within its historical and social context. We have aimed to enrich the presentation as much as possible with 'language in use' taken from fiction, popular culture, newspapers, and electronic media.

This second edition comes eight years after the first, and in that period there have been very many publications on World Englishes that have both added to our knowledge of varieties and changed our perceptions of the nature of English in the globalised world. In particular, the notion of English as a Lingua Franca has been greatly developed and clarified. We should acknowledge the use we have made of major handbooks like Kortmann, Schneider et al. (2004; 2008), Kachru, Kachru, and Nelson (2006) and Kirkpatrick (2010a), of complementary textbooks like Jenkins (2003, second edition 2009), Kirkpatrick (2007), and Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008), and of significant theoretical contributions like Schneider (2007).

There have also been real-world developments that have shifted the centre of English somewhat away from first-language users, like the increasing importance of India and China, and the accession of new countries to the EU. The continuing rise of computer-mediated social networking has increased the range of forms of English visible to outsiders and made clear the nature of many of the form features we focus on here as resources to be drawn on rather than features of fixed varieties.

We have extended Chapter 3 with more discussion of lingua-franca English and computer-mediated communication and an introduction of Schneider’s Dynamic Model. There is a new section about smaller communities which use English as their native tongue in Chapter 4. We have extensively re-written Chapter 6 to take greater account of lingua-franca uses, China English, and a potential Euro-English, and added discussion of cross-currents in approaches to English world-wide in Chapter 7. To make the book easier for you to use we have added a glossary of linguistic terms in alphabetical order. Also, to help you progress through the text confidently, we have provided focus questions at the beginning of each section and review questions at the end. Suggested answers to all the review questions are provided online free of charge via www.hodderplus/linguistics/worldenglishes, where you can also hear a range of online recordings of English speakers from different backgrounds.
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Philip Shaw
University of Stockholm
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And certaynly our langage now vsed varyeth ferre from that whiche was vsed and spoken whan I was borne. ... Certaynly it is harde to playse every man by cause of dyuersite & chaunge of langage.

(William Caxton, Preface to Eneydos (1490))

Focus questions
- What is the origin of the English language?
- What language(s) is it most closely related to?

The above view on the state of English, expressed by the legendary printer, editor and translator who introduced printing in England in 1476 and had considerable influence on the emergence of a standard language, might just as well have been voiced by a contemporary observer of the language. The present-day observer might, for example, react to the sentence *Everyone in the street was shocked when they heard the news*, having learnt that *everyone* should be followed by *he/she*, or be utterly confused by the different vowel qualities in accents of English: the word *pen*, as pronounced by a New Zealander, is easily perceived as *pin* by British speakers.

For a deeper understanding of today’s English with its infinite variation, it is, in fact, worthwhile travelling even further back in history than Caxton’s time. In this chapter, we would like to outline the early history of the English language in England, that is from its first appearance up to the emergence of a standard language. About 450, when Britain was largely inhabited by Celtic peoples – the last Roman legions having left some 40 years earlier – fair-sized groups of Germanic settlers began coming into the country, driving the indigenous population into ‘corners’ such as Wales and Cornwall. The invaders, who probably came from Northern Germany and Denmark, represented three main tribes of people known as Angles, Saxons and Jutes. The Angles, from whose name the word English is derived, settled in the north, the Saxons in the south – their name living on in today’s Sussex, Essex and Middlesex – and the Jutes in a small area in the south-east, including Kent and the Isle of Wight. These settlers were later referred to as Anglo-Saxons, and their language, although not documented substantially until about 500 years later, constitutes the roots of English.

On the basis of later evidence and of our knowledge of the mechanisms of language change and diffusion in general, it can be assumed that the distinct groups of settlers produced a dialectally varied language. To some extent this may have been due to differences in the Germanic varieties spoken in their original homelands on
the Continent, but it also reflects the distinct communities formed by the groups in various parts of England. Some of these early ‘tribal’ differences can even be traced in rural dialects today; for example, /f/ and /s/ at the beginning of words or syllables in the standard language correspond to /v/ and /z/ in the south-west of England (cf. 4.1.5.1). ‘Cider from Somerset’ may, for example, be presented as Zider vrom Zummerzet in local advertising. Incidentally, a few of the words featuring this dialectal characteristic have been adopted in the standard language, such as *vixen*, ‘female fox’, and *vat* (related to German *Fass*, Swedish *fat*).

One of the most important reasons for linguistic variation and change is the degree of contact with speakers of other languages or dialects. When Caxton made his observation on the diversity of English, it had already been exposed to and affected by major influence, in particular from Scandinavian languages and French. Curiously, however, contacts with the indigenous Celtic population have not resulted in many borrowings in English. This is indeed something of a mystery, since the native people would have had a more adequate, traditional vocabulary at their disposal to describe and categorise the world around them. Such evidence as there is survives chiefly in place names: river names such as *Thames*, *Avon* and *Wye*, and place-name elements such as *crag*, ‘steep and rugged rock’ and *cumb*, ‘deep valley’ (cf. *Ilfracombe*). Admittedly, there are also Celtic borrowings of another type in English now, such as *weedy*, ‘the water of life’ and *galore*, ‘lots of’, but these are of a much later date. It should also be added that in some parts of Britain, which are, or have been, Celtic strongholds (parts of Scotland, Cornwall), regional dialects of English have fair-sized elements of Celtic in them. A more thorough account, not restricted to vocabulary, of the impact of this substratum, that is, ‘underlying language’, will follow in 4.2–4. However, recent ongoing research suggests that the Celtic influence on English – on all levels of language – has been much more substantial than hitherto believed (cf. Filppula 2008).

In contrast to the limited evidence of Celtic influence on English, that of Latin is certainly pervasive. To begin with, this influence may be explained by the fact that Latin was not the language of conquered people but of a higher civilisation, from which the Anglo-Saxons had a great deal to learn. Some of the early Latin loanwords may actually have been adopted even before the Anglo-Saxons left the Continent. Examples of such early loans are *cheese*, *pepper*, *street*, *pound*, *wall* and *camp*.

With the introduction of Christianity in 597 the Latin influence made itself noticeable in many spheres of life. Firstly, all the words pertaining to the Church were introduced: *altar*, *angel*, *sandal*; also a certain number of words connected with learning and education which reflect another aspect of the Church’s influence: *school*, *master*, *grammatical*. Secondly, many words connected with everyday life such as names of articles of clothing and household utensils were introduced: *sock*, *chest*, *sack*, *cap*, as well as words denoting foods: *hast*, *paer*, *radsh*. Thirdly, new names for trees, plants, and herbs often replaced the Anglo-Saxon words: *pine*, *lily*, *fenul*. The influence of Latin again made itself felt during the Renaissance (around 1500–1650 in Britain), affecting scientific and scholarly writing in particular, and it has remained strong to this day. Obviously, since Classical Latin is no longer a living language, its present-day impact could hardly be viewed as ‘borrowing’; rather, the Latin element has been
integrated into the English system. This integration includes affixes productive in word-formation, such as re-, in-, inter-, -fy (reshuffle, incapacitate, interdisciplinary, ratify).

Towards the end of the eighth century, speakers of English, especially in the north-eastern parts of the British Isles, began to come into contact – of a rather enforced nature – with speakers of yet another language variety, namely the Viking invaders from Denmark and Norway. In spite of the violence and barbarity that characterised many of the invaders and their encounters with the English population, there was a great deal of peaceful settlement and mutual benefit as well. Many individuals became permanent settlers, remaining behind when their ships returned home. With regard to the language contact in particular, it must have been facilitated by the fact that Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse were fairly closely related; both were Germanic languages and shared a common stock of vocabulary. There were, however, marked differences in the grammatical systems. According to some recent theories, Englishmen and Scandinavians can be assumed to have got round certain communication problems by simplifying the language, for example by dropping quite a few inflectional endings. This is, actually, one of the factors that have been brought forward to explain how English developed into the ‘ending-less’ language it is today.

Although not as massive as that of Latin or French, the Scandinavian influence has been substantial and has, characteristically, affected many everyday words which are close to the core of the language. The very pronunciation of the k’s and g’s in the following words, where Old English equivalents would have had fricatives, is a sign of Scandinavian origin: sky, book, which, skirt, kid, give, ogg. Certain common place name elements are Scandinavian, such as -by, -thorpe, and -toft ‘a piece of ground’ (cf. Grimsby, Scunthorpe, Lowestoft). Old Norse has even influenced English pronominal usage, which is quite sensational in terms of patterns of borrowing: the pronouns they, their, them are Scandinavian loans, having replaced Anglo-Saxon forms that had grown too similar to other pronouns to keep them distinct.

In certain dialects spoken in typical ‘Viking areas’, that is basically what was known as the Danelaw, the influence has been particularly marked; in Yorkshire, for example, the following Scandinavian-based words of an everyday character are widely known: lake ‘play’, scurf ‘fist’, lath ‘barn’, teem ‘empty’. Owing to the close relationship between the languages in contact, it can, however, sometimes be quite difficult to determine which words are truly Scandinavian. A case in point is bairn ‘child’, often brought up as an example of a Scandinavian word; yet similar-sounding forms are – or were – found in most Germanic languages. Since the use of bairn tends to be restricted to the northern parts of Britain, it is not unlikely that it has been reinforced by the close contacts with Scandinavia.

In Shetland and Orkney, which were under Scandinavian rule up to 1469, well over 95 per cent of the place names and a substantial part of the vocabulary in the traditional dialects is Scandinavian. A few telling examples of Shetland vocabulary, very much alive today, are: ouker ‘tool for bailing out water’ (cf. Swedish ösaker), plagg for ‘garment’ (cf. Swedish plagg), scarf for ‘cormorant’ (a bird, cf. Swedish skarv), du as a less formal word of address than you.

In 1066 an event occurred which had a greater effect on the English language than
any other in the course of its history, possibly with the exception of the quick spread
and diversification that we are witnessing in this century. The result was that English,
the bane of so many other languages, was itself at risk in the two centuries following
this event, namely the Norman Conquest. During this period, the use of English was
socially restricted; it was not used at court, in church, or in government administra-
tion. Such restriction generally tends to be an indication that a language variety is
endangered. English, however, turned out to be a survivor; although it was seen by
many as a crude peasant language, others grew to view it as a marker of ethnicity and
national identity. It was formally reinstated in 1362, when the king’s speech at the
opening of Parliament was delivered in English. In the same year an Act was passed
making English instead of French the official language of the law courts.

During its heyday in Britain, however, French had an enormous impact on the lin-
guistic repertoire and on the English language itself. As already suggested, it was the
most prestigious language variety. The following is a much-quoted remark made by
the late-thirteenth-century chronicler Robert of Gloucester: ‘Bote a man conne Frens,
me telþ of him lute’ (‘unless a man knows French, people think little of him’).

French was the language of law, administration, business and sophisticated life,
and this is reflected, for example, in the following borrowings, picked from among
the 10,000 that were adopted from the time of the Norman Conquest up to about
1500: judge, cordial, faith, faint, veil. It is interesting that French words were introduced
to denote the meat from certain animals, whereas the names of the animals remained
English: pork from pigs, veal from calves, mutton from sheep, venison from deer. This is
generally explained by the fact that French cooking was seen as superior.

In the period immediately following the conquest, loanwords were from Norman
French rather than from a Parisian standard. Some of these words were borrowed again
in their Parisian French form and came to be used in a slightly different way from
their Norman counterparts – another factor which has enriched the English language.
Examples of such pairs are warrant – guarantee and warden – guardian. It is also worth
pointing out that the French influence on the English language has continued over
the centuries but has been mostly restricted to certain areas, such as etiquette, liter-
ary terminology, fashion and cookery. The influence has also made itself noticeable in
certain grammatical structures and the placement of stress in French-based words such
as canal, hotel, antique.

In addition to borrowings from the sources mentioned so far, English has, in vari-
ous periods, been influenced by many other languages: Dutch/Low German, for exam-
ple with regard to boating terms, High German, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Yiddish,
Hindi and Afrikaans. Since these influences tend to be connected with certain varieties
of English, they are highlighted in Chapter 4, which also deals with the considerable
historically based regional variation in the British Isles, including the special case of
Scots.

Towards the end of the fifteenth century, when English was firmly reinstated as the
language of power and the art of printing began to exercise an influence on the style of
writing, a standard language began to emerge. Earlier, writing had been clearly dialectal
and extremely varied with regard to spelling, vocabulary and grammar. The developing
standard was London-based – in particular, it reflected the language of the prosperous middle-class businessmen who had moved into London from an area north-east of the city. The influential University of Cambridge in that area is also believed to have played an important role here. Not until the eighteenth century, however, were English spelling and grammar codified in a standard form; this happened when the legendary Dr Samuel Johnson published his famous dictionary in 1755. As for a standard of pronunciation, it hardly existed before the latter half of the nineteenth century, when public school usage made a certain southern accent more prestigious than other varieties.

### Review questions

1. Why do you think the Celtic element in English is so limited?
2. Why was it comparatively easy for the English and the descendants of Scandinavians to communicate?
3. In what way did French ‘endanger’ English after the Norman Conquest? Where might English be ‘endangering’ other languages at present?

### Further reading

The spread of English

(Gordon and Deverson New Zealand English and English in New Zealand (1998)).

Focus questions

● Why has English become a global language?
● In what order were the following territories settled from Britain: Australia, Barbados, Canada, Jamaica, New Zealand, South Africa, the USA?
● Many people in Africa use English for some purposes and other languages for others. Why and for what purposes?

This motto is the headline in the introduction to an account of New Zealand English (Gordon and Deverson 1998). It is difficult not to agree with this claim in a global sense; hundreds of millions of people use English every day nearly everywhere in the world; it is, for example, the main language of air-traffic control, international business and academic conferences, technology, diplomacy and sport. 'A massive increase in the number of people learning English has already begun, and it is likely to reach a peak of around 2 billion in the next 10-15 years' (Graddol 2006:14).

By contrast, consider the following statement made about 400 years ago by Richard Mulcaster, a schoolmaster and linguist: 'The English tongue is of small reache, stretching no further than this island of ours, nay not there over all.'

It is typical of the spread of languages over large areas that it is led by military action and the formation of empires. Once the language is known over a wide area it becomes a useful medium of communication and takes on a dynamic of its own, even where the military and political forces behind it have weakened. The conquests of Alexander the Great (356–323 BC) and the subsequent monarchies in Egypt and South-West Asia led to Greek being widely known in the area and becoming an ‘international’ language. The conquests of the Islamic armies 900 years later meant that Arabic became widely known and gradually adopted even as a first language over an area overlapping with that in which Greek had previously played a similar role.

When Mulcaster made his pronouncement, Western imperialism had, in fact, already started and English was embarking on its expansion throughout the world. With the arrival of the sizable groups of settlers in Massachusetts in the early seventeenth century, among them the Pilgrim Fathers in Plymouth, the colonisation of North America really got under way; in 1640 there were 25,000 English speakers in New England alone. Owing to the prosperity of the colonies and the massive immigration throughout the nineteenth century, the population has increased at an explosive rate; today the USA has about 250 million speakers of English as a first language.
At the same time as the USA was settled, that is in the course of the seventeenth century, many Caribbean islands like Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad, as well as parts of Guiana on the mainland, were seized by Britain and settled by landowners, workers and slaves who were or became English-speaking. In 1658 the settler population of Jamaica (from Britain, Ireland and the Americas) was 7,000. The profits from sugar plantations in these territories were the capital on which the later expansion of the British Empire was built. There are about 7.1 million speakers of English and English-based creoles in the Caribbean today.

The story of English in Canada does not really begin until the latter half of the eighteenth century. In 1763, when Canada became a British possession, it had almost no English-speaking settlers. One part of what is now Canada had, however, been English-speaking long before this, namely the British colony of Newfoundland whose traditional dialect has Irish, Scots, and West Country features as well as a distinct flavour of its own. The number of English speakers in ‘Canada proper’ increased rapidly after the end of the American War of Independence, when there was a mass migration of civilian and military refugees, the so-called United Empire Loyalists, who moved from the new United States to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Today Canada has about 20 million speakers of English as a first language (out of a total population of well over 32 million).

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, the first British settlers arrived in Australia and New Zealand. As is well known, a large proportion of the Australian immigrants did not voluntarily move ‘down under’; they were prisoners assigned to the penal colonies in New South Wales because the British jails were overcrowded. This convict system operated from 1788 to 1840 and in all some 110,000 prisoners were transported. The early settlers in New Zealand were not prisoners, however. There was an unofficial early settlement of whalers and not until 1840 was an official colony established, when the British Government signed the Treaty of Waitangi with the Maori chiefs. Today Australia has well over 17 million speakers of English as a first language and New Zealand about 3.5 million.

In South Africa, English was not established until 1806, when Britain invaded the Cape for strategic reasons. Today there are about 3.5 million speakers of English as a first language in South Africa, but it is only one out of 11 official languages.

Most users of English in the British Isles, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Jamaica, Barbados, many other territories in the Caribbean, other islands and island groups such as the Falkland Islands, St Helena, and Tristan da Cunha, as well as a sizeable proportion of the inhabitants of South Africa, are native speakers of English and use it as their first language. Most of these speech communities have set their own standards, which have been codified in dictionaries. They will be presented in detail in Chapter 4, where we follow Kachru (1985:12) in referring to these as ‘the inner circle’ (more details in 3.4.3.1).

British (later US) trading and colonisation also brought English to other areas where there were no large settlements of native English speakers. For example, the Indian subcontinent was first exposed to English in 1600 when the British East India Company was formed, and at the same time the very first contacts were made with west
Africa. By 1800 English was well established in both areas and the subsequent expansion
of the British Empire spread it much more widely. In the postcolonial era English
is used as a second language (ESL) in most of these countries, that is quite widely in
business and government, often officially recognised and used as the medium of teach-
ing. The English used in these areas often differs radically from inner-circle varieties,
and is a characteristic of the local speakers (cf. 3.1). It is hard to say with any precision
how many proficient speakers of English there are in these countries, but the figure of
750 million has been cited (Graddol 2006). India probably has as many as the US at
least, Nigeria and the Philippines may have more than Britain, and there are very many
more in other postcolonial countries around the world. These varieties of English,
especially those with official status, are often referred to as the New Englishes (cf.
however Mufwene 2000:9, who argues that the term 'new English' should apply to all
varieties identifiable as English today, 'since every spoken language is adapted by its
speakers to current communicative needs and contexts'). These varieties will be the
subject matter of Chapter 5, where we use Kachru’s term ‘the outer circle’.

The ‘circles model’ is summarised in Figure 2.1. It was developed by Kachru before the
collapse of the Soviet Union and the rise of the internet. It is basically a classification of
nation-states according to the uses made of English within their frontiers (see 3.4.4.1). It
remains a useful schema for understanding uses of English, but globalisation, migration
and the prevalence of computer-mediated communication among people far apart from one
another physically have changed the nature of interaction in English.

English is used extremely widely today among speakers who have acquired it as a
language for use with foreigners, rather than in their own schools, government bod-
ies and so on. There are probably more such users in this group than in either of the
others. They are often communicating with other non-native users in what are called
English as a Lingua Franca (ELF, not to be confused with EFL = English as a For-
eign Language) situations. Chapter 6 discusses the role of English as an international
language of communication – its use in the ‘expanding circle’ created by globalisation
and the characteristics of the English that is used in them. Distinctive varieties are
developing in this expanding circle, and we discuss the nature and significance of what
The spread of English is called China English (6.4.2) as an example. The massive exposure to and use of English also tends to result in a heavy impact on the first language of its users.

Whereas a number of English varieties fit extremely nicely into one of the three categories, others are characterised by shifting status, for example due to the increasing use of English as the medium of instruction in EFL countries, or tend to be viewed differently in the literature. In particular, the distinction between second and foreign is fuzzy (cf. 3.3); confusingly, the branch of applied linguistics studying the teaching and learning of foreign languages usually refers to this as second language acquisition (SLA).

Not surprisingly, then, the overall statistics for English worldwide appear to be somewhat variable and should be taken with a pinch of salt. Obviously, the EFL category is particularly difficult to pinpoint; it really depends on what level of proficiency a person should have to qualify as a speaker of English. The following figures are quoted from *The Future of English?* (Graddol 1997):

- First-language speakers: 375 million
- Second-language speakers: 375 million
- Foreign-language speakers: 750 million

Numbers and the predominance of foreign-language speakers have increased since that estimate was made, and 'foreign-language' has become inappropriate. In 2006 Graddol suggested that knowledge of English could be becoming universal among educated people:

> The role of education in school is now seen as to provide the generic skills needed to acquire new knowledge and specialist skills in the future; learning how to learn. Literacy in the national language and perhaps the mother tongue where that is different, remains a basic skill, as does numeracy. But information technology – how to use computers and applications such as word processors, spreadsheets and internet browsers – has become just as important in basic education. In globalized economies, English seems to have joined this list of basic skills. Quite simply, its function and place in the curriculum is no longer that of 'foreign language' and this is bringing about profound changes in who is learning English, their motives for learning it and their needs as learners. (Graddol 2006:57)

Whatever source of information we use for our statistics, the figures will be staggering. It is true that Mandarin Chinese and Spanish have more native speakers, but at present they have neither the global sway nor the multi-functional use that characterises English today. It is also true that Latin in its day was widely diffused in its popular or 'vulgar' forms and that Classical Latin was, for many centuries, the language of scientists and scholars in much the same way as English is now; but, for obvious reasons, this cannot be compared with the worldwide spread and the all-pervasive influence of English that has been witnessed in the latter half of the twentieth century and beyond. Nevertheless, Graddol (2006:62) also states that 'English is no longer "the only show in town"', drawing attention to the rising importance of both Mandarin and Spanish.

It is convenient for many learners that English has few grammatical endings and vocabulary derived from both Romance and Germanic roots, but it is particularly
inconvenient that it has a very irrational spelling system. The main reason for the current status of English is not to do with linguistic advantages or disadvantages of this kind; just as the concept of language can be clarified by defining it as ‘a dialect with an army and a navy’, the special position of English in a worldwide perspective must be related to political/economic power and historical coincidence. In other words, the fact that English is now an influential world language is not in any way due to its superiority as a language, but is a result of the activities of its speakers over the centuries. As we have tried to suggest, empires spread languages and the British Empire and the USA have been no exceptions. But as with Greek and Latin, once the language has been spread it is available for those who have learnt it to use for their own purposes.

We are, of course, fully aware of the oppression and suffering caused by colonialism, and to some extent we also sympathise with anxiety felt with regard to cultural imperialism. We do not focus on these issues in this volume because our main driving force in writing this book is enthusiasm for the endless expressivity, variation and changeability of this world language, a language which has grown up and left home and now seems to be a resource worldwide.

Before looking more closely at its many varieties, however, we should clarify our framework for classifying and describing them; this is the purpose of the following chapter.

Review questions
1. Where did most of the early English-speaking settlers in Canada come from?
2. Why might Indian English be called a ‘New English’? Given that it probably dates back to 1800 or so, what objection might be made?
3. Why do estimates of the numbers of people who know English vary so much?
4. Why is English a world language?

Further reading
A dialect is – or – a different way of speaking – from the same place – different areas – they have different accents – yes ... (laughter)

(A London girl interviewed for the BBC radio series Locally Speaking, produced by Brian Redhead and Malcolm Petyt (early 1980s))

Focus questions
- What is the difference between an accent and a dialect?
- In your own English: Do you use the spelling colour or color? Does lawn rhyme with corn? What does pavement mean?
- Why and how are new words formed (coined) in World Englishes?
- What is Standard English?

The main purpose of this chapter is to provide a framework for the presentations of varieties of English around the globe. Throughout the chapter, any examples illustrating terms and concepts are directly related to the subject matter of this book. The first section is devoted to a discussion of the character and possible causes of linguistic variation and change. The following section presents types of variation at various levels of language, setting up the structure for detailed descriptions of individual varieties in Chapters 4–6. Finally, the classification of World Englishes is discussed along several dimensions.

3.1 Linguistic diversity and diffusion

3.1.1 Models and explanations
The diversity of language can, at least to some extent, be accounted for by using models such as ‘language family trees’, suggesting genetic relationships and temporal as well as spatial divergence. Although electronic communication and rapid travel make spatial divergence a somewhat problematic factor in the twenty-first century, it remains essential to understand how we arrived at the present situation. The tree model, a typical expression of nineteenth-century German philology, was essentially adopted by the influential twentieth-century linguist Ferdinand de Saussure as well. He envisages the emergence of ‘dialect splits’ in the following way: a language, originally quite uniform, existing on two isolated islands, will eventually and gradually split into two dialects. This is said to be ‘purely a function of time’, although it obviously also points to spatial causation, for example relative isolation due to physical barriers such as water, forests, and mountains.
The reasons for the development of regional linguistic differences are, however, rather more complex and not completely understood. Whereas the traditional line of thinking described above clarifies a great deal of linguistic diversity, it also fails to account for many phenomena. Why is it, for example, that regional linguistic variation is comparatively limited in Australian English, despite the vastness of the country and the existence of major geographical barriers? Conversely, neighbouring villages in many European countries, including the UK, may have clearly distinctive dialects, to the point of unintelligibility.

The branch of modern linguistics known as sociolinguistics has made great strides towards a more sophisticated understanding of linguistic differentiation. Whereas some features can probably only be explained as independent innovations, others are the results of social rather than purely geographical phenomena: the strong sense of togetherness in certain speech communities and the search for a marked identity; the possibility and frequency of contacts with other groups of people; social mobility; linguistic accommodation; urbanisation. Recent linguistic innovation and spread can, indeed, to a large extent, be ascribed to the last-mentioned phenomenon.

In Chapter 4 we will take a closer look at some linguistic scenarios where urban centres seem to play a crucial role in the diffusion of innovations, such as the impact of London English and the ‘Northern Cities vowel shifts’ in the USA.

In attempting to account for the causes and effects of language change, a distinction is usually made between internal (endogenous) and external (exogenous) explanations, that is ‘whether change is brought about by pressures internal to the linguistic system itself, or whether it is the speakers who can be held responsible, adopting forms from other varieties’ (Foulkes and Docherty 1999:10). Clearly, however, linguistic changes may also be brought about by social factors within the same variety (cf. Hickey 1999, describing the impact of ‘fashionable Dublin’).

### 3.1.2 Some basic concepts: language, dialect, accent

Without further specification, the terms language, dialect and accent have already been used in this book but as the motto at the head of this chapter suggests, they are not so easily defined. Here we discuss these terms and introduce some other concepts that are relevant for our presentation of world Englishes.

The difference between language and dialect is not clear-cut. It is often suggested that languages are autonomous, whereas dialects are heteronomous; in other words, we can say that ‘X is a dialect of language Y’, or ‘Y has the dialects X and Z’, but never ‘Y is a language of dialect X’. There is a great deal of truth in this distinction, but it is contentious in borderline cases such as the status of Scots (4.1.2.2).

The most realistic distinction is probably ‘A language is a dialect with an army and a navy’, as famously formulated by the linguist Max Weinreich, i.e. it is extralinguistic, not based on language itself but on the political situation in the real world. The point is that the names of languages tend to be related to the names of independent political entities, ‘polities’: Danish, for example, is the language spoken in Denmark. Yet this distinction obviously does not apply to English, considering that it is the sole official language of more than 20 nations.
Another difference is said to be that dialects, in contrast with languages, are mutually intelligible. Yet this is not always the case, as exemplified in the following conversation, quoted by the sociolinguist Lesley Milroy (1994:161), where cross-dialectal miscomprehension is due to differences in tense systems:

A: How long are yous here?
B: Till after Easter.
(2.00 seconds pause: A looks puzzled)
C: We came on Sunday.
A: Ah yous are here a while then.
(Contextual note: A is a native of Donegal, Republic of Ireland; B and C are Standard English speakers resident in Ireland.)

It is also true that non-standard dialects are characteristically spoken and do not, like standard languages, have a codified written form, laid down in dictionaries and grammar books (3.4.2.2). Regional/social or nonstandard dialects are, however, frequently reflected in writing, in fiction, though usually restricted to the dialogue, in local publications, in school essays, and in online informal conversational writing (3.2.1.2). It is true that nonstandard written representation can but rarely rely on set grammatical rules or systematic spelling conventions, and therefore tends to be idiosyncratic, incomplete and inconsistent (cf. Taavitsainen and Melchers 1999). In this book, the text samples that are included in Chapters 4 and 5 represent different varieties of Standard English, but we have also included samples of nonstandard language to illustrate characteristic regional/social features.

Dialects are also said to be used only in certain domains, whereas languages show maximal variation or ‘elaboration of function’. This has to do with the situational use of language in a society. The term domain simply stands for ‘a recurring situation type’, ‘a definable context of life in a society’. Typical domains are the school, the family, work, local as well as national administration, the Church and the media. Nonstandard dialects may, for example, be restricted to family life, possibly to work and – marginally – to the school. A vigorous living dialect or language is characterised by use in several domains; loss of a domain is often an indication that the dialect is endangered, as studies of a Scottish Gaelic dialect have shown (Dorian 1981).

In order to avoid the notoriously difficult dialect/language distinction, linguists tend to prefer a more neutral term, namely variety, which covers both concepts and is not clouded through popular usage. This term, as the reader will already have noticed, is generally used in referring to World Englishes.

The difference between dialect and accent can be formulated in a very simple way: accent refers to the pronunciation of a variety and dialect to its grammar and vocabulary. It should, however, be borne in mind that speaking a particular dialect usually implies using a particular variant of pronunciation as well. In particular, this refers to ‘word-based’, ‘nonsystemic’ or lexical-distributional pronunciations (Wells 1982:79), that is those spread over the vocabulary in an unpredictable way. They can usually be explained historically, but will definitely seem nonsystemic if viewed
synchronously. Nor do they show a regularity of correspondence with the standard accent; the lexical items *night*, *fight*, *miss*, *find*, for example, are all pronounced with the /æt/ diphthong in Received Pronunciation (RP), the Standard English English accent, whereas in traditional West Yorkshire speech their vowels are all different: /ni:t/, /fε:t/, /ma:s/ and /fɪnd/.

In an introductory textbook aiming to describe worldwide variation in English, it is obviously not conceivable to include very localised regional dialects or fine social distinctions. Rather, the focus will be on the standard varieties, such as Standard Canadian English, and the various accents associated with them. Whenever regional/social variation is considerable, however, and when it has played a part in the shaping of ‘transported’ Englishes, it will be accounted for. Since regional linguistic diversity is clearly related to a development over time, it is – not surprisingly – above all in the sections on the British Isles that we will have occasion to take a closer look at regional, nonstandard features.

### 3.2 Types of variation in form

If we imagine a large sample of formal written texts and recordings of English (or pieces of conversational writing like Facebook messages) from all over the world, we will find that the published written texts are generally very similar, with almost identical grammar, spelling that varies in a few well-defined areas, and limited variation in lexis. Of course we will find a few formal written texts in other dialects, like this extract from a poem which represents the pronunciation (*gorra* ‘got a’), and lexis (*cannit* ‘can’t’, *bairn* ‘child’) of the Geordie dialect of Newcastle in north-east England:

> A hev gorra bairn
> an a hev gorra wife
> an a cannit see me bairn or wife
> workin in the night


But such texts will be extremely rare, with the majority much more uniform. This reflects the fact that most published written texts are in the same dialect, the one we call Standard English above. On the basis of small variations in spelling, lexis and grammar, we will be able to group these texts into varieties of Standard English.

The spoken texts, and conversational written ones, will vary widely in pronunciation and more widely in orthography, grammar and lexis than the written ones. Spoken and conversational written language is generally less influenced by the formal standard than written. These differences mean that we will be able to divide these texts up into a fairly large number of varieties, with common features within the groups and predictable differences between them. However, we would not expect every speaker to use one and only one variety, because of the effect of context; we know that speakers often use one variety at work and another with their friends, for example. Nor would we expect all the texts in a group to have identical features, even at the same level of formality; we know there is variety ‘inside’ varieties.
Variation in World Englishes can thus be found at all levels of language: spelling, phonetics/phonology, morphology, syntax, the lexicon (vocabulary) and discourse. In the following presentation we give an introduction to this variation and outline our descriptive framework. We begin with the smallest units in writing and speech and end with some aspects of discourse pragmatics.

3.2.1 Spelling

3.2.1.1 Formal spelling

Most formal written texts are produced in codified, standard varieties, where spelling is regulated by authoritative dictionaries. Although varieties of (World) Standard English are generally characterised by great similarity at this level of language, there are some well-known exceptions, such as the British-American diversity, mostly rule-governed as in travelled vs traveled, centre vs center, colour vs color, but also lexical-distributional as in gay vs guy, yer vs you. Most of the American spelling conventions were created by Noah Webster, who in 1789 proposed an ‘American Standard’. It was partly a matter of honour ‘as an independent nation ... to have a system of our own, in language as well as government’ (in Crystal 1995:80).

In some transported Englishes, especially Canadian English, which is generally characterised by conflicting loyalties, that is to Britain vs the USA, there is great variability in spelling and usage varies for regional, social, and political reasons (4.6.3.1). A worldwide survey for a prospective international style guide, *Langscape* (http://www.spellingsociety.org/journals/25/langscape1.php [accessed 4 February 2011]), reports on the language preferences of supraregional reading/writing communities, and on their affiliations to the British/American divide (Peters 2001). McArthur (2001:5) claims that ‘we already have a single print standard for world English, which consists of dual institutions for spelling and punctuation ...’.

As already mentioned, Scots, with its long written tradition, holds a special position, arguably as a language in its own right. (cf. 4.3.2.2). Those who argue that Scots is a language distinct from English claim that it therefore merits a distinct orthography (McClure 1995:41). The exact character of this orthography, however, is subject to endless debate, if not controversy. The most serious attempt to supply a codification and formal recommendation for Scots spelling is the ‘Makars’ Style Sheet’, created in 1947 by a group of writers, but according to McClure (1995:41), ‘... the prospect of an officially-recognized standard orthography for Scots is as remote in 1995 as it was ten years previously ...’. The situation in 2010 is still the same (McClure, personal communication).

Finally, it is worth noting that English-based pidgins and creoles rarely as yet have standardised orthographies (cf. Romaine 1988:111). Broadly speaking, written representations of these varieties are characterised by a wish for closer relationship between spelling and pronunciation than in standard orthographies, for example bi- long for ‘belong’, kwin for ‘queen’ (Tok Pisin, Papua New Guinea). In Jamaica schools teach a standard orthography for ‘patwa’ or Jamaican Creole as a route into standard English. Children learn the spellings joj and choch before judge and church, for example.
3.2.1.2 Spelling in informal conversational writing

We have to distinguish sharply between formal texts and conversational written ones, often in computer-mediated communication. In conversational written texts differences of style can be marked by differences of spelling convention, so that an informal style is marked by nonstandard spelling as well as features of nonstandard grammar. The various types of nonstandard spelling can be classified as follows:

1. number/letter rebus (2B or not 2B, c u l8r m8)
2. clipping (HAVE = hav, FRIDAY = fri)
3. abbreviation (GOOD = gd, FROM = frm)
4. initialisms (btw, lol)
5. expressive respelling: orally (llooong), or merely visually (luvvvv) iconic
6. representation of colloquial spoken forms (BEING = b covenant, THE = da)
7. regularisation of irregular spelling (NIGHT = nite, yte, BECAUSE = coz, cuz)

Several of these are interesting in the present context because they allow local pronunciations to appear. While da, somehow representing a fashionable Afro-American pronunciation, is common everywhere as a spelling for the, de is particularly common in texts originating from Ireland as a representation of an Irish pronunciation. The spellings wut and cuz for what and (be)cause are common in US texts, while wot and coz are more common in those from England.

3.2.2 Phonetics/phonology

This level of language is the most distinctive in the characterisation of varieties of English; in fact, the distinction and divergence in English accents appears to be increasing continuously, whereas at other levels, such as syntax, varieties are rather converging (Trudgill 1998b).

We assume that you are familiar with basic phonetics such as the speech organs, the difference between vowels and consonants (including the concept of approximants), the general classification and description of speech sounds and some aspects of prosody such as the structure of the syllable and forms and function of intonation. Similarly, you are expected to be familiar with the elements of phonology, especially the concept of phoneme. If you feel a need to brush up on any of these topics, you are referred to one of the standard textbooks (Davenport and Hannahs 2011, Cruttenden 2008, Ladefoged and Johnson 2010, Roach 2009). We have included the latest IPA (International Phonetics Association) chart see page viii, but have tried to avoid using extremely narrow phonetic transcription with an array of diacritics. If an accent of English is characterised by very special phonetic realisations, this will usually be described in words rather than by adding a number of additional symbols. As is customary, // is used to indicate phonemic transcriptions, whereas [] is used for allophonic transcriptions (cf. the description of the /au/ phoneme in RP and Australian English below) and occasionally also for impressionistic notation without relying on phonological analysis. Any symbols (letters) enclosed in <> refer to spelling, not pronunciation.
Below, we also list and exemplify a few terms that are often used in the book but may not be familiar to you if your phonetic training has been exclusively based on Received Pronunciation (RP) or General American (GA):

**glottal**: a sound produced in the larynx, due to the closure or narrowing of the glottis, as in the initial consonant [h] of *happy* and in the *glottal stop* [ʔ], which is stereotypically connected with London *Cockney* but actually found in various accents around the English-speaking world.

**retroflex**: a position slightly further back than alveolar, with the tip of the tongue bent or ‘curled’ backwards, as generally in *r*’s produced by Americans and speakers from England’s West Country (the south-west).

**tapped**: refers to consonants that are related to trills: the difference is that the movement is momentary; there is only one beat (tap), which is usually produced by the tip of the tongue. A tapped /t/ which is represented as [ɾ] and sounds almost like a [d] is common in some accents of British English, especially between vowels, as in very, hurry. This sound is also characteristic of most varieties of American English, but then as a realisation of *intervocalic* /t/, as in city, latter.

**trilled** *(rolled)*: refers to certain types of /r/ and stands for the rapid, repeated tapping of one speech organ against another. It is something of a stereotype that front trills – in which the tip of the tongue is used – are characteristic of Scottish English (cf. 4.3.3.2). According to Catford (1994:70), the *apico-alveolar* trill [ɾ] is *... a type of r traditionally used by stage Scotsmen*.

**uvular**: the back of the tongue against the uvula. Unlike many European languages, English does not generally have uvular, ‘back’ /r/, but there is a recessive pocket in north-east England where it can still be heard under the name of the ‘Northumbrian Burr’, and some Scottish speakers use it variably, as for example in the recording of the Glasgow speaker.

**wide**: a term used about diphthongs that are characterised by a relatively long distance from the starting-point to the finishing-point. Some Broad Australian diphthongs, for example, are typically wider than their correspondences in the reference accent (RP) as in [set] rather than [si:] for say (cf. 4.7.2.3).

In comparing accents of English around the globe, we should consider the **phonemic inventory**, that is the set-up of distinctive units, as well as the phonetic output, that is the various **allophones**. The average listener will no doubt find the most striking differences in the actual output; variation in vowel quality, in particular, is enormous. Two accents, such as RP and General Australian English, may have exactly the same number of distinctive units (phonemes), and yet sound very different indeed. Both accents, for example, have an /æ/ phoneme, as in *palm, father*, which is realised as [a:] in RP but as a front [æ] by most Australian speakers. To take another example: the minimal pair *bid/bad* will apply to all native-speaker varieties of English, but the actual contrastive sounds vary drastically in quality: in New Zealand English they approximate to *hid/heid* as pronounced by an RP speaker. Not surprisingly, such differences will
lead to cross-dialectal misunderstandings, such as the unfortunate pronunciation of Shetland as [ʃɪ’tænd] by a New Zealand visitor to the islands.

There are, however, also important differences among World Englishes with regard to the phonemic inventory. Comparing RP and the somewhat constructed ‘average’ accent General American, which may be referred to as the two reference accents, we find that the vowel systems differ quite substantially. The most striking difference is that American English has fewer diphthongs, generally lacking centring ones and having a monophthong in words such as go. Scottish English has even fewer diphthongs and African as well as Caribbean English varieties tend to have restricted vowel systems with many mergers.

We wish to emphasise that the only reason for our frequent comparisons made to the reference accents, especially RP, is that they are well defined and, above all, generally well known to students of English. In using them as yardsticks we are neither saying that they are superior to other accents, nor that they are the original sources from which all other accents have developed.

A very useful and widely quoted attempt at a worldwide classification of English accents was made by Trudgill and Hannah for their pioneering textbook International English, first published in 1982. It should be pointed out that this ‘typology’ relates to fairly standardised, first-language varieties only. The classification identifies four main types of English:

1. ‘English-based’, including English as spoken in England and Wales, but also in South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand
2. ‘American-based’, including English as spoken in the USA and Canada
3. ‘Scottish-based’, including Scotland and Northern Ireland
4. ‘Irish-based’, exclusively found in the Republic of Ireland.

Trudgill and Hannah (2008:10) give 11 criteria distinguishing accents of English and identifying the four types. Some of the most important criteria are:

- the quality of the vowel (/æ/ vs /ɑ/) in words such as bath, half, dance
- the absence (in nonrhotic accents) or presence (in rhotic accents) of /r/ in final position or before a consonant (nonprevocalic /r/), as in lean, work
- the degree of closeness in the front vowels, as in pen, pan
- a front or back vowel in words such as father, part
- absence or presence of contrast in length and vowel quality in word pairs such as cot–caught
- absence or presence of voice in intervocalic /t/, as in later, letter.

Absence of nonrhotic /r/, for example, is characteristic of ‘English-based’ accents, whereas voicing of intervocalic /t/ is found in ‘American-based accents’, and the lack of contrast in cot–caught is typical of Scottish-based accents but also found in Canada.

Wells (1982:181E), setting up a typology for accents of English based exclusively on vowels, suggests virtually the same four types, namely Type I: provincial southern Irish English; interestingly, also valid for Jamaica and Barbados; Type II: RP, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, ’and indeed most accents of England and Wales ‘; Type III: General American and Canada; Type IV: Scotland and Northern Ireland. His two main
factors are systemic differences in the vowel system and the phonological distribution of these vowels, particularly in words such as near and square. As a shortcut in assigning accents to types, the following table is suggested (Wells 1982:183):

1. Does lawn rhyme with corn? | No | Yes | No | No
2. Does mirror rhyme with nearer? | No | No | Yes | No
3. Does good rhyme with mood? | No | No | No | Yes

1–3 exemplify differences in historical phonology. As we have seen earlier, Type II accents are characterised by absence of nonprevocalic /r/; hence lawn rhymes with corn. Type III accents only have undergone a change in which nonsyllabic [ə] disappeared between a vowel and a following /r/, thus making nearer rhyme with mirror and sharing with herring (Wells 1982:244). In Type IV accents, Middle English /u/ and /u:/ have merged. It would appear, then, that Type I accents, having undergone none of these changes, are the most traditional.

In the detailed presentation of accents to follow in Chapters 4 and 5, we will use the framework provided in Wells 1982, that is the so-called ‘standard lexical sets’ which are by now well established in the literature.

Throughout the work, use is made of the concept of standard lexical sets. These enable one to refer concisely to large groups of words which tend to share the same vowel, and to the vowel which they share. They are based on the vowel correspondences which apply between British Received Pronunciation and (a variety of) General American, and make use of keywords intended to be unmistakable, no matter what accent one says them in. Thus ‘the KIT words’ refer to ‘ship, bridge, milk...’; ‘the KIT vowel’ refers to the vowel which these words have (in most accents, /i/); both may just be referred to as KIT (Wells 1982:xviii).

In other words: since the actual phonetic quality of the KIT vowel may vary (in New Zealand English, for example, it approximates to /ə/), ‘the KIT word’ is a much better reference point than ‘the /i/ vowel’.

The 24 standard lexical sets are shown in Table 3.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Keyword</th>
<th>Wells’ examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>ship, sick, bridge, milk, myth, busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>step, neck, edge, shelf, friend, ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>tap, back, badge, scalp, hand, cancel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>stop, sock, dodge, ramp, quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>cup, suck, badge, pulse, trunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ</td>
<td>υ</td>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>put, bush, full, good, look, wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>staff, brass, ask, dance, sample, calf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that the standard lexical sets are exclusively designed to provide a framework for variation in vowels. On the other hand, it is of course true that some sets, such as NEAR and SQUARE, are very much conditioned by consonants in the phonetic environment. Needless to say, our presentation of accents will also include characteristic consonantal features. There is, for example, considerable variation in the quality of /r/ and /l/ and in the realisation of /θ/ and /ð/.

So far, our description of English phonetics/phonology has been restricted to segments, that is individual sounds (vowels, consonants, approximants). All accents are however also characterised by prosodic (suprasegmental) features, which function over longer stretches of speech than phonemes. These include not only stress, rhythm and intonation, but also syllabic and phonotactic structure, that is the specific sequences of sounds that occur in a language.

The most important phonotactic difference among accents of English has, in fact, already been described in connection with the account of typologies, namely the distribution of /r/. Another issue has to do with sequences (clusters) of consonants. In most accents of English, a word or syllable may be initiated by a sequence of three adjacent consonants, but only if the first of these is /s/. A great variety of combinations is found in initial two-consonant clusters, yet all possible combinations are not exploited. The historical initial cluster /kn/ in words such as knee, knock was lost in the
south of England in the late seventeenth century, but can still be heard in varieties of Scots, as in Shetland dialect, where *knee* may be realised as [kni:] or [kən]. The latter exemplifies a common strategy in pronouncing unusual and problematic clusters: the cluster is actually avoided through the insertion of a so-called *epenthetic* vowel. A well-known historical example of this is the name *Canute*, the English version of the Scandinavian name *Knut*.

Epenthetic vowels of this kind are also common in other accents of English, especially second-language and foreign-language varieties, to handle consonant clusters not found in the speaker’s first language; *sakool* for ‘school’ as pronounced by Punjabi speakers (McArthur 1992:376), *sukuru direba* for ‘screw driver’ by Hausa speakers in Africa (Wells 1982:64) and *sutura ku* for ‘strike’ by Japanese speakers. Medial and final clusters may also be avoided by epenthesis, as in Hausa *silk* for ‘silk’ and *crips* for ‘crips’ (produced by EFL speakers from various countries); this strategy is also well known from ‘inner-circle’ varieties, for example Irish English *[fylm]* for ‘film’, *[dabolin]* for ‘Dublin’. Epenthesis is not the only strategy used in avoiding consonant clusters, however. Reduction (deletion) is often found in initial as well as final clusters, as in *[kratʃ]*, *[traŋ]*, *[tfal]* for ‘scratch’, ‘strong’, ‘child’ recorded in Jamaican Creole (cf. 4.11); this is also a characteristic of varieties of African English and of African American Vernacular English (AAVE).

Prosodic features of speech no doubt play an important part in the recognition of individual speakers as well as accents, for example rising tones in statements produced by Northern Irish English speakers, the Welsh ‘lilt’ and the characteristic rhythm perceived in Indian English. Regrettably, a coherent account or typology based on stress, rhythm and intonation is not yet available (but cf. Grabe (2004) for information on a British typology project). The following should therefore be seen as an unpretentious listing of a few prosodic features that in our experience appear to be salient.

A characteristic of Received Pronunciation is the very marked difference between stressed and unstressed syllables, in particular with regard to vowel quality; unstressed syllables are generally reduced to [ə] as in *[kən’sdə]* for ‘consider’, *[ıvəntəri]* for ‘inventory’ (according to Wells (2008), italicised schwa indicates that the vowel may be left out altogether). Whereas unstressed Latin prefixes are largely realised in the same way in General American, medial syllables are not: the American variant of *inventory* is given in Wells 2008 as *[ıvəntəri]*. On the other hand, certain accents in the north of England are characterised by a different rhythmical pattern, giving much more prominence to prefixes. Instrumental analysis of realisations of the word *consider* by RP and Yorkshire speakers showed that the first vowel was more than twice as long in the Yorkshire recordings (Melchers 1972:57).

Conversely, some accents of English surpass RP in having extremely marked stresses to the degree of near-exclusion of unstressed syllables. This is amusingly illustrated in *The Jimmy Carter Dictionary* (Maloney 1977), a popularly written handbook to facilitate the understanding of the president’s southern accent, where *urp* indicates his way of pronouncing *Europe*, and *prezdet* indicates his title. Interestingly, a similar kind of rhythm is found in England’s East Anglia (Wells 1982:641), as illustrated in Dickens’
rendering of East Anglian speech in *David Copperfield*, for example gen’l’m’n, Mas’r, Em’ly (cf. Poussa 1999:3ff.).

Most accents of English as a first language are generally described as stress-timed, i.e. ‘a general rule of English rhythm is that we take an equal amount of time from one stressed syllable to the next’ (Cruttenden 1997:20), whereas Asian and African varieties are said to be syllable-timed, which means that an equal amount of time is taken over each syllable; it follows that much less use is made of reduced syllables (cf. 5.2.2.2). Accents of English also vary a great deal with respect to word stress, both in groups of lexical items, for example words having the suffix -isy, and lexically-distributionally (3.1.2).

There is, of course, also variation in intonation patterns (cf. Grabe 2004 as quoted above). Cruttenden (1997:114, 116) states that the most noticeable variation within British English is the extensive use of rising tones in many northern cities; nowhere in the English-speaking world is the difference in tonal inventory as great as that between RP and Belfast or Liverpool. In addition to the rising tones used routinely in certain regional accents, a particular type of rising statement intonation is increasingly used in what are traditionally falling-tone accents. This phenomenon, known as HRT (high rise terminal), was first observed in young people’s speech in New Zealand and Australia in the 1960s, but is found in many other English-speaking countries, such as the USA, Canada and the UK. Some further information about its possible origin and its social and conversational functions is given in 4.8.1.2.

An excellent literary representation of HRT in US speech is given by Jane Smiley in her campus novel *Moo* (1995):

The undergraduate student approached him as soon as he got off the elevator. “I’m Lyle Karstensen, sir?” he said, and he held out the portfolio he had under his arm. “I’m leaving school? I’m going to work for a year or so and come back? It’s not like I’m flunking out or anything? It’s just so expensive, you know?”

Dr. Cates said, “Is there a problem with your grade?” He pushed the key into the lock of his office.

“No, sir? You gave me an A? See, that was the only A I’ve ever gotten here? Because I really liked your course? So when I was thinking of someone to give these to, I thought of you?”

Finally, a few words should be said about voice quality. This refers to the overall characteristics of speech, including pitch and loudness ranges, which are not only individually but also socially and regionally determined and clearly function as salient features. Voice quality tends to be described in rather vague terms such as ‘harsh’ or ‘loud’. Laver (1980), however, has provided an excellent framework for description, on which Wells (1982:92ff.) bases his claims that a high and wide pitch range is associated with AAVE, whereas a Texan tends to have a low pitch range and a Scottish Highlands accent is characterised by generally low volume. A pioneering sociophonetic study identified a specifically working-class Glaswegian voice quality and found that it is justified to talk about a special ‘Glasgow voice’, since all the speakers in the investigation shared a particular constellation of articulatory settings (Stuart-Smith 1999:215).
3.2.3 Grammar

This section, which deals with morphology and syntax, the two main domains of grammar, is – for various reasons – considerably shorter and less detailed than the previous one. For one thing, we find that students are generally more familiar with the relevant terminology, and our treatment of grammar is quite straightforward and traditional (following Quirk et al. 1985).

More importantly, morphological and syntactic variation – at least among standard varieties of English – is not as striking as phonological variation, nor has it been as thoroughly studied and described. After presenting their typology of English accents (cf. 3.2.2), Trudgill and Hannah (1994:6) write:

Lexically and grammatically, the split between the ‘English’ and ‘American’ types is somewhat neater, with USEng and CanEng being opposed on most counts to the rest of the English-speaking world.

As the following section in this chapter will indicate, and the accounts of ‘inner-circle’ varieties in Chapter 4 will further corroborate, this is indeed very true as regards the lexicon. Considering morphology and syntax, Trudgill and Hannah are also right, yet the differences are few and can often be described as tendencies rather than absolute distinctions. In addition, English English is presently undergoing certain changes that may be attributed to the influence of American English: the use of *hopefully* as a sentence adverbial (*Hopefully, you will find this chapter useful*), the use of *do*-support in constructions such as *Do you have any money?*, and the increasing use of ‘bare’ infinitival complements after *help*, as in *My mum used to help cook the meals for the children instead of help to cook* (cf. Cramley 2001:79). On the other hand, according to Trudgill (1998b:32) there is also some indication that grammatical innovations may be spreading from Britain to the USA, for example the use of *do* in sentences such as *I don’t know if I’m going to the party tonight, but I might do*.

There exists as yet no neat, comprehensive typology of grammatical variation in World Englishes, although the recent large-scale Mouton handbooks (Kortmann et al. (2004), Kortmann et al. (2008)) constitute an important step forward. However, attempts have been made at describing worldwide variation in certain salient features such as *tag questions* (Crystal 1995:299), which may be *variant* as in *You didn’t see him, did you?* or *invariant* as in *You didn’t see him, is it?* (cf. Cramley 2001:79, and 4.2.3.2 and 5.2.3 in this book). Other syntactic and morphological features that are clearly variable and would lend themselves particularly well to typological descriptions are:

- concord with collective nouns (for example the *government/audience is/are*: the plural is used much less frequently in American English than in English English; Australian English has a pattern of its own and so on)
- tense and aspect (the past and perfect tenses, for example, tend to be used differently, as in American English *Did you call her yet?* corresponding to English English *Have you called her yet?* (cf. also the Irish English example quoted in 3.1.2); in a number of varieties around the world the progressive form is used with *stative* verbs, as in Irish English *This is belonging to me*).
• the use of auxiliaries (variation in the use of shall and should with first-person subjects, the development of new auxiliaries such as gotta in certain varieties; cf. also the changing use of do-support described above)
• pronominal usage (there are, for example, two distinct second-person pronouns in some varieties of English, signalling different degrees of formality such as sg. you vs pl. you(’e) in Irish English, also found in some American and Australian English (again, consider the example quoted in 3.1.2))
• irregular verb forms (e.g. the well-known ‘American’ past tenses done (instead of dived) and snuck (instead of sneaked); in nonstandard varieties, variation is particularly striking).

3.2.4 Lexis

3.2.4.1 Processes of lexical differentiation

All varieties of English share the overwhelming majority of their abstract and generalised vocabulary, because it derives from a common body of knowledge and a common set of texts. We will use the term General English for words which are nonlocal in this way. However, it is common experience that the names of some everyday things vary across varieties of English. What the Americans call a closet the British call a built-in wardrobe and what the British and Americans call a cupboard or wardrobe the Indians call an almirah. This variation is usually accommodated in the notion of Standard English – that is Standard English has US, British, Indian and so on variants with some different lexis.

One source of different lexis in present-day varieties is separate inheritance. Two variants may have existed in the norm at the time when the varieties separated and the two varieties may have happened to adopt different items as the unmarked word. This is said to be the origin of the contrast between British autumn and US fall, for example. Similarly, both railroad and railway, sidewalk and pavement were in use in Britain in the nineteenth century and railroad and sidewalk have happened to become the norm in the USA as against railway and pavement in Britain.

The second source of difference in lexis is word-formation (coining) in one or both varieties. There are many different word-formation processes. Perhaps the most common is the simple application of an old word to a new concept. Thus North Americans use the word robben to refer to a different bird from the one called robben in Britain, and a hawker in Singapore and Malaysia is someone who keeps a stall in the market, while a British hawker goes from door to door selling his or her wares (5.2.4).

A particular variant of this is conversion: shift of word class with retention of meaning, as in West African to off – ‘to switch off’.

A new word may be formed by compounding or giving a specialised meaning to a combination of English words. In the USA the compound windshield corresponds to the British form face flannel, or just flannel. West Africans have produced the combination chewing stick for the stick with a chewed end that is used for toothcleaning.

Another intralingual process is derivation, where a new word is created by adding affixes to an old one. When cars acquired noise-reduction devices the suffix -er was
used in Britain to create silencer and in the US to create muffler. In West Africa a chief sits on a stool just as a king sits on a throne, so the words destool and enthronement have been derived by analogy with destool, enthronement. In Australian English, the suffixes -ie and -o are particularly productive (roughie for ‘outsider in a horse race’, arvo ‘afternoon’, smoko ‘a break for smoking’).

The third main source of lexical difference is borrowing. The early US settlers, meeting Cucurbita pepo, borrowed Narragansett Indian aquatasquash and shortened it to squash. Borrowing has been a common way of dealing with new phenomena in newly settled areas – kula, bili, billabong in Australia – and of referring to local institutions where English is a second language – Dalit ‘caste name’, namaskar ‘type of prayer’ in India.

There are various degrees of borrowing: squash exemplifies radical reforming to suit the borrowing language, whereas the borrowings for ‘small/young Cucurbita fruit’ – British courgette from French and US zucchini from Italian – retain more of their source-language form. Borrowed forms are often combined with native ones to make hybrids like Indian English generator-wallah ‘man who supplies generators’. The elements of source language compounds or idioms can be translated literally to produce a loan-translation or calque like West African long legs ‘influence in high places’.

Variety difference often results from a combination of these processes: US English has coined the compound eggplant for the vegetable, but British English has borrowed the word aubergine and Indian and South African English have borrowed brinjal. Similarly the British gave the word marrow a new meaning to refer to the vegetable for which the Americans borrowed squash.

3.2.4.2 Areas of lexical difference and similarity

When it comes to common-core verbs and closed-set items (pronouns, determiners, prepositions, auxiliaries and so on), we make a three-way distinction between non-English, some kind of English, and Standard English. If a type of speech does not share a high proportion of these items with other varieties of English it is not a variety of English.

Many varieties of English differ somewhat from one another in function words. For example, you in US or British Standard corresponds to tu (singular familiar) and you (plural or singular unfamilial) in South Yorkshire or you (singular) and you (plural) in nonstandard Irish and US Southern English. Any significant amount of variation in this area makes the variety a nonstandard English by our definition. Standard varieties do differ slightly in closed-set items (Standard US and EngEng outside vs Scottish outwith, US Eng toward vs EngEng towards and so on), but the main variation is in open-set items like nouns and verbs.

Following Deverson (2000:33), we can use two dimensions to classify variation in lexis: variation of form and variation of meaning. In terms of form, we can distinguish forms which are unique to a particular variety (such as IndE dalit ‘untouchable’) from those which occur in other varieties (such as muffler, which occurs (or used to occur) in both British and American English meaning ‘scarf’ and in US English meaning ‘silencer’). In terms of meaning we can distinguish between meanings which are
unique to a particular culture or area, and those which are lexicalised in several or all varieties. We can subdivide the unique meanings into those which are inherently local, referring to an aspect of local culture, fauna and so on that is unique, and those which are local lexicalizations of concepts which could arise anywhere. We can also subdivide the forms that occur in other varieties by whether they only have their characteristic local meaning, or whether the local meaning coexists with a more widespread one.

Table 3.2 Types of lexical variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Concept is purely local (localism)</th>
<th>Form is only used in this variety</th>
<th>Form has another meaning in other varieties (tautonym)</th>
<th>The meaning of this form in other varieties is also available in this variety</th>
<th>Concept is referred to by another form in other varieties (heteronym)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BONFIRE NIGHT (England)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (if no = KANGAROO)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CRORE (India)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 THUMB TACK (US)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ROBIN (various)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BAR (British-type systems)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (if no = KANGAROO)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BACKBENCHER (India)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CHIPS (various)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 MOB (NZ)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 KANGAROO</td>
<td>yes but known worldwide</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4.2 shows, this gives us nine possible categories, each identified by a keyword, explained below. Lines 1 and 2 contain localisms, that is words whose form and meaning are both unique to a particular variety. Line 3 contains heteronyms, that is local words for generally available concepts. Görlach (1995a) illustrates heteronyms by the pair garbage and rubbish which mean roughly the same thing and are used in different varieties. Lines 4, 5, 6 contain Görlach’s tautonyms, that is, in this context, words which have the same form but different meanings in different varieties, such as bungalow, meaning ‘single-storey house’ in Britain but ‘detached villa’ in East Africa and elsewhere. Lines 7, 8 contain words which are simultaneously heteronyms and tautonyms, such as pavement, which is a tautonym in that it means ‘sidewalk’ in Britain but ‘road surface’ in the US, and a heteronym in that British pavement and US sidewalk.
mean the same thing. Finally, line 9 contains words which fall into none of the above categories but nonetheless have a meaning associated with a particular part of the world or variety. These are words like *apartheid*, formerly associated with South Africa, but known throughout the world by this name.

**Figure 3.1** Tautonymy, as in ROBIN

**Figure 3.2** Heteronymy, as in THUMB TACK

Starting with the exclusively local forms, in line 1 (Figure 3.3 below) we have *foreignisms*: the names of institutions, natural organisms, artefacts and so on, which are unique to the region in question. These are often on a cline from words borrowed from a particular local language and only comprehensible to speakers of that language, via genuinely English words for local referents which are genuinely only known to locals (BONFIRE NIGHT), to General English terms for referents which do not occur everywhere (KANGAROO).

**Figure 3.3** Foreignism, like BONFIRE NIGHT

**Figure 3.4** General English word for a local item, like KANGAROO
Thus *interdining ‘eating with members of a different caste’ is probably only known to speakers of Indian English and presupposes Indian culture. We choose the keyword BONFIRE NIGHT for this group, because the word is only used with reference to a particular British custom (bonfires and fireworks on 5 November) which is only known and discussed in Britain.

The extent to which the word is known outside its ‘home’ depends on how widely the institution, fauna and so on are known. If the referent is widespread or becomes well known, the foreignism becomes simply the General English name for a nonuniversal item or concept (Figure 3.4 above), like *rambutan (tropical fruit), *okehe (tropical hardwood), *sarong (South-East Asian garment) or *sharia (Islamic law). We call such words KANGAROO words, arguing that although *kangaroo refers to an Australian animal, it is the name of this animal in every variety of English. The line between BONFIRE NIGHT words and KANGAROO ones is fine, but important in discussing varieties like China English (6.4.2).

In fact General English often has names for phenomena and institutions outside the geographical regions and cultural domains where being monolingual in English is the norm. Thus the English of anthropology includes terms like *bride price (gifts are given to the bride’s family on marriage, rather than the groom’s, as with a traditional European or Indian *dowry) and *cross-cousin (one’s mother’s brother’s, or father’s sister’s, child of the opposite sex to oneself) which refer to non-European institutions or categories. Several writers on different African Englishes cite *bride price as a foreignism, but it would be more appropriate to regard it as a General English term with an extended range, a KANGAROO word.

In line 2 of Table 3.2 (Figure 3.5 above) there are cases where the unique local word represents a concept which could exist in any variety but has not been lexicalised in all: British (Australian, etc.) *fortnight ‘two weeks’, *stone ‘fourteen pounds, as a measure of weight of humans’, Indian *crore ‘ten million, mainly for money sums’, Yorkshire lake *play as a leisure time activity (as opposed to *play as in *play a game’. We take CRORE as the keyword for such a local lexicalisation.

In line 5 we have one type of heteronym (Figure 3.2), that is, locally different words for generally available concepts. For example, the concept *flea is represented by *fla in General English but by *lep in traditional Yorkshire speech. Similar heteronyms
differentiate dialects in the USA: what is a paper sack in some places is a paper bag in others (4.5). The heteronyms that differentiate varieties worldwide are mostly fairly new. Many refer to physical objects, particularly those that have come into prominence in the last two centuries (Brit drawing pin = US thumb tack) and accordingly we take THUMB TACK as the keyword. As British and other terms are replaced by their American equivalents (older British wireless has been replaced by radio, for example) the number of heteronyms tends to diminish. New technology does not throw up heteronyms to the same extent as railways, roads, motor cars and so on did. However, US cellphone and urban legend vs British mobile phone and urban myth are exceptions to this rule.

In line 4 there are full tautonyms (Figure 3.1) which unambiguously refer to different (local) things in different varieties (ROBIN words). These are not particularly common, and the examples seem to be mostly transfers of species names. An example is North American robin, which refers only to a local species, but is tautonymous with British robin referring to a different species. There is tautonymy here but not heteronymy, since neither bird has a name in the other variety.

In line 5 we have partial tautonyms, where one meaning of a form is shared among varieties while another is exclusively local. Deverson cites New Zealand elder as an example, where the word refers both to the plant it refers to in General English, and to a different local one. The Bar referring to an institution in British-type legal systems is exclusively local (over a large area), while the bar in a pub or hotel is widely shared. These can be called BAR words.

In line 6 there are partial tautonyms where the local meaning could theoretically be used anywhere, like backbencher which in General English means ‘member of the legislature outside the government’, but in Indian English only also means ‘lazy/uncommitted student’, a concept for which (we are arguing) there is, by chance, no lexicalisation in other standard varieties. We will use BACKBENCHEL for type 4.

Line 7 represents words which are both heteronyms and tautonyms (CHIPS words). These are illustrated not only by pavement above but also by potato chip which is tautonymous in that it refers to ‘crisps’ in the US but ‘French fries’ in Britain, and heteronymous as part of the set US potato chip = Brit crisp = older Indian wafers. Similarly elk is tautonymous in that it refers to Alces alces (US/Brit ‘moose’) in Britain but Cervus elaphus/canadensis (Brit ‘red deer’/Canada ‘wapiti’) in the USA, and heteronymous in that C. elaphus/canadensis is called elk in the USA, red deer in Britain and wapiti in Canada.

In line 8 there are partial tautonyms which are also heteronyms. For example darning needle is said to refer not only to a type of needle, as in General English, but also to a (type of) dragon fly in some US varieties, and conversely the concept ‘dragon fly’ is related to the forms dragon fly and darning needle in different varieties. Similarly New Zealand mob refers both (as in General English) to a mob of people and (uniquely in New Zealand) to a flock of sheep. Conversely the concept ‘flock’ is related to the forms mob and flock. We will call these MOB words.

The result of combined tautonymy and heteronymy can be either faster or slower replacement of non-American heteronyms, as these two examples demonstrate:
Table 3.3 Combined heteronymy and tautonymy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UK/Aust:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>front of a car, where the engine usually is</td>
<td>hood</td>
<td>bonnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roof of a convertible, folded down in good weather</td>
<td>soft top</td>
<td>hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this punctuation mark: {}</td>
<td>braces</td>
<td>curly brackets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elastic supports over the shoulders for men’s trousers</td>
<td>suspenders</td>
<td>braces, IrE gaffes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elastic supports round the waist or legs for women’s stockings</td>
<td>garters</td>
<td>suspenders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since both *hoods* appear in a similar context there is scope for confusion, and replacement of British *hood* by *soft top* makes communication more effective. However, the associations of *suspenders* in British English seem, not surprisingly, to have slowed adoption of the US word for BrE *braces*, and the familiarity of BrE *braces* seems to have slowed adoption of the US word for BrE *curly brackets*.

Görlach (1995a) points out that when a variety adopts a heteronym from another it can replace the original form, *as radio* has basically replaced *wireless*, it can become a synonym within the new variety, as *garbage* and *rubbish* seem to have done in many varieties, or the two words can become specialised. British English has adopted formerly US *can* for drinks (*a can of beer/coke*) and metaphorical uses (*canned music*) but kept *tin* for other products (*a tin of beans/must*).

3.2.5 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with language in use: how we use language in particular circumstances to achieve particular ends. It is concerned with appropriacy rather than correctness. Some aspects of pragmatic difference are linguistic, in that a different form is used for a similar purpose across varieties.

Thus it is a common feature of many varieties of English that terms of endearment are used to establish solidarity between strangers in certain circumstances. Assistants in small shops often address customers as *dear* or an equivalent. But there are strict pragmatic rules for who can address who in these terms and varieties differ in the terms used. In Britain terms of endearment can be used from men to women, and vice versa, and among women. In London *dear* and *darling* are heard, all over the North *love*, in Newcastle *pet* and *dear*, and in Devon one can hear *my love*. In small towns in the USA one might hear *buddy* and in Louisiana *cher*.

However, pragmatic differences are cultural or social as well as linguistic. From a male taxi-driver to a male customer in Britain *mate* would establish solidarity, *sir* would establish social distance with respect, and *gimme* would establish social distance without showing respect. In Australia *mate* might be the only possibility. In the US *mate* might be equivalent to *mate* and *sir* might be similar in implication to its British equivalent,
but there would be no equivalent to "squire". Different societies call for different systems of address, different types of politeness and provide different occasions when it is necessary to say something.

3.2.6 A note on the linguistic variable

It goes without saying that our descriptions of individual varieties of English given in the two following chapters will not cover complete grammars or sound systems, let alone vocabularies. For one thing, our scope is limited; but more importantly, it would make the presentation very repetitious and tedious. It follows that we have tried to focus on characteristic features, highlighting the differences between the main varieties, but also social/regional variation within these varieties.

The term linguistic variable, which was originally developed by William Labov (1972) in his pioneering sociolinguistic studies, refers to a feature in which variation has been observed to occur, where that variation can be related to social variables or to other linguistic variables. The feature could be taken from any of the five categories described in this section, but so far most studies have been devoted to phonology and grammar.

Some well-known examples of socially/regionally significant linguistic variables – at least in part of the English-speaking world – are rhoticity, present-tense verb endings and the realisation of -ing. The spelling <–in> for <–ing> is widely used in conversational writing to symbolise informality.

3.3 Variation in historical origin and evolution

Chapter 2 provided an outline of the expansion of English throughout the world, distinguishing between ENL, ESL, EFL and ELF varieties and accounting for Kachru’s much-quoted and illuminating ‘three-circle’ model, which has largely supplied the organisation of this book. As the representation of the model itself with its overlapping circles suggests, it cannot provide a watertight typology; a case in point is the fuzzy distinction between outer- and expanding-circle varieties. It has also been difficult to accommodate the so-called ‘new Englishes’ into the model, considering their very different origins and histories.

A more sophisticated model with particular reference to the character and development of postcolonial varieties has recently been put forward by Schneider (2007).

This ‘dynamic model’, identifying a fundamentally uniform evolutionary process, has been widely accepted and found to apply to most varieties, including inner-circle ones. The following is a brief summary of its content and implications.

Five stages can be identified in the evolution of World Englishes: ‘foundation’, exonormative stabilisation’, nativisation’, endonormative stabilisation’ and ‘differentiation’.

1. ‘Foundation’ simply implies that English is introduced to a new territory by settlers. The foundation stage may operate over an extended period of time. Language contact plays an important role here, between English and indigenous languages as well as between different dialects of English as spoken by the settlers, but borrowings tend to be chiefly lexical, relating to local terms and places (compare for example Aboriginal names in Australia). Identity
construction is also characteristic of this phase, that is on the part of the English-speaking settlers as well as 'the others'.

2. 'exonormative stabilisation' occurs when there is a stable colonial situation and the mother country, for example Britain, sets the linguistic norms, which may result in 'elite bilingualism' among members of the indigenous population. Knowledge of English is seen as an asset; Borrowing is chiefly lexical at this stage as well.

3. 'nativisation' means that ties and allegiance to the mother country are weakening and a new identity is accepted by the settlers. This has major linguistic consequences: the indigenous population tends to stabilise a second-language system that is a kind of synthesis of substrate effects, language learning processes and features adopted from the settlers’ English. A 'complaint tradition' develops, with teachers and others expressing disgust with the local forms of English (compare for example 4.8.2 on perceptions of New Zealand English)

4. 'endonormative stabilisation' is when local norms are gradually accepted and there is a growing national identity embraced by settlers and the indigenous population alike. This is, among other things, evidenced by the codification of the local variety in publications of national dictionaries and the increase in local fictional writing.

5. 'differentiation', finally, implies that the new nation begins to view itself 'in its own right'. It is seen as a composite of regional, social and ethnic groups and increasing dialectal differences may arise.

In our presentation of World Englishes (Chapters 4–6) you will find examples of these five stages, although we have not necessarily spelled them out.

3.4 Dimensions of classification

We have shown above that we can group samples of language by linguistic characteristics: spelling, pronunciation, grammar, lexis and pragmatics. The groups of samples with similar features in these areas would represent varieties like African American Vernacular English (AAVE), Australian, Indian, Jamaican Creole, Nigerian, Singapore, RP + Southern British, Northern US.

These varieties differ in a number of ways other than their linguistic or code features, and this section looks at ways of classifying varieties, their speakers, or the countries in which they are used (Gupta 1997). We try to provide coherent definitions of terms in Global English studies, making clear what is being classified: a language variety, a country, or a speaker for example, and what criteria are used for the classification: sociolinguistic, linguistic, psycholinguistic and so on. The reader will see that the same cake can be cut up many different ways for different purposes.

3.4.1 Varieties, by standardisation

We can now try to group these linguistically defined varieties in informative ways. First of all, we attempt to define more closely what we mean by terms like 'norm' and 'standard'.
3.4.1.1 Norm

We suppose that any community which uses a variety of English has a linguistic norm for its use. That is, we use the term **norm** for the implicit set of rules speakers appear to use for what it is appropriate to say in what grammatical or social context. When we say that Northern Irish English tends to use the base form of the verb with they as subject but the -s form with plural nouns (*the girls does that, they do that* (Milroy and Milroy 1985)) we are describing the norm for Northern Irish English. In terms of the norm of the relevant Northern Ireland community, *the girls does that* is correct and unmarked, and *the girls do that* would be the mark of an outsider (D’Souza 1998).

In practice we will expect the type of agreement we find in an individual Northern Irish speaker to vary both because of the influence of the standard norm, and because speakers do not always conform to the norm. That is, individuals may only intend to follow the standard norm in some situations, for some people, or for some of the time, and even so they may not always manage what they intend (3.4.2). Linguistically the norm thus represents the variety typical of most of the given community in a given situation most of the time. Sociolinguistically it is the variety that signals membership of the group in question in a given situation. The term norm, as we shall use it, implies nothing in terms of acceptance by schools, publishers or social elites.

3.4.1.2 Standards and Standard English

As we have noted above, varieties are often classified by the sociolinguistic criterion of relation to Standard English. As we described in Chapter 1, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries publishers and educationalists defined a set of grammatical and lexical features which they regarded as correct, and the variety characterised by these features later came to be known as Standard English. Since English had, by the nineteenth century, two centres, Standard English came to exist in two varieties: British and US. These were widely different in pronunciation, very close in grammar and characterised by small but noticeable differences in spelling and vocabulary. There were thus two more or less equally valid varieties of Standard English – British Standard and US Standard.

Subsequently there has been a demand for other local standards – Australian, Indian, South African, Nigerian, Jamaican and so on. This has been accommodated by saying that varieties that vary from one another and from British/US Standard English in the way that British and US vary from each other can be counted as standard English, while varieties that vary more are nonstandard (Trudgill and Hannah 2008, 1–4). According to this definition Standard English is a dialect, not an accent, and no particular accent is (in theory) attached to it. A variety of Standard English can have almost any accent, but can only have a very small range of grammatical difference from others. Norfolk dialect or AAVE, which say *I do, he do*, are ‘nonstandard’ (but mainly spoken by natives), while Indian Standard or Nigerian Standard, which say *I do, he does*, are ‘standard’ even though they may not have the ‘typically English’ /θ/ and /ð/ sounds (and are mainly spoken by non-natives).
Three implications are worth emphasising. First, there is no such thing (at present) as a Standard English which is not British or American or Australian and so on. There is no International Standard (yet), in the sense that publishers cannot currently aim at a standard which is not locally bound. Second, the implication of Trudgill and Hannah’s distinction is that one can very well speak some variety of Standard English with a Chinese or Spanish accent. Third, Standard English is only defined by the elite publishers and journalists. It has no official status, and so can change and there can be disagreement about what is now standard and what is not (yet). We shall use ‘Standard’ to refer to a norm which is linguistically within Trudgill’s definition. In a given territory there may therefore be several local norms, not all of which are Standard varieties. Some writers call all these norms ‘standards’ (with a small ‘s’) but we will not do so.

If speakers in a country look to one of the norms in their own society as standard, we can call them endonormative (cf. 3.3). If they look to a norm outside their own country we can call them exonormative. If Nigerians start to appeal to a Nigerian standard rather than a British one, they become more endonormative. In the seventeenth century Scottish people started to look to London rather than Edinburgh for ‘correct language’ and thus became more exonormative (4.1.2.2).

3.4.1.3 Codification and use in writing

There are at least four stages in language standardisation: selection of language conventions, their acceptance by an influential group, their diffusion, and their maintenance by some authoritative institutions. In the first stage, one norm is selected by some powerful group from the various norms existing in a particular area, typically a state. This is based on the prestige of the norm rather than any linguistic feature – standard varieties are usually based on the norm of the capital, the educated classes, the dominant ethnicity and so on. For example, as what was later to be called Standard English started to emerge, initially as a norm for writing in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it was based on the language of the court in London, the London publishers, the social and educational elite at Oxford and Cambridge and so on. As the rules are being formulated, acceptance for them must be sought from influential groups like religious authorities, civil servants, publishers, teachers, the social elite, and in the seventeenth century particularly the royal court. Once they are accepted they are diffused and maintained by agencies like the church, schools and publishing houses. Diffusion is typically accompanied by elaboration of form and function; for example, at the same time as Standard English was developing it took over a great deal of Latin and Greek vocabulary that allowed it to fulfil functions in science, theology and philosophy previously performed by Latin.

At a fairly late stage in the standardisation process codification becomes possible and seen as desirable. In the course of the eighteenth century English grammar books and dictionaries started to be produced defining what they called ‘correct’ usage for both speech and writing. Once the standard norm is codified, prescription becomes possible. ‘Correct’ can now mean ‘according to an abstract principle of correctness’ rather than ‘conforming to an observed norm’. One such principle might be that one
should pronounce words according to their (now standardised) spelling and speak according to the written standard. This meant that the books recommended pronouncing words like *hunting* with /hʌŋ/ according to their spelling rather than /hʌn/ and saying *isn’t* rather than *ain’t* even though most people of all classes said /hʌn/ and *ain’t*.

At some point in the process it becomes possible to condemn people for not following the rules, and social discrimination on a linguistic basis becomes possible.

Many varieties are or were until the twenty-first century (3.2.1.2) little used in writing and there are no prescriptive rules for correct grammar, spelling or vocabulary; correct usage, the norm, is just what people say. Other varieties, like Caribbean Standard English, Indian Standard English or Nigerian Standard English, are at a fairly early stage of standardisation where some selection has taken place and the selected norm is accepted in some quarters, but not yet generally. As Banjo (1991) shows, Nigerian writers have to rely on their intuitions about what educated Nigerians would or would not say. There is a dictionary of Indian English (Nihalani et al. 2006) but its authors state specifically that their list is descriptive, not prescriptive, and they may include usages which are not Indian Standard. Görlich (1995b) shows that provincial Indian newspapers in English include much Indian English grammar which seems to fall outside the definition of the standard based on British and American publishers’ practice. It is possible that the definition of standard needs rewriting to allow more grammatical variation, but the point is that at present it is impossible to say whether a particular usage is part of Indian Standard or not. By contrast, in the codified standards (3.1.2), a writer can check, in authoritative and accepted reference material, whether usages are accepted or not. Although *ain’t* is widespread in spoken usage, it is clearly excluded from Standard English, for example. This codification is not complete, universally accepted or rigid, but it is considerably more complete than that for other norms.

Standard English, as defined by Trudgill and Hannah, allows any pronunciation, and prescriptions on pronunciation are not widely enforced nowadays. However, it is worth noting that the British prestige accent called RP (for Received Pronunciation) is extremely well codified (for foreign-language teaching purposes, among others), and was at one time prescribed for broadcasting and diffused by elocution teachers, as described in Tony Harrison’s poem *Them and Us* (Harrison 1986). The trend over the last 40 years has been to reduce or abandon attempts to standardise English English pronunciation.

### 3.4.1.4 Varieties, by type of prestige

Another sociolinguistic criterion for classifying varieties would be the type of prestige the variety gives its speakers. Here we would need to distinguish between *overt* and *covert prestige* (Labov 1972). Some varieties might give no prestige of any kind, for example perhaps dying traditional rural dialects. Others might be stigmatised and called ‘ugly’ or ‘low-class’ but actually give covert status (make their speakers appear warm, ‘cool’, humorous, masculine or tough). Examples might be Cockney, African American Vernacular English or Jamaican Creole. Third there are standard or near-standard varieties which seem to give both overt and a kind of covert prestige. These
are varieties like Educated Scots, Standard Singapore English, Nigerian Standard English. In their own areas they give their users overt prestige (make them sound educated, powerful, cultured, polite and so on), but at the same time they express loyalty to or solidarity with their own community. Scots, Singaporeans or Nigerians do not want to sound like Englishmen or Americans. Finally there are varieties which give overt prestige worldwide – principally US Standard with a General American accent and British Standard with an RP accent. Because speakers may not wish to identify entirely with one group we will find mixed varieties – particularly in the area of accent, with some pronunciations signalling membership of one group and some of another.

In many societies (Jamaica, Singapore, for example) there is a continuum of speech forms from a local standard, used by educated people on formal occasions, through a range of intermediate forms, to a very nonstandard variety used by uneducated people in informal situations. The terms acrolect, mesolect and basilect can be used for the ‘high’, ‘middle’ and ‘low’ ranges of the continuum in these circumstances. It is often the case that the more informal the situation the more basilectal the speech, so one person may speak mesolect at home and acrolect at work, and another may speak basilect at home and mesolect to the boss.

To sum up this section, we can say that a variety is defined by characteristics of its phonology, morphology, syntax, lexis, semantics and (perhaps) pragmatics. Some varieties have covert prestige and some overt. Varieties which share most features of morphology, syntax and lexis with the varieties used by British and American publishers can be called standard (and they typically have overt prestige). Some standard varieties are codified, that is there are accepted grammars and dictionaries which define them and create a (fairly) clear boundary between standard and nonstandard usage. Other standard varieties are less codified, so that it is more difficult to produce standardised texts in these varieties.

3.4.2 Texts, by degree of standardisation

Standardisation normally is the process of developing a norm into a standard language. But it is worth noticing that many of the texts we encounter, at least in print, have gone through a process of standardisation – editing.

A remarkable development has occurred with the development of computer-mediated and mobile-phone communication. A new dimension of stylistic variation has become available for written communication. Formerly it was typical of spoken language that it varied widely in style, with formal styles in some situations and informal in others, and the possibility of switching style for rhetorical effect, but most writing (with the important exceptions of personal letters and literary forms like the drama and the novel, which represented speech) was relatively formal and often edited. Nowadays, however, there is a large quantity of easily visible conversational writing (3.2.1.2) on social networking sites, on chat sites, in mobile-phone SMS text messages and other media. This writing shows wide stylistic variation, particularly in terms of spelling and lexis, with some texts in formal Standard English and others using some or many of the familiar markers of informal conversational writing, as in C U l8a, m8 innit?.


Editing is the process of going through a text and ensuring that it conforms to a set of prescriptions, often the publisher’s or newspaper’s house style rules backed by the editor’s intuition. Informal conversation and informal conversational writing are not and should not be edited, but when we hear unedited formal spoken language, or see unedited formal writing, we quite often notice lapses. For example, an (Irish) aircraft cabin crew member has been heard to announce your cooperation with these measures are essential if we are to prevent the spread of foot-and-mouth disease. We can assume that the target here was standard agreement, and the failure to hit it was not a result of a different norm, but a ‘lapse’ of some kind.

We meet lapses less often in writing, because books have mostly been edited by publishers’ editors, newspaper articles have been checked by subeditors and in the past letters and circulars had been typed by secretaries. The effect is to eliminate from much of our formal reading most signs of the variability of writers’ codes. This variability may come from other norms — usages associated with regional dialect for example — or from changes in the norm of the standard not yet recognised by the prescriptions, or from lapses. Lapses are often to be seen in unedited notices (cf. also Krishnaswamy and Bürde 1998:75) but the ease of electronic publication means that a good deal of unedited would-be formal written text is publicly available. For example, this is an email circular issued by a British university’s internal security staff:

Dear all

All depts please be aware of sneak thieves / sus characters, now is the time with lots of student activity about that these people are likely to strike, they obviously blend in well, but do act differently. Reports of suspicious youths in student health, description although vague are as follows: — 2 persons (youths) both 17/ish spotty, casual appearance, base ball caps, puffa jackets, trainers, short dark hair one, has curly hair with a possible broken tooth. These guys were seen off by vigilant staff so please be aware.

The availability of email means that the notice has been written out and published in five minutes, instead of going through a process of typing by a professional secretary, duplicating on paper, addressing and so on. A by-product of this technical progress is that the message now emerges as first conceived, without editing to eliminate failures of punctuation, agreement (description ... are presumably influenced by reports) and even morphology (thiefs). There is also some mixture of style (these guys were seen off by vigilant staff so please be aware). The last sentence also shows that the logical connections are of a spoken type.

Such texts are interesting because they show that the standard is artificial in its regularity. The text-standardisation process eliminates most lapses from our reading, making the standard language a more predictable and transparent vehicle of meaning. Edited language has created the illusion that a uniform and well-regulated language code is normal and natural, but conversational writing and unedited formal writing are tending to destroy it. Hence in discussing varieties we have to pay attention to the type of text we are dealing with, the extent to which it has been standardised, and the particular prescriptions that have been applied.
3.4.3 Countries

3.4.3.1 Countries, by domains of English use

We can classify countries by domains of English use, following (and adapting) the well-known three-circle model developed by Kachru (1985) (Chapter 2). Those in which virtually all public and private interaction takes place in English for a majority of the population are what Kachru (1985) calls inner-circle countries: Australia, Canada, Jamaica, the USA, the UK and so on. These countries were either settled predominantly by English-speaking people or settled in such a way that English-speaking people provided a linguistic model, as described in Chapters 1 and 2. In the process local languages, regarded as uncivilised, were eliminated or marginalised, often along with their speakers.

Kachru’s outer circle contains countries in which private interaction typically does not take place in English for the majority, but public interactions in fields like the law, secondary education, national politics and business often use English. These were colonised by Britain (or the USA) without massive settlement or the accompanying destruction of languages and peoples. The result has been countries where English coexists with other languages. Examples are India, Nigeria, Singapore and many other ex-colonial countries (Chapter 5). Notice that the definition used here makes South Africa clearly an outer-circle country, since less than 10 per cent of the population uses English for all purposes, and Canada an inner-circle one, since a majority (about two-thirds) of the inhabitants do so.

In the majority of other countries in the world English is an important school subject and increasingly used for international communication, particularly in science and business (Chapter 6). These countries, in which English is taught as a school subject and used predominantly for interaction with foreigners, are put in the expanding circle by Kachru. But the category covers a wide range from countries like the Scandinavian ones, where English is an everyday presence in the media and even on the street, to Russia and Japan, where actual use of spoken English is a remote and obviously ‘foreign’ phenomenon.

The definition we have given here takes no account of the legal status of the language as official or otherwise, since it appears that there are countries like Kenya where English plays most of the roles typical of the outer circle without being official.

In the current era of globalisation countries or states are relatively less important units and this means that the three-circle model loses some of its relevance. In the 1980s perhaps one could have said that people in inner-circle countries had English as their home language, for intranational use and to a large extent for international use. In outer-circle countries they had English mainly for intranational use, but also for international. In the expanding circle English was mainly for international use. But in the second decade of the present millennium these distinctions are blurred. There are more people in inner-circle countries who do not have English as their home language. There are more people in the outer circle who do have it as such a language, and also English has become more important for these people as an international language because there is more movement and the internet has opened new contacts. And in the
expanding circle there are starting to be intranational uses in education, business and entertainment.

3.4.3.2 Countries, by proportion of efficient speakers of some variety of English

The domains in which English is used are not directly related to the proportion of people who are proficient in English. Kachru’s model says nothing about the amount of individual bilingualism in the countries classified. We could try to classify countries by a demographic criterion: the proportion of speakers with the ability to speak on a range of topics in some variety of English in the population. No reliable or comparable figures could be obtained for such a vague criterion, but it is clear that such a classification would not parallel the three-circle model. In outer-circle India, for example, it is said that only about one-sixth of the population speaks English proficiently (Graddol 2006), while in some expanding-circle countries, such as the Netherlands and the Scandinavian countries, much higher proportions of the population — up to 60 or 70 per cent — may have a comparable level of proficiency (Preisler 1999a,b). In fact, since levels of literacy and completed primary education are low in some outer-circle countries one could speculate that there are many rich expanding-circle countries where knowledge of English is more widespread than in some poor outer-circle countries.

3.4.3.3 Summary

This section thus shows that countries can be divided according to the functions or domains of English within them, but the categories ‘outer circle’ and ‘expanding circle’ do not correlate with the proportions of the population who can use English, or with the status of the language as official or unofficial.

It can be connected to the previous sections in the following way: the prestigious codified standard varieties are associated with inner-circle countries, which are countries in which a large majority of the people can use English, though probably only a minority use a fully standard variety. The uncodified standards are associated with outer-circle countries, in some of which only a fairly small proportion of people have more than very limited proficiency in English, and again a minority of the English speakers use a standard variety.

3.4.4 Official language, by political function

Fishman (1968) makes a distinction between an official language which has a nationalist function (as a symbol of national identity) and one which has a nationalist function (as a practical means of communication in administration, for example). Since most countries which use English intranationally do so because they were at one time or another colonies, English can be problematic as a nationalist language. The USA solved this early on by establishing its own variant of Standard English; and some inner-circle countries like Australia are following this route. In other inner-circle territories attempts can be made to maintain a minority language as a nationalist symbol. Ireland is an extreme case where the nationalist language — Irish — is little used and the
nationist one – English – is for many a reminder of oppression and loss of identity. Maori in New Zealand and Welsh in Wales are supported as nationalist symbols, but monolingual English speakers in these countries may be nationalistic without identifying with the language.

Many other postcolonial states have the same kind of opposition between symbol and practicality. In multilingual countries like Singapore or Nigeria the choice of English as administrative language has been made for nationalist reasons, and local languages may be used to arouse loyalty. In India the nationist solution – English – has survived partly because the local languages, Hindi, Tamil and so on, are the focus of rival nationalisms. In all these cases nationalist sentiment encourages the recognition of endonormativity, alongside a ‘complaint tradition’ (3.3) and maintenance of (or lip-service to) local languages.

### 3.4.5 Speakers

3.4.5.1 Speakers, by type of proficiency

Speakers of English or any other language can be classified by a psycholinguistic criterion – the type of proficiency they have. Language acquisition researchers seem to be confident that a language learnt very early in life is known in a different way from one learnt later on (Paradis 2009). So we can distinguish first-language speakers who have learnt the language at a young age in the home, from second-language speakers who have encountered it later. This gives us the categories native speaker (of a particular variety) and non-native speaker (of a particular variety). Note that there are increasing numbers of native speakers of varieties associated with the outer circle, such as Nigerian pidgin (Schaefer and Egbokhare 1999) and Singaporean (Gupta and Yeok 1991).

It is often difficult to tell who is to count as a native speaker. Some people have used English as their main language since they were 3 or 4, but did not speak it ‘first’. Others speak no language except a strongly nonstandard version mostly spoken by non-natives. Others spoke English to their mothers from infancy but no one else, and did not speak the language at all between the ages of 5 and 15. The way in which these ambiguities are solved by society reveals that the category ‘native speaker’ is partly a social construction. The main criterion seems to be accent: an accent associated with a variety mainly used by native speakers (particularly white native speakers) qualifies the speaker as a native. Correspondingly an accent associated with a variety mainly used by non-native speakers (Indian, for example) qualifies one as a non-native, however one acquired it. Worse still, nativeness is associated with race and it is not unusual for English teachers who are native speakers with non-European appearance to find themselves discriminated against in finding employment. Nevertheless, regarded as a psycholinguistic category describing someone’s personal history, ‘native speaker’ seems as valid as any other category surrounded by a grey area of hard cases.

Singh (1998:48) suggests a definition of ‘native speaker’ which makes it a proficiency category rather than one based on psycholinguistics or personal history: ‘one who shares with others in the relevant speech community relatively stable well-
formedness judgements on expressions used or usable in the community’. Here, however, we stick to a psycholinguistic/personal history definition.

3.4.5.2 Speakers, by scope of proficiency
An alternative classification of speakers which emerged in the 1990s (Mufwene 2000, Modiano 1999a,b) uses a functional criterion – the scope of proficiency. Here we need to distinguish two dimensions. One is geographical in some sense, and there might be three levels. At the highest the speaker is internationally effective – able to use communication strategies and a linguistic variety that is comprehensible to interlocutors from a wide range of national or cultural backgrounds. An American, an Indian or a Swede who can use English to communicate with Arabs, Singaporeans or Australians would have a proficiency of this scope. The next level is nationally effective proficiency: what a South African would need to communicate with other South Africans with different mother tongues, or an Alabaman would need to talk to a Vermonter. The third level, local proficiency, is the proficiency someone needs to deal with people in his or her own area: a working-class Glaswegian or Detroiter talking to his or her peers. Such proficiency is mainly of use to native speakers and immigrants to English-speaking communities, since non-natives will usually communicate with their peers in their mother tongue.

The other dimension would be range, in terms of the registers and styles available to the speaker. Highly proficient users can understand and produce speech and writing of a wide range of types about a wide range of topics. Less proficient users can understand and produce fewer types of utterance on fewer topics.

The functional criterion takes no account of the psycholinguistic one (and vice versa). Thus there is no reason to believe that natives (as here defined) will necessarily be highly proficient internationally effective communicators: their accent, lexis, or, most likely, communication strategies and cultural presuppositions may make them ineffective (6.5). Non-natives will often have developed better communication strategies and a better knowledge of what is culturally specific; on the other hand, given the bias of broadcasting, their accent is more likely to be unfamiliar to their interlocutor. A separate issue is that native speakers may tend to use their linguistic confidence to dominate interactions, and thus be effective in a different sense.

The distinction between type and scope is important because in ordinary usage to call someone a non-native speaker of a language implies that he or she is less than fully competent in the language. Thus non-native speakers are condemned to being ‘perpetual learners’ (Kandiah 1998) whose usage never acquires any authority. For skilled users of English this is a ridiculous affront.

3.4.6 Situations, by type of competence of speakers
Far more people speak English as a second language than as a first. Consequently, many interactions in English are between non-native speakers, and there was great interest in the beginning of the twenty-first century in the characteristics of such interactions. It has become clear that we can classify interactions by the type of competence of the participants. The category that has attracted most attention is the one called
English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), where prototypically all participants are non-native speakers. The results of research into this type of interaction are discussed in 6.1. ELF situations are usually seen as contrasted not only with English as Native Language (ENL situations where all participants are native speakers of (some variety of) English) but also with English as a Foreign Language (EFL) situations where some speakers (typically natives) take the role of teachers or advisors and others (non-natives) take a subordinate role as learners or non-experts.

The term ELF is associated both with straightforward study of what happens in situations of the relevant type and with advocacy of an egalitarian attitude to non-native speech, treating it as endonormative (3.4.1.2.) so long as it is effective. Advocates of ELF argue that English is not the ‘property’ of its native speakers and that native norms for speech and conversational writing are not applicable to ELF situations. It follows that a situation in which some natives and some non-natives are present can be characterised as ELF if the natives adopt an egalitarian stance and do not attempt to assert linguistic authority by, for example, rephrasing others’ utterances ‘correctly’.

3.4.7 Overview

In this section we have argued that we can only understand variation in English worldwide if we separate the classification of countries, language varieties, speakers’ personal histories, speakers’ personal competence, and the situations of use from one another. It is easy to assume that being a citizen of a particular state, using the variety spoken in that state, being a native speaker of that variety and being highly proficient in it go together, and that using a particular language implies interaction with native speakers of that variety. We assume that being American, British or Australian, being a native speaker of English, speaking Standard English and being highly proficient are interchangeable. But English is an international language and natives are a minority of users, probably even a minority of highly proficient users of Standard English. We therefore have to take account of all sorts of other possibilities for individuals: non-native speakers of Indian English who are Indian citizens with internationally effective proficiency, native speakers of Singapore English who are British citizens with internationally effective proficiency, non-native speakers of American English who are American citizens with only nationally effective proficiency, native speakers of British English who are British citizens with only locally effective proficiency and all other combinations of the four parameters. We further have to take account of variation across situations in terms of the scope and type of proficiency. We may have non-natives with very high proficiency interacting with one another, non-natives with rather low proficiency interacting with one another, non-natives with varied proficiency interacting with one another, natives with locally effective proficiency interacting with one another and still more possibilities.
Review questions

1. Define and exemplify rhoticity, centralised diphthongs, epenthetic vowels, HRT, variant tag.
2. Explain: ‘Phonologically, all Australian English is very close to RP; phonetically, it is not’ (Wells 1982:595).
3. Think of some new words in English and describe their origin and coinage.
4. Using your own examples, illustrate some characteristic differences between British and American English.
5. Describe both an ELF and an EFL situation.
6. There is a discussion about the relative advantages of native and non-native speakers of English as teachers of the language. What advantages occur to you of each type of competence?
7. Australia, India and Sweden have been called English-speaking countries. How are they different?
Focus questions

- To what extent is the dynamic model of the evolution of World Englishes (3.3) applicable to each of the inner-circle varieties?
- Before you read about each variety, listen to the examples on our website and at IDEA (http://web.ku.edu/~idea/).

This chapter deals with first-language Englishes throughout the world, from Standard English English to Jamaican creoles. It is organised along a regional, that is country-by-country, and to some extent historical, dimension rather than a typological one. It is true that linguistically, especially with regard to phonology, English English is closer to Australian, New Zealand, and South African English than to Scottish or Irish English. From a cultural and societal point of view, however, the relationships may be rather different. This is why the first sections will deal with varieties in the British Isles, although these, in turn, differ somewhat with regard to emergence and exposure to language contact (cf. 3.3). Both the order of presentation and the distribution of pages in this chapter may give the impression that we favour Britain at the expense of the USA, but the reason is simply the great variation in UK speech communities as well as the general typology of Englishes (cf. 3.2.2).

A country-by-country approach is unproblematic in a case like New Zealand, where a variety of English is used in a well-defined geographical area which is also a political unit, but this is not always the case. The sections describing varieties in the UK, for example, clearly do not deal with different countries in the sense of ‘states’ and, on the whole, all these varieties look to Standard English English as the norm for the written language throughout the area. Furthermore, Northern and Southern Irish English are both dealt with in the section on Ireland, which is not a political unit; yet for historical as well as linguistic reasons, considering the Celtic substratum and – disregarding phonology – the close affinity between the varieties, it makes sense to present them together. You will also notice that South Africa as a linguistic area is dealt with in more detail in Chapter 5, but it deserves a section here, too, even if only about 8 per cent of the population use English as their first language, since South African English is a variety in its own right with its own codified standard. The Caribbean, too, features inner-circle as well as outer-circle varieties of English; on many West Indian islands, such as Jamaica, Barbados, St Kitts and Montserrat, a variety of English is the only existing native language.

The sections are introduced by maps providing the necessary background to settlement history and regional variation. Some basic facts on geography and history, with special reference to demography, are provided, followed by an outline of the language
situation. We have also tried to think of an appropriate ‘motto’ for each section which should capture some essential aspect of the language used or an attitude characteristic of a certain regional identity. Sometimes the mottoes reflect popular, folk-linguistic stereotypes, which – like all stereotypes – contain an element of truth but also express interesting attitudes.

The bulk of the presentation is devoted to a descriptive account of linguistic features, in accordance with the principles and terminology laid out in Chapter 3. Each section/variety consequently features local realisations of the Wells standard lexical sets (3.2.2), as compared with at least one of the reference accents (RP and General American).

While it is feasible to give a fairly complete picture of the sound system in this way, this is clearly not the case when it comes to giving a useful, structured account of the lexicon. We have tried to exemplify – although not necessarily spell out – the processes, such as borrowing and derivation, and types, such as heteronomy, of lexical differentiation described in 3.2.4. The passages on spelling (if included) and grammar are comparatively short, since – at least in Standard Englishes – the differences are not striking and varieties tend to be converging rather than diverging. Pragmatic characteristics, if any, are often incorporated in the section on grammar.

At the beginning of the linguistic description of most varieties we suggest a ‘short-list’ of particularly salient features. The purpose of this is simply to provide some cues or markers for ‘variety-spotting’. To take an example: Australian and South African speakers of English share a great many vowel qualities, but are easily distinguished by the vowel in father: South Africans have the RP-like back [ɑː], whereas Australians typically use a front [əː]. Inevitably, the salient features are somewhat subjective, but they are largely based on experience from students’ perceptions.

A limited selection of works suggested for further reading is given at the end of most sections. The length of the sections varies to some extent. Although they may enjoy a special status, at least from a historical and normative point of view, the reference varieties have not been particularly favoured, partly because they are more familiar and exhaustively treated in general linguistic textbooks, but also because they are not viewed as ‘major’ or ‘better’.
The United Kingdom
Area: 245,000 sq.km
Population: 62 million (of which about 95 per cent speak English as their first language)
Capital: London

The Republic of Ireland
Area: 70,000 sq.km
Population: 4.5 million (of which the vast majority speak English as their first language)
Capital: Dublin

Further reading
4.1 England

... the copiousness of our language appeareth in the diversitie of our Dialects, for wee have Court and we have Country English, wee have Northerne, and Southerne, grosse and ordinarie, ...

(from The Excellencie of the English Tongue by Richard Carew (1555–1620))

Focus questions
● Why is England characterised by such diversity in accents and dialects?
● What effects has urbanisation had on the dialects of England?
● Describe some differences between northern and southern dialects/accents in England.
● What is the origin of Received Pronunciation?
● Listen to the online recordings 1–3 and note some accent and sociolinguistic features

4.1.1 An introductory note

English English (EngE) as a variety sometimes seems, as it were, to be taken for granted; it is not even the declared official language of the UK. It is symptomatic that some descriptions of World Englishes do not include a section on EngE and that the two records brought out by the BBC in the 1970s with the titles English with a Dialect and English with an Accent do not include samples of RP/Standard EngE (they do include General American).

Here we certainly devote a section to England as a linguistic area, but for various reasons the character of the presentation will differ somewhat from that of the other sections. Since Standard EngE and RP constitute well-known norms to which other varieties are compared for reference, it is neither meaningful to highlight salient features nor is it desirable to provide a detailed description of such a standard variety in a book of this kind. A similar approach is adopted in the section on American English (4.4).

Instead, some attention is paid to nonstandard/regional variation in England. There are two reasons for this: first, as pointed out in 4.1.2, this is where we find the most striking regional variation in the English-speaking world and second, as many of the following sections will show, regional varieties of EngE have provided a considerable input into the so-called ‘transported Englishes’.

4.1.2 The country and its people

England today is a heavily urbanised country. There is, however, a continuing population shift out of the large conurbations towards the suburbs and countryside (Britain 2007:4). Textbooks in geography generally emphasise the contrast between northern and southern England, not just because of different landscape types but also because of the industrialised north as opposed to the more rural south. This distinction is widely perceived, as demonstrated, for example, in the use of regional accents in
television commercials. Studies of attitudes to accents (Wales 2002:61ff.) confirm the picture of northerners as, for example, more reliable, friendly and down-to-earth (‘tell ’em Yorkshire, tell ’em straight’). The north–south distinction is also the best known and most striking with regard to regional variation in language (cf. 4.1.3). ‘From a linguistic point of view, the population of England is about equally divided between the north and the south’ (Wells 1982:149).

The early history of England as outlined in Chapter 1 tells us that its population is composed of a variety of peoples, whose languages have all left their stamp on Standard EngE and on the regional dialects. In recent times the structure of England’s population has changed through large-scale immigration, especially from the Caribbean and south Asia (for some figures, cf. Gibson 2007). The immigrants have mostly settled in urban centres, forming significant communities in the major cities. The writer Caryl Phillips, whose voice can be heard on the recording, represents this category. He was born on the island of St Kitts in the West Indies and grew up in Leeds, which is noticeable in his accent.

Caribbean English varieties known as ‘patois’ or ‘creole’ (cf. 4.11), as represented, for example, in the songs written and performed by Linton Kwesi Johnson (‘A Cockney Translation’, ‘Inglan is a bitch’), have had considerable impact on young people’s speech and play an important role in marking identity.

In England today, ethnicity is indeed an important factor in the study of linguistic change and variation, as is still social class. Yet many recent studies have identified gender as prior to class and there is also evidence of general changes in social structure and behaviour, resulting in linguistic levelling (Kerswill 2003).

4.1.3 Regional variation – an overview

The phonology, grammar and lexicon of traditional dialects in particular, but to some extent also of modern varieties, show that a major division is into dialects north and south of the river Humber. There is a clear historical background to the existence of this boundary (cf. Chapter 1). Early written sources confirm that the speech of northerners was perceived as different in the south:

All the language of the Northumbrians, and specially at York, is so sharp, piercing, and harsh, and shapeless, that we Southerners can scarcely understand that language.

(A modern version of John Trevisa’s translation of Polychronicon, 1181)

Although north–south, admittedly with a less rigid boundary line, remains the most significant distinction, further subcategorisation is called for. In describing regional variation in England, the medieval text quoted above actually also mentions the speech of the ‘men of myddel Engelond’, that is the Midlands.

In Wells (1982), the description of EngE accents contains four main sections, devoted to RP London, the south (highlighting East Anglia, the West Country and Bristol) and the north (highlighting Merseyside and Tyneside). This means that ‘the linguistic north’ according to Wells also comprises most of the Midlands. Some linguistic differences between speakers representing different dialect areas are presented in 4.1.5.

In reality, dialect areas are seldom fixed and absolutely distinctive or discrete but
tend to form a continuum. It is, for example, not easy to establish where ‘Yorkshire dialect’ turns into ‘Lancashire dialect’ and varieties can be distinguished within Yorkshire dialect. The following transcript of a recording of a sheep farmer from Askrigg in Northern Yorkshire demonstrates that characteristic, regional features may be variable, not only among the speakers of a community, but also in individual speakers. The speaker, who has been asked to describe the art of ‘dry stone walling’, naturally uses the word *stone* several times. The word is sometimes realised as a typically northern form, /ste:n/, but just as often as a more southern variant, /sto:n/.

Well, first of all, you sort your /ste:n/s out, you see
you level your ground
and you get your biggest /sto:n/
your foundation /ste:n/
you’ve an eye for t’ /sto:n/
it’s a gift, is dry stone /sto:n/ walling
...
you finish off wi’ your top /ste:n/
now your top /ste:n/ is t’ /ste:n/...

4.1.4 Standard English English/Received Pronunciation – a ‘reference variety’

The emergence and status of Standard EngE were outlined in Chapters 1 and 3. The codification and propagation of this dialect are maintained and updated in major publications such as the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) as well as a number of general dictionaries and grammar books written for native and non-native users of English.

The dialect which we call Standard EngE is not necessarily linked to a standard pronunciation; it could just as well be pronounced with a localised Manchester or Norwich accent. It has been estimated that 12 per cent of the population of England are speakers of Standard English; 9 per cent speak Standard English with a regional accent (cf., for example, Trudgill 2002, Britain 2010). In EFL teaching, however, Standard EngE is often still linked to Received Pronunciation (RP).

The concept of Received Pronunciation (where *received* is used in the sense of ‘approved’, ‘accepted’) was developed by Daniel Jones (1881–1967), Professor of Phonetics at University College London, ‘the real Professor Higgins’. It is worth mentioning that he did not view this accent as ‘better’ than any other. Rather, its great advantage was, as he saw it, that it was ‘widely understood’. Today, the description and codification of RP, which has a southern bias but is a social rather than a regional accent, is above all maintained through the *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary* (LPD) (Wells 2008).

Like all other accents, RP is not static but subject to change, for example influenced by features characterising Cockney, a variety ‘often overtly despised, but covertly imitated’ (Wells 1994:205). A popular, loosely defined term for a south-eastern, London-influenced accent of this kind is *Estuary English*. Opinions vary as to its
status and character. Trudgill (1999a) rejects the idea that it is a new variety. Similarly, Foulkes and Docherty (1999:11) consider it to be a levelled form rather than a unitary, well-defined variety, spreading because the features represent neither the standard nor the extreme nonstandard poles of the RP–Cockney continuum. Kerswill (2007:50f) describes it as ‘a set of levelled (relatively homogenised) regional’ — as opposed to local — accents or dialects spoken in the south-east of England. A rich documentation on Estuary English and its relationship to RP and Cockney can be found at www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/estuary [accessed 4 February 2011].

The inevitable change of RP is reflected in the latest edition of LPD, which includes ‘a number of pronunciations that diverge from traditional, “classical” RP’. In fact, LPD now also includes some localised variants, not given as first alternatives, and marked with a special symbol, for example northern forms of BATH (Wells 2008:xix). A great number of entries also bear witness to the impact of American pronunciation on the word level, for example harsh, which is shifting its stress to the second syllable.

4.1.5 English English (EngE) – a descriptive account with special reference to regional variation in phonology

General differences between EngE and AmE are not dealt with at length but outlined and exemplified in Chapter 3 and highlighted in the descriptions of varieties which are characterised by competing norms, such as CanE (4.6), where, for example, you will find an account of some spelling differences.

4.1.5.1 Phonology

As declared in 3.2.2 our accounts of segmental phonology follow Wells (1982), in particular with reference to vowels, where we refer to his keywords such as STRUT and TRAP illustrating ‘lexical sets’, that is classes of words which tend to share the same vowel. We presented the 24 standard lexical sets in detail, with a number of examples illustrating each set, and supplied their realisation in the two reference accents, Received Pronunciation and General American, by means of phonetic symbols.

In England, northern and southern accents are clearly distinguished by the pronunciation of the STRUT vowel, which in the north is identical with FOOT. This Northern STRUT pronunciation represents an older form; hence Wells refers to the ‘FOOT–STRUT split’ (Wells 1982:350ff.), which took place in Southern England in the eighteenth century. This meant that the phonemic inventory was increased to six distinctive short vowels instead of five. Unsplit FOOT–STRUT ‘has to be, along with the vowel in BATH, one of the most salient and the most symbolic markers of Northern English pronunciations today’ (Wales 2002:49). Evidence of the salience of unsplit FOOT–STRUT is given in the Tony Harrison poem mentioned in 3.4.1.3 (‘We say [ʌ] not [u:]’). Another well-known northern characteristic is the so-called ‘flat’ vowel in BATH. A striking difference in northerners’ attitudes to these two markers is reported.

There are many educated northerners who would not be caught dead doing something so vulgar as to pronounce STRUT words with [u:], but who would feel it
The high awareness of unsplit FOOT–STRUT has resulted in intermediate forms, such as \([k\hat{a}]\) for cup, and also in hypercorrect realisations of FOOT, for example \([\text{\textquoteleft}f\text{\textquoteright}g\text{\textacuted}s]\) for sugar.

With reference to FACE and GOAT, northern accents generally reflect a more old-fashioned, monophthongal pronunciation. In Devon and Cornwall, too, FACE may be pronounced in this way.

In RP and the south-east generally (Estuary English) a shift in the quality of DRESS and TRAP is taking place to the effect that these vowels are lowered to \([\varepsilon]\) and \([a]\) respectively. TRAP is thus approximating to STRUT and there is already anecdotal evidence of miscomprehension:

One day in the early 1990s a judge is reported to have said in court: 'I'm afraid we'll have to adjourn this case, I have written my judgment out but I left it in my cottage in Devon and I can't get it sent here until tomorrow.' 'Fax it up, my Lord,' the helpful barrister suggested, to which his Lordship replied, 'Yes, it does rather.' (Crystal 1995:255)

Interestingly, as we will see, in other Englishes, notably AusE, NZE, SAfE and AmE, short front vowels are moving in the opposite direction, that is getting closer (cf. 7.2).

A distinctive feature is also the so-called \textit{happ}Y vowel, that is final, unstressed \(i\). The symbol used in \textit{LPD} is \(\text{i}\), signalling that in RP it has become clearly different from KIT. Its changing quality is ascribed to Cockney/Estuary influence. Most northern accents do not have this so-called 'happ\textit{y} tensing'.

A characteristic of East Anglia and adjoining areas is so-called \textit{yod} dropping, a well-known feature of US English, that is words like \text{due} and \text{few} are realised as \([du:]\), \([f\text{\textacuted}r\text{\textquoteleft}s]\). Yod dropping is increasingly found in RP as well (super, suit, etc.) but not as generalised as in East Anglia.

In Scouse (the Liverpool dialect/accent), there is no contrast between NURSE and SQUARE; both can be represented as \([\varepsilon]\). Consequently, \text{stare} and \text{stir}, \text{fair} and \text{fur} are homophones, and true Liverpudlians like The Beatles happily rhyme \text{aware} with \text{her} (Trudgill 1999a:72ff). This feature is reminiscent of Irish English, at least as spoken in Dublin and Belfast (4.4.1.1).

In traditional Geordie (the Newcastle dialect/accent), on the other hand, NURSE has the same vowel as NORTH, which means, for example, that \text{shirt} and \text{short} are homophones. Another characteristic feature of Geordie is that a number of words belonging to the \textit{THOUGHT} set, especially those with the spelling \(<\text{a}>\), followed by \(<\text{l}>\), are pronounced with \([\text{\textacuted}l]\). The following well-known Geordie joke illustrates its unusual vowel system:

A local man goes to see the doctor (who apparently is not local!) about his hurt knee; the doctor bandages it up and asks him: 'Do you think you can walk (\text{w\textacuted}k) now?'. to which the Geordie man replies: 'What do you mean, can't walk? I can hardly walk (\text{w\textacuted}k)!' (Wells 1982:375).
It is in the vowel systems that we find the most striking examples of variation and change, but varieties of English in England are also characterised by distinctive consonantal features, some of which are also highly significant from a social point of view. Initial /h-/ , a notorious prestige marker, shows significant social variation. H dropping, which is quite a natural phenomenon owing to the "elusive" character of [h] and known from varieties of many languages, is particularly well known from traditional Cockney. In present-day RP and Estuary English, nonstigmatised H dropping occurs only in function words in unstressed position, but in most nonstandard accents content-word H dropping is the rule rather than the exception. Only Geordie and East Anglian speakers do not tend to drop their h’s. In all H dropping areas, hypercorrect forms are common, such as [’hæpl] for apple, [’hɔːdi] for Audi.

In some areas, particularly in the West Midlands, syllable-final <-ng> is characteristically realised with retained final [g]. The local pronunciation of Birmingham is [’bzmɔŋm].

Like RP most accents in England today are nonrhotic, but there is an ‘r-ful’ pocket in Lancashire and a rhotic area in the south-west. In this area /r/ is retroflex, and there are, in fact, several types of /r/ in England with regard to position and manner, most commonly a weakly articulated postalveolar approximant [ɹ], tapped [ɾ], especially in medial position, and increasingly a [w]-like approximant. In Northumberland, uvular /r/ can still be heard (cf. 3.2.2). As mentioned in Chapter 1, initial fricatives are typically voiced in the south-west, as in finger [v-], saddle [z-], shepherd [ɔː]-. Admittedly, this feature is recessive.

A characteristic of RP and Estuary English in particular is the striking allophonic variation in /l/, which is ‘clear’ before a vowel, as in love, but ‘dark’ — even vocalised — before a consonant or in word-final position, as in milk, fall. Since the position of the back of the tongue in dark /l/ approximates to [ɑː], a natural phonetic process has resulted in so-called L vocalisation, for example [nuks] for milk. A famous regional characteristic of /l/ is found in Bristol, where it is used intrusively at the end of words ending in [ə], i.e. not quite like RP intrusive /r/, which is a linking phenomenon, as in Panorama-r-interview, Arlanda-r-airport, Bristol /l/ , which is stigmatised, often features in jokes, such as the somewhat ‘constructed’ account of a family with three daughters, called Idle, Evil and Normal. It is, however, very much alive. Stanley Ellis, an expert on English dialects, reports that a Bristol lady talked about having been to the ‘operal’ where the heroine wore a beautiful ‘tiaral’ (personal communication).

For a more detailed account of present-day phonology in England, compare Foulkes and Docherty (2007), and for some information on prosodic characteristics we refer you back to 3.2.2.

By way of summarising this section we display some of the characteristic features discussed above on a simple map, focusing on the following regions: Central Yorkshire and Lancashire, Tyneside, Merseyside, the south-west and East Anglia (Figure. 4.2).

4.1.5.2 Grammar
In line with our presentation of phonology, we would like to draw your attention to some characteristics of nonstandard grammar. Some of these are widespread, such as
double or multiple negation ('I couldn't find none nowhere'), 'nonstandard never' (using never for not), seemingly 'switched' concord as in we see, he go, and a wider variety of relatives than used in the standard ('the man what was driving the car, the man as was driving the car'), and it has been suggested that these are examples of vernacular universals (Chambers 2004). We referred to the nonstandard verb forms as 'seemingly switched' because we want to emphasise that they are only ungrammatical if seen as representations of Standard English. The concord system, for example, is partly accounted for through the so-called 'Northern Subject Rule' (McCafferty 2007:131), which says that –s is used with all third person plural subjects other than the pronoun they and that a verb separated from its subject by another sentence element may take –s, regardless of subject person or number. Nonstandard, regional grammar is as rule-governed, if not yet as well described, as the standard language. An important step forward towards remedying the lack of adequate description was taken in the publication of Real English, The Grammar of English Dialects in the British Isles (Milroy and Milroy 1993) (cf. 7.1) and more recently in the handbook Varieties of English: The British Isles (Kortmann and Upton 2008). The data presented in this handbook as well as other recent studies has demonstrated that 'England (and the remainder of the British Isles even more so) should not be seen as a homogeneous, largely standard-speaking speech community' (Britain 2010:39). A couple of more regionally restricted grammatical features are described below.
Pronouns: the use of ‘three-dimensional’ demonstratives, that is with a further degree of remoteness, as in this/that/yon in the north, and theas/thit/thik in the West Country; access to two forms of address, signalling different degrees of formality, such as you and thou (thu) in the north; ‘pronoun exchange’, that is using subject instead of object forms and vice versa, in the West Country (Her told I).

Verbs: ‘invariant’ forms, that is used for all persons, of BE, such as is or am in the north and – particularly well retained – be in the West Country, where another characteristic is the use of do as a marker of aspect: I is refers to a single event, whereas I do is (pronounced with the emphasis on is) refers to a habitual or repeated action (cf. Trudgill 1999a:101).

4.1.5.3 Lexicon

There are few examples of specific words used in specific urban areas, yet Trudgill (1999a:109ff.) shows that regional variation can exist in the naming of fairly recent phenomena, such as words for gymshoes. Traditional Cockney was known to have many Yiddish loanwords, such as nosh for eat, and, in particular, to make use of so-called ‘rhyming slang’, in which a two-term phrase is used for a single everyday word with which it rhymes: trouble and strife for wife, apples and pears for stairs. The second element in the phrase may be dropped: butcher’s for look (from butcher’s hook), so ‘take a butcher’s’.

On the whole, it is difficult to generalise about regional lexical variation. Word maps showing distributions of traditional dialect words, for example Upton and Widowson (2006), based on material from the Survey of English Dialects, roughly confirm the dialect areas outlined in the phonology section. There is also a clear link to the different early settlements. The Scandinavian-based word lake ‘play’, for example, mentioned in Chapters 1 and 3, is firmly located in an area north of the Humber, but there are also indications of the extended ‘linguistic north’, for example in the distribution of another word of Scandinavian origin, namely tom ‘pour’. Cornwall had a Celtic-speaking population only a few centuries ago, and this still shows in the vocabulary of the local dialects: bugen ‘pastry-cake’, gook ‘bonnet’ and murians ‘ants’ are all Celtic loanwords (rather ‘remnants’ or ‘relics’, in fact). In East Anglia, immigrants from the Low Countries (Flemish weavers, Dutch canal builders) have influenced the local dialects, as exemplified in the (recessive) word dwile ‘dishcloth’.

In the modern dialects there is much less differentiation between dialect words, although the vocabulary used in certain areas of social life, such as food and drink, is still regionally variable and quite confusing. Trudgill (1999a:125) accounts for regional differences in words for making tea: make, mash, mask, wet, brew. In a heated debate on what constitutes a tea-cake, a Lancashire lady recently gave her firm definition: It’s a sweet thing, is tea-cake (personal experience).

Not surprisingly, studies have shown that the knowledge of traditional dialect words is decreasing at an alarming rate. There are several reasons for this lexical attrition. For one thing, a great number of words are used to refer to artefacts and ways of life, especially rural, which are no longer there. Another reason is clearly the ever-increasing exposure to Standard English. When Stanley Ellis, fieldworker for the
Survey of English Dialects in the late 1950s, interviewed an informant in Lancashire, she mentioned an ordinary Standard English word, characterising it as hilarious and deviant; this could hardly be experienced today.

4.1.6 Further reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Listen to an English-language television programme and note how speakers pronounce words you expect to belong to the DRESS, TRAP STRUT, BATH, NURSE and MOUTH sets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the relationship between Standard English English and RP? Are there speakers of Standard English who do not use RP? Are there users of RP who do not speak Standard English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Why is Estuary English attractive? Where do its features come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do they pronounce singer in the West Midlands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local accents in England seem to be quite strong, but local lexis is dying out. Why do you think this is happening?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Wales/Cymru
It’s the crowning glory for anybody to play [plei] for Wales [weːlz] (Welsh informant from Carmarthen recorded by J. C. Wells for Accents of English (1982))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● What is the significance of the motto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● When did English come to Wales (cf. Chapter 2)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Try to apply the dynamic model (3.3) to the history of Welsh English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1 The country and its people
Wales (Cymru in Welsh) is a principality of the UK. It has a population of about three million, unevenly distributed over its almost 21,000 sq.km. Whereas most of the country is mountainous and sparsely populated, the south-east, especially the so-called ‘Valleys’ of Glamorgan and Gwent, has been densely populated ever since the Industrial Revolution. Almost two-thirds of the population live in this area, in a belt around the industrial centres of Cardiff, Swansea and Newport.

It is believed that the indigenous population of Wales was overrun by Celtic peoples, the original ‘Britons’ or ‘Brythons’, in the Bronze and Iron Ages. From the first to the fifth century the Romans ruled the country. After the Roman withdrawal, the Celtic
population maintained independence against the Anglo-Saxons who had established themselves in England. In 1282 Edward I took over Wales completely and bestowed the title of Prince of Wales on his first-born son; hence the title 'Prince of Wales'. The integration of Wales into the administrative system of England was confirmed through the Acts of Union of 1536 and 1543, which had explicit linguistic consequences in that English was made the official language of law, education and trade; the Church was to remain a Welsh domain. (Incidentally, the Tudors, who then ruled England, were of Welsh origin themselves.) These statutes preceded the corresponding Acts of Union in Scotland and Ireland by 150 and 250 years respectively.

The Industrial Revolution led to drastic changes in the structure of the population. To begin with, there was massive emigration of Welshmen looking for jobs in England; later, there was considerable immigration of Englishmen for work in the mining and smelting industries of South Wales.

Although Scotland and Ireland, the two other 'Celtic countries', are much more or totally independent politically, Wales has been the most successful in preserving its Celtic language and cultural heritage. Welsh, the Celtic language, is spoken by about 20 per cent of the country’s population, most of whom live in the north-west and centre of the country. All children living in Wales are obliged to learn Welsh at school. There is a Welsh-medium television channel and a number of Welsh-dominated song and poetry festivals, such as the National Eisteddfod [æˈstedɪfdɔːd] (in English), dating from the twelfth century and revived in the late nineteenth century. An important role in the maintenance of Welsh language and culture has been played by Plaid Cymru, the Welsh Nationalist party. Nevertheless, because of restrictions in domains, Welsh is regarded as an endangered language (cf. Crystal 2000 and 4.2.2.1 below).

The words Cymru [ˈkəmɾu], the indigenous name of the country, and Cymraeg, the name of the language, are derived from the older Celtic word Combroges ['kompərəs] 'compatriots'. The etymology of Wales/Welsh is obscure but the leading theory is that its original meaning is related to a word meaning 'foreigner'. It was the Anglo-Saxons who named the country Wealas (a plural form).

4.2.2 Wales as a linguistic area

4.2.2.1 A note on Welsh and its current status

Welsh belongs to the Celtic languages, which are distantly related to English and other Germanic languages in that they are all Indo-European. Some basic Welsh vocabulary indicates this relationship. Like English, Welsh is characterised by a number of early borrowings from Latin: 
- **ysgol** 'school',
- **eglwys** 'church',
- **stryd** 'street',
- **pont** 'bridge'. For further examples, cf. www.bwrdd-yr-iaith.org.uk/ [accessed 4 February 2011]. Because of the substratum effect, some other Welsh features are mentioned in the presentation of Welsh English below.

Welsh and Gaelic (spoken in Ireland and Scotland) represent the two main branches of Celtic that are still extant: Brythonic and Goidelic, respectively. The two branches are sometimes referred to as 'p-Celtic' and 'q-Celtic', since a distinction between them is found in the consonants of a great number of words, for example Welsh *pren*, Irish
The inner circle 'tree'. The closest relative of Welsh today is Breton, spoken in Brittany, France. Cornish, once spoken in Cornwall and subject to revival, is another p-Celtic variety.

Although Welsh is 'unquestionably in the strongest position of any Celtic language today' (Nettle and Romaine 2000:136), its general decline, especially from the end of the nineteenth century to the 1970s, is referred to by the same authors as 'a catastrophic collapse'. During the last 25 years, however, the process has actually slowed down and there are indications that it may even reverse, that is with reference to Welsh–English bilingual speakers. There are striking differences between the different counties; in Gwynedd (north-west), according to the 2001 census data, 61 per cent of the people over three years of age claimed that they could speak, read and understand Welsh.

The rapid decline in the twentieth century can be illustrated by the following observation recently reported by a Swedish tourist: a tombstone in the village churchyard in Goginan near Aberystwyth dedicated to the memory of a sister and brother has the inscription referring to the sister, who died in 1903, in Welsh, whereas the text referring to her brother runs 'and her brother the Rev. Richard Arnold James, died Sept. 9th, 1953, aged 86 years'.

For an informative and telling study of attitudes to bilingualism in Wales, see Baker (1992), who reports research conducted among 11–18-year-olds in three schools in three regions representing different degrees of 'Welshness'. The results show, for example, overall agreement with the statements 'It is important to be able to speak English and Welsh', 'Knowing Welsh makes people cleverer' and 'Road signs should be in English and Welsh', but disagreement with 'Knowing both Welsh and English gives people problems' and 'People only need to know one language' (Baker 1992:81ff.).

4.2.2.2 Welsh English – an overview

In general classifications of world Englishes, mainly according to phonological criteria (3.2.2), Welsh English (WelshE) is placed in the 'English-based' category. The reasons why WelshE differs from Irish and Scottish English in this respect are historical; it is simply not a variety that has had a chance to develop its own character over the centuries.

Although ordinary Welshmen have had some acquaintance with English since the Middle Ages, they have not had it as their mother tongue, as their first language, until quite recently – a matter of a century or two. In looking at the pattern of English in Wales today, one must remember that North America, for instance, has had a substantial body of native English speakers for longer than Wales has. Welsh English, as a native language, is mostly not much older than South African English. (Wells 1982:377)

As pointed out in 3.1.1, regional linguistic variation is clearly, though not exclusively, a function of time. WelshE, although – on the whole – a 'young' dialect, nevertheless shows considerable phonological variation. Wells (1982:378) draws attention to three areas influenced by three different regions in England: South Wales (the west of England, for example Bristol), mid-Wales (the Midlands, for example Birmingham), and North Wales (the north of England, for example Liverpool). To some extent,
this regional division is related to the topography of Wales, which has made north–south communication somewhat difficult. Another obvious factor is the varying use of Welsh and the history of English in the respective areas. There are, in fact, pockets in Pembrokeshire (south-west Wales) which were anglicised as early as the Middle Ages. The Gower peninsula in the south is another well-known example of early anglicisation. The distinctiveness of WelshE is most noticeable in the north-west where Welsh is strong.

The regional dialects spoken in the industrial south and in the east have strong affinities with the dialects in England that have provided an input through contact and immigration. These dialects were once superimposed on distinct substratal Welsh influences but it is believed that they are gradually losing their Welshness (Thomas 1994:112).

Like many other regional accents in the UK, WelshE today is heavily influenced by accents spoken in the south of England. A striking example of this influence is given by Mees and Collins in their study of ongoing glottalisation in Cardiff. Interestingly, ‘... in Cardiff and the adjacent area, where many people appear to look away from Wales towards England, glottal stop is a prestige feature’ (Mees and Collins 1999:201).

4.2.3 Welsh English (WelshE) – a descriptive account

A 'shortlist' of particularly salient features:

● the 'sing-song' or 'lilting' intonation, particularly in the 'Valleys'
● long medial consonants as in ready, happy, knitting ['nətɪŋ]
● schwa in STRUT words, making a large untidy room homophonous with a large and tidy room and seagull rhyming with eagle (Wells 1982:381). Welsh typically has a very similar vowel. On the other hand, schwa does not occur in final checked syllables, as in Welshmen ['welʃmən]
● a Welsh consonant: voiceless /l/ when the spelling has <ll>, as in Lloyd, Llangollen, used in place-names, personal names and a few Welsh-based words
● the invariant tag isn’t it?, as in You are enjoying yourself, isn’t it?
● the fronting of sentence constituents, for example Singing they were.

4.2.3.1 Phonology

As noted in the above shortlist, WelshE differs from RP in the phonemic inventory because of the STRUT–schwa merger. Another characteristic is NEAR, which tends to merge with NURSE (ear, for example, is generally realised as [æə] in south-east Wales (Penhallurick 2007:159).

START, BATH (and to a lesser degree PALM) words are socially sensitive, varying between front and back; in the case of BATH also between long and short. A close fronted variant is found in Cardiff working-class speech; stereotypical representations of class-related speech are working class [ku:dɪ] vs middle-class [ku:dɪ].

NURSE is often rounded in south-east Wales, giving it the quality of [æə] or [æɹ]. There is no corresponding vowel to NURSE in Welsh, and Wells (1982:383) makes the interesting observation that the rounded versions are reminiscent of slightly
inaccurate attempts made by EFL learners. PRICE and MOUTH are characterised by a centralised first element having the schwa-like quality of STRUT.

As our motto for Wales shows, FACE has a monophthongal variant, occurring, for example, in the south-west, where the speaker comes from. Similarly, GOAT may be realised as [go:t]. The reasons for the different vowel realisations illustrated by play and Wales are historical: the corresponding vowels were different in the Middle Ages. The spelling usually provides a clue: monophthongal variants occur in words where the corresponding spelling is <a>, with minimal pairs such as made–maid, pane–pain. Similarly, threw (thrown) and thrown constitute a minimal pair.

The most striking consonantal feature is the extended duration of medial consonants as described above. Welsh voiceless /l/ (its IPA symbol is [ɬ]), an alveolar lateral fricative or approximant, also included among the salient features of WelshE, is not common among the world’s languages and not found elsewhere in Europe (Ladefoged and Maddieson 1996:203). Non-Welsh speakers sometimes replace it by [l], [ʃ] or [kl]. Except for the anglicised areas in the south-east, /l/ does not exhibit allophonic variation, but tends to be clear in other areas in the south and dark in the north.

One reason why WelshE is placed among the English-based varieties (cf. Trudgill and Hannah 2008:10, 16) like AusE and NZE is the fact that it is nonhortic, at least in ‘educated WelshE’. This is something of a mystery, since Welsh is rhotic and so were the varieties of English spoken by the early settlers. Wells (1982:180) speculates that it may be ascribed to the kind of English imposed by schoolteachers. According to Penhallurick (2007:162), however, rheticity is common in traditional Welsh-speaking areas. The quality of prevocalic /r/ is variable, ranging from rolled to tapped to approximant, depending on region as well as phonetic environment (Wells 1982:390).

A characteristic of northern WelshE phonology is the nonexistence of /æ/, making, for example, price–prize and call–call homophonous.

As our first salient feature we chose the characteristic intonation. ‘Sing-song’ is a very vague designation, often used about any accent that sounds unfamiliar. Unfortunately, an adequate account of Welsh intonation is not yet available, but an observation formulated by Wells (1982:392) provides useful guidance: in ordinary statements where standard accents would have a simple fall, for example it’s no longer ‘valid’, WelshE would have a rise-fall (‘valid’).

4.2.3.2 Grammar

Like other Englishes, WelshE is less distinctive at this level of language than in phonology. The following presentation refers to informal – mostly spoken – language, and includes a number of nonstandard features.

To a great extent, these features are shared with other varieties in the British Isles (cf. 4.1.5.2): double (multiple) negation, ‘nonstandard now’, participles preceded by a- (‘a-doing’), the relatives as and what, generalisation of verb forms (I sees, they likes), ‘unorthodox’ forms of strong verbs (He was took bad), the pronoun he used in the subjective, possessive pronoun forms such as yourn, thourn.

In addition to the invariant tag isn’t it?, referring to the whole sentence, northwestern WelshE has the tag yes?, as in You’re studying World Englishes, yes?
The following characteristics, more specific to WelshE, relate to the Welsh substratum and/or to traditional dialects in western England. Most of the data is taken from Thomas (1994).

The fronting of a constituent was included among the particularly salient features (Saying they were). Fronting is a strategy for focusing on a constituent and is accompanied by emphatic stress. In Standard English, focusing is often expressed through pseudo-clefting, that is What they were doing was singing, or clefting, for example It’s now that they are going. In Welsh there is no distinction between clefting and pseudo-clefting; both correspond to fronting, which is commonly used. The WelshE correspondence to the cleft sentence exemplified above would simply be Now they’re going, with the emphasis on the first word.

WelshE has characteristic ways of expressing aspect through use of periphrastic do as in I do go to chapel every Sunday. Similar constructions are found in England’s West Country (cf. 4.1.5.2) and are believed to ‘represent an older Celtic substratum’ (Thomas 1994:192). Be + -ing, used as a habitual marker as in I’m going to chapel every Sunday, also has parallels in Welsh and other Celtic languages.

Another feature which has its parallel in Welsh is ‘expletive there’, used in exclamations such as There’s strange it was! corresponding to Standard English How strange it was!

4.2.3.3 Lexicon
There are surprisingly few borrowings from Welsh in WelshE. We have already mentioned the widely used eisteddfod. Other borrowings include del and bach [ba:x], used as terms of endearment, box! [box] ‘enthusiasm’, and bara brith [bara brith] ‘bread loaf made with currants’.

WelshE dialects further contain words that are found in certain dialects in England. A well-known example is elem ‘starve’, found in the west Midlands and as far north as Lancashire.

There are also many characteristic idioms, some of which can be ascribed to the Welsh substratum, whereas the origins of others are obscure. An example of the latter category is the repetition of an adjective for intensification, as in She was pretty, pretty.

According to Thomas (1994:145ff.), ‘Welsh English, as a distinct dialect, is a transitional phenomenon’; increasingly, WelshE will exclusively be characterised just as a distinct accent.

4.2.4 Further reading

Review questions
1. Which characteristics in 4.2.3 are likely to derive from Welsh substratum features? Which might be left-overs from learning English as a foreign language?
4.3 Scotland

'I'm not an English girl, I'm a wee Scots girl'
(quoted from a Glasgow informant recorded by Caroline Macafee for Traditional Dialect in the Modern World (1994))

Focus questions
- What makes Scotland complicated as a linguistic area?
- Is Scots a language or a dialect?
- Think of a well-known personality from Scotland (actor, politician, writer) and describe her/his speech.
- What is the status of 'the languages of Scotland' in the European Community?
- Listen to the online recordings 4–6.

4.3.1 The country and its people
Scotland is the northernmost part of the UK (Figure 4.1), comprising about a third of its area but not even a tenth of its population. Its main distinctive areas are: the Highlands in the north and north-west; the more populous Lowlands in the south with the capital Edinburgh; the Western Isles (Outer and Inner Hebrides); and the Northern Isles (Orkney and Shetland).

The founder population of Scotland can be viewed as consisting of:
- Celts from Ireland, representing the Goidelic (Gaelic) language group, settling in the west in the fifth century
- Anglo-Saxons, in particular the ‘tribe’ known as Angles, expanding northwards from Northumberland into southern Scotland and gradually spreading westwards to south-western Scotland (seventh century)
- Scandinavian (especially Norwegian) Vikings who conquered Orkney, Shetland and part of the Scottish mainland (Caithness) in the ninth century
- Anglo-Normans from England at the invitation of Scottish kings who gave them lands partly in the hope of strengthening the monarchy. Their retainers and servants were English-speaking.
Scotland as a linguistic area

Scotland as a linguistic area is as varied as its topography. Three main languages/varieties can be recognised, each of which in turn includes a number of dialects: (Scottish) Gaelic, Scots and Scottish Standard English (SSE). Although obviously not a variety of English, Scottish Gaelic deserves inclusion in this overview presentation, owing to its importance as a substratum language. Whether Scots is a variety of English or not will be subject to further discussion below (cf. also 3.1.2).

4.3.2.1 Scottish Gaelic – its history and status

Scottish Gaelic, the Celtic language of Scotland, which in Scotland is usually simply referred to as Gaelic [ˈɡælɪk], belongs to the q-Celtic branch (cf. 4.2.2.1). In the tenth century Scotland was largely Gaelic-speaking, but during the eleventh century this language lost its preeminence at court and among the aristocracy who spoke Norman French. In eastern and central Scotland it was largely replaced by Scots. By the seventeenth century, Gaelic had retreated to the Highlands and Hebrides. After 1745, when the highland chieftains were defeated during a rebellion, Gaelic began losing its position as a first language throughout most of the Highlands.

From the late fifteenth century into the eighteenth, the decline of Gaelic was precipitated by a number of acts of the Scottish and British Parliaments, aimed at promoting English-language education. The neglect of Gaelic resulted in the language surviving as an oral rather than a written medium (MacKinnon 1998:176ff.). Nancy Dorian’s famous study of the process of language death in east Sutherland (north-east Scotland) gives the picture of a diglossic situation (3.4.3.1), with Gaelic being used in high domains, particularly the Church, whereas it was undergoing rapid and conscious loss in the important home domain. One of Dorian’s informants characterises his parents’ use of language in the following way: ‘They wanted to speak Gaelic so that we couldn’t understand them’ (Dorian 1981:104). Virtually all Gaelic speakers are today functionally bilingual.

The latest census figures available (2001) tell us that there are about 60,000 Gaelic speakers in Scotland, of whom the majority claim to read Gaelic and nearly 50 per cent to write it. There has, in fact, been a resurgence of interest in the language since the 1990s, probably due to the establishment of Scotland’s own Parliament, in the domains of home, church and community. In bilingual areas Gaelic is usually L1 of instruction for most primary subjects. For detailed information, compare MacKinnon (2007).

The Western Isles traditionally constitute a stronghold for Gaelic, together with some areas in the north-west of mainland Scotland. The latest census results also show that there seems to be a growing proportion of Gaelic speakers in the Lowlands, especially in the Glasgow area. In places, Gaelic is also taught as a second language. Recent years have also seen an increase in Gaelic radio and television broadcasts, where various genres are represented, such as soap operas. There is a Gaelic publishing house and a film unit.
4.3.2.2 The history and status of Scots

As has already been hinted at, a great number of people, linguists included, might resent the inclusion of Scots in a book entitled *World Englishes*, arguing that it is a language in its own right. On the other hand, this variety certainly deserves a place in a section describing 'language in Scotland'. Also, even if its status is that of a language, it is nevertheless more closely related to English than any other language, and it is descended from Old English. Its impact on SSE is undisputed; in fact, it can be argued that Scots–SSE constitutes a linguistic continuum (cf. Aitken 1984).

There is a wealth of early written sources, giving evidence of a distinct variety of language, as exemplified in the following extract from a schoolboy’s letters dating from the 1540s. A striking feature of early forms of Scots is initial *quh-,* corresponding to present-day *wh-.*

Father, I requisit yow for crystis schaik [sake] till hauie pitie vpon your pour brother villam, quhilk is now beth [both] modderles and fatherles, and guie ye tack [take] a chair [care] of him, and bring him vill up ... 

(quoted from Meurman-Solin 1999:309)

Yet, throughout the growth of Scots it remained close to northern varieties of English and Scots and English were generally intelligible (Romaine 1982:57). Many written sources, in fact, are characterised by a mixture of Scots and English features.

Between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries all Scots of all ranks (with the exception of monolingual Gaelic speakers) spoke a form of language that is known as 'Older Scots'. Aitken, expressing some doubt as to the exact status of present-day Scots, does not hesitate to call Older Scots 'an autonomous national language, with its own distinctive pronunciations, grammar, vocabulary and, very strikingly, spelling ...' (Aitken 1985:42).

After the joining of the crowns of England and Scotland in 1603, written as well as spoken language in Scotland became more and more anglicised. A less formal and conservative variety of Scots, based on the spoken language, was used in some genres, especially poetry, for example by Robert Burns (1759–96). Scots as a spoken language was used by the rural population and the working classes.

Written Scots was revived and promoted in the so-called 'Scottish Renaissance' in the twentieth century, led by a group of influential writers, notably Hugh MacDiarmid and William Soutar. Drawing on previous literary and dialect usage from the Lowlands, this group came up with an 'eclectic variety', sometimes scathingly referred to as 'synthetic Scots', but generally known as *Lallans* (= Lowlands). A style sheet for spelling was set up in 1947 (cf. 3.2.1).

There is today abundant writing in Scots, in localised forms such as Shetland dialect as well as more regionless variants. Mostly, writers do not seem to look to the style sheet for guidance, but set up their own rules for spelling. It is likely that dictionaries such as *The Concise Scots Dictionary* (first published in 1955), supplying spelling variants, are also consulted. Virtually all genres are represented, from private letters, notes and radio scripts to fiction, Bible texts and scholarly articles.

The following text is an example of the last genre:

Father, I requist yow for crystis schaik [sake] till hauie pitie vpon your poor brother villam, quhilk is now beth [both] modderles and fatherles, and guie ye tack [take] a chair [care] of him, and bring him vill up ...

(quoted from Meurman-Solin 1999:309)
Other efforts 50 years ago were directed at the broadcast media. David Abercrombie (supported by others, including Jack Aitken) was demanding the privilege of hearing Scottish accents on the radio, never mind the Scots language.

(Caroline Macafee, ‘Scots: Hauf Empty or Hauf Fu?’ (Macafee 2001))

In support of the claim that Scots is a language in its own right, the following arguments are usually brought forward:

- it has a historically based, highly distinctive sound system, grammar and vocabulary
- it has dialects of its own
- it has a varied and unbroken orthographic and literary tradition
- it has been recognised for more than 300 years as integral to Scotland’s cultural identity (McClure 2010:99)
- it is now recognised as a language by the European Bureau of Lesser Used Languages, an agency of the European Union. In addition, the UK Government has signed the European Charter for Minority and Regional Languages at level II (one level below Gaelic).

There has also been a very marked improvement in the response of the Scottish Government and they now directly support Scottish Language Dictionaries and the Scots Language Centre (Chris Robinson, personal communication).

For further information about Scots, go to websites such as www.scots-online.org (‘Pittin the Mither Tongue on the Web!’ [accessed 4 February 2011] and the Scottish Corpus of Text and Speech (SCOTS), www.scottishcorpus.ac.uk [accessed 4 February 2011].

4.3.2.3 Scottish Standard English (SSE)

SSE can simply be defined as Standard English pronounced with a Scottish accent and with a few Scotticisms in grammar and vocabulary, for example we use ‘little’, as used in our motto. This variety has been the official language of Scotland for at least three centuries. It is “the mother tongue of a large minority of native-educated Scots (mainly the middle classes and those who have received a higher education) and the public language of most of the remainder (mainly the working class of the Lowlands)” (McArthur 1992:903). Note that the major Scottish dictionaries do not constitute a codification of this standard variety but rather focus on Scots.

It is worth mentioning that “RP does not enjoy the same status in Scotland as it does in England and Wales; a Scottish accent can be prestigious in a way that a local English accent is not” (Wells 1982:393). It could even be claimed that Scotland has its own RP in the so-called ‘Morningside’ accent (stereotypically represented in the film The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie), as well as Glasgow’s ‘Kelvinside’ accent.

4.3.2.4 Regional variation in Scotland

In the Highlands, Gaelic began being displaced by English in the mid-eighteenth century. Since Scots was never spoken there, the language variety used is SSE
Scots has always been connected with the Lowlands (cf. the term Lallans mentioned above), including the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, but has also been extended to the Northern Isles (Orkney and Shetland) and to the north-eastern part of mainland Scotland; these northern varieties are the most conservative dialects of Scots (McColl Millar 2007:1). The variety spoken in the city of Aberdeen and its hinterland is popularly known as ‘Doric’ and has a very characteristic accent. Cf. also the variety known as Ulster Scots, described in 4.4.

Among the regional varieties of Scots, Shetland, Orkney and – to a lesser extent – Caithness occupy a distinctive position in that here Scots has been ‘planted’ on a Scandinavian substratum. Until the year 1469, these areas were part of a Viking earldom. The language used was a localised variety of Old Norse that came to be known as Norn, which was the first Germanic language to be spoken in the area. The shift to Scots must have been gradual, and – owing to the scarcity of written sources – it is not possible to determine the time of the actual demise of Norn (cf. Waugh 1996 for a heated debate on this issue). It is definitely misleading to label present-day Shetland dialect (a Scots dialect) as Norn, as is done, for example, in Crystal (1995) but also by many Shetlanders and Orcadians themselves, taking a romantic view.

As seen from the following extract from a letter, Shetlanders are generally bi-dialectal, mastering Shetland dialect as well as Standard English as discrete varieties.

Diss is twaartree lines alang we’ da peenie booklet o’ Frisle words ... I toitht du wid likk ta höy een o’ dem ... Am been skrivan a lokk a auld words diss winter, and hiv gottin aboot a thoozan doon.

I think I had better write in English! I have been meaning to write for a while but being me I never got down to it.

(This is just a few lines together with the little booklet of Fair Isle words ... I thought you would like to have one .... I have written down a lot of old words this winter, and have got about a thousand)

(Alexander Stout, Barkland, Fair Isle, in a letter to Gunnel Melchers, 1985)

By contrast, most other Scottish varieties display a complex interplay between two language varieties, i.e. there is continuous rather than discrete variation. Along this continuum, speakers have access to features from both linguistic systems and adapt their speech according to context and audience. A sociolinguistic study of Edinburgh and Glasgow speakers indicates that Edinburgh speakers are more oriented towards standard varieties than their Glasgow counterparts (Chirrey 1999:223f.).

In the following description of linguistic features, we take account of the Scots/SSE continuum, but it is impossible to do justice to the richness and variation found in Scots.

4.3.3 Scots/Scottish Standard English (SSE) – a descriptive account

A ‘shortlist’ of particularly salient features, found in all varieties, but in most cases to a higher degree in Scots:
the retention of the voiceless velar fricative /x/ in words spelt with <gh> or <ch>, such as loch, bright, Waugh

dark /l/ in all positions, which in Scots has resulted in L vocalisation, evidenced in spellings such as lu ‘full’, su ‘salt’, aw ‘all’ (cf. the title of Macafee’s article quoted above)

a characteristic distribution of vowel length as compared to RP, which makes ‘short’ vowels sound quite long and ‘long’ vowels rather shorter (cf. the spelling jayki as exemplified in 4.3.3.1 below)

the firm rhoticity which explains the nonexistence of centralised diphthongs, that is words such as theirs and can are pronounced with monophthongs

the Scots component in the vocabulary, as already exemplified in wee, dreich, syne.

4.3.3.1 The spelling of Scots

As pointed out in 3.2.1 and 4.3.2.2, Scots spelling is highly variable in spite of access to a style sheet and various dictionaries, which, however, tend to allow for a number of variants, for example breid, brede, bread, braid for ‘bread’ according to the Concise Scots Dictionary. Some further observations on the orthographic representation of certain phonological features can be made by looking at the Scots texts above. Present-day writers of fiction who use Scots regularly, at least in dialogue, tend to indicate ‘long’ vowels, as in jayki for ‘jacket’ (Irvine Welsh). This should only be necessary if the text is written for a non-Scottish readership.

4.3.3.2 Phonology

The Scots vowel system is regionally variable, but has at least eight phonemes: /i e æ a u o ʌ/ The number of distinctive vowels could vary between eight and twelve, to which should be added two or three diphthongs (Wells 1982:197ff).

As pointed out in 3.2.2, the Scottish vowel system, including Northern Irish English, is distinct typologically from other accents of English (Type IV). What follows here refers specifically to SSE; integrating Scots with its considerable regional variation would be too complicated. An obvious difference from RP is that SSE has a smaller phonemic inventory. One reason for this is the phonetic value of the /u/ quality is represented as ‘elegant’ realisation, but the usual quality is close, rounded, central [u]. Similarly, front vowels in BATH and PALM are associated with higher status than back [a]. A Morningside accent, in fact, is characterised by [a] or even [ɛ]. As in CanE (4.6.3.2) and varieties of AmE (4.5.5.1), LOT and THOUGHT are identical.

As seen from the SSE vowels described above, length does not feature as a contrastive element. Yet all vowels, with the exception of /e/ and /a/ (which are always short), have long or short allophones in complementary distribution. The rule for this
The inner circle distribution, known as Aitken’s Law or the Scottish Vowel Length Rule (SVLR), says that vowels are short unless they are followed by /r/, a voiced fricative, a morpheme boundary, or are final in an open syllable (cf. Wells 1982:400, Chirrey 1999:224). A few examples of the workings of SVLR: the vowels in heed and hid, mace and mess, and the stressed vowel in Peter have the same (short) duration, whereas those in see, sleep, maze would be longer (compare also the short duration of take represented as tack in the Older Scots text above). The importance of the morpheme boundary can be illustrated by word pairs such as greed–agreed and need–kneed (past tense of the verb kne) where the first word would have a relatively short vowel and the second a rather longer one. The rule operates in some diphthongs, too: the realisation of tie will be different from tied, for example. In concluding our brief presentation of the SVLR, we have to mention that, according to recent research (Scobbie et al. 1999), it is susceptible to considerable pressure from non-Scottish varieties and may play a smaller role in Scottish phonology than claimed by Aitken and Wells.

A few further comments on SSE vowels and diphthongs: KIT displays a socio- phonetic continuum. The usual realisation is [i], but it is often more open and retracted in urban SSE as well as Scots (Stuart-Smith 2008:58). This may explain why the word fingers pronounced by a Shetlander was perceived as fungus by a Lancashire lady (personal observation). It is also reflected in spelling, for example <milk>, <bord> for milk, hand (Robert Lawson, personal communication).

As exemplified by ride–ried, PRICE is variable in quantity according to the SVLR. In contrast with other SVLR vowels, it is also variable in quality [ae]~[ax]. This variation is reminiscent of Canadian raising (cf. 4.6.3), but its distribution is not the same.

Like FACE and GOAT, MOUTH is usually monophthongal (realised as [u] or [uː]), at least in Scots, for example [sau] ‘south’, [kuː] ‘cow’ (cf. the orthographic representations abot and deon in the Fair Isle extract above).

As for the quality of vowels before /t/ it remains to be mentioned that some Scottish accents, such as middle-class Edinburgh speech, have undergone ‘the NURSE Merger’ (Wells 1982:407). This means that in contrast with accents in the west of Scotland, for example, words like skirt, thing and lurk all are pronounced with /æt/. Finally, the vowels of SSE and especially the Scots end of the continuum are clearly different from most other accents of English in their lexical distribution. Well-known examples are the corresponding words in Scots for stone, home, usually spelled <stane>, <hame> and pronounced /sten/, /heme/ (cf. the spelling <bith>); for both in the schoolboy’s letter. <braid> for broad in the Macafee text). FOOT and GOOSE, as we have seen, are generally identical in SSE, but in some local varieties they may be realised in six different ways, depending on the history of the lexical items. The word boot, for example, may have the vowel [ɔ] in the dialect of Glenesk (Wells 1982:397) and a similar vowel quality is found in traditional Shetland dialect.

Consonants

In addition to the retention of /s/ as listed among the salient features, SSE has kept syllable-initial /hw/ as in what, which, whisky, overwhelm, a feature which may sometimes
be heard in some other varieties of English, such as CanE and AmE. According to Wells (1982:408), ‘a case can be made for treating it as a unit phoneme’. A tangible piece of evidence for its phonemic status was experienced by Gunnel Melchers, who was once to be picked up by a Scotsman in a street called Whinmoor Street. Since she pronounced it with /w/ he went to Wynmore Street instead. In some parts of Shetland, <wh-> is realised as /kw-/; <qu-> sometimes with hypercorrect /hw/; [kw.uk] ‘whisky’, [hw.uk] ‘queen’. In the north-east of mainland Scotland (Aberdeen, Buchan), <wh-> is realised as /f/, making what virtually homophonous with foot, at least as pronounced by speakers of the local Scots dialect.

In urban areas, including Lerwick, the small ‘capital’ of Shetland, the use of glottal stops in medial and final position is increasing rapidly and is socially variable, according to class, age and gender. In traditional Shetland accents there are no dental fricatives, for example [t.uk] ‘think’, [d.uk] ‘there’, [da.uk] ‘the’.

We have already stated that SSE as well as Scots is rhotic and shown how this has implications for the vowel system. A few words remain to be said about the quality of /r/, however. With regard to the generally embraced stereotype of Scotsmen’s trilled r’s, we refer you back to 3.2.2. Trilled r’s are still heard, but the most common types of /r/ found in Scotland today are an alveolar tap [ɾ] and a postalveolar or retroflex fricative or approximant [ɹ] (Wells 1982:411). Uvular /r/ is not uncommon and can be heard in the speech of the Glaswegian informant on the recording. Like many other Scottish speakers, he appears to vary the quality of /r/ according to the phonetic environment.

As stated in the list of salient features, /l/ is generally dark, but tends to be clear in the Western Isles and the Highlands, which can probably be attributed to the Gaelic substratum. The same explanation can be given for the strongly aspirated voiceless plosives in these areas; in other parts of Scotland /p t k/ are often unaspirated. Another influence of Gaelic is suggested for the coalescence of /r/ + /s/ into a retroflex sound, a feature otherwise known from Indian English (Wells 1982:628) and Scandinavian EFL.

**Prosody**

SSE differs from RP in the stress pattern of certain words, notably verbs ending in -ize, which tend to be stressed on the last syllable.

Information on intonation in ScotE is scarce. According to Chirrey (1999:229), Edinburgh speech patterns are characterized by mid to low falls, also in questions of all kinds, and there is no evidence of HRT. Glasgow speech, on the other hand, is characterized by rising-contour patterns (Brown et al. 1980:19).

**4.3.3.3 Grammar**

The following brief presentation based on Miller (1993; 2008) describes colloquial language towards the Scots end of the continuum. As seen from the Fair Isle text quoted in 4.3.2.4, Standard EngE is regularly used in writing. The purpose of Miller’s account was, in fact, originally to inform teachers of English about Scots grammar, so that they would be better equipped for marking essays and passing judgements in general about children’s use of language.
Some of the following characteristics are shared with other varieties of English, especially Northern EngE.

**Morphology**

Nonstandard features abound in the past tense and past participle forms of verbs. The forms have sprung from different sources: sellt ‘sold’ and killt ‘killed’ indicate that irregular verbs have become regular. The voiceless ending is a historically based Scots feature as illustrated in the Macafee text above. Driv ‘drove’ and taen ‘took’ are other irregular forms. Forget ‘forgotten’ (Should auld acquaintance be forgot?) was used in earlier forms of Standard English, and went for ‘gone’ was used in Older Scots. Two widely used verbs are ken ‘know’ with kent as a past tense and past participle, and gie ‘give’ with gied as past tense and gien as past participle. In Orkney and Shetland be is used instead of have as the general perfective auxiliary.

Plural forms of nouns such as wife, leaf, loaf keep the voiceless consonant, that is wives, leaves, loaves. Scots also retains irregular plurals such as shoon ‘shoes’, een ‘eyes’.

In Orkney and Shetland there is firm retention of two forms of address: informal du vs formal (singular) you, as brought up by the Shetland informant on the recording.

Many speakers of Scots have a three-dimensional demonstrative system, similar to that of the north of England, that is this/that/yon (cf. 4.1.5.2). Yon tends to indicate physical as well as emotional distance (expressing dislike or ‘otherness’), as in yon oil companies, yon Southfork (the Ewing ranch in the soap opera Dallas) (recorded in Shetland).

**Syntax**

There is unmarked plurality in measure phrases, as exemplified in 50 year, found in the Macafee text.

In Scots, negation is expressed by no or not, as in She’s no leaving or by the forms nae and n’t, which are always attached to other words, as in She isnae leaving.

Scots is ‘massively different from Standard English’ with regard to modal verbs (Miller 2008:104). It lacks shall (replaced by will in all contexts, including questions like Will I pour the coffee?), may and ought. Need is exclusively treated as a main verb. A striking characteristic of Scots is the use of double modals as in They might could be finishing their work on time. Such constructions are also found in varieties of AmE (4.5.6.2).

Progressive constructions are used with stative verbs, as in I wasnae liking it and the lassie I was going wi wasnae liking it (Miller 2008:107).

Like WelshE, Scots often has an invariant tag. The Scots version is e, which may be added to positive as well as negative declarative clauses. The tag e’m is also used, added to positive clauses, that is a system like that used in Standard English (you’re liking this, e’m?).

In Scots the definite article is used before nouns denoting institutions and certain periods of time: the day ‘today’, the mon ‘tomorrow’, at the kirk ‘at church’.
4.3.3.4 Lexicon

As demonstrated even in the brief Macafee text, Scots includes lexical items that will be completely opaque to someone conversant with Standard English only. Such opaque words may stem from different sources, for example Old English, as in the case of rax (Macafee text), Gaelic, or Old Norse. These three, in fact, constitute the most important sources for Scots vocabulary, but there is also evidence of substantial borrowing from Latin and French.

Early Scots shared a great deal of its vocabulary with Northern Middle English, including most of its borrowings from Scandinavian languages. Some examples of words from this source used in Modern Scots are: gate ’road’, kirk ’church’, big ’build’, lass ’girl’, lowse ’loose’, rowan ’mountain ash’. The Scandinavian element in traditional Orkney and Shetland dialect, which is not so much an effect of borrowing as due to a substratum, is much more noticeable. Some examples of Shetland dialect words were given in Chapter 1. In Orkney and Shetland the Scandinavian-based, traditional vocabulary has tended to remain in the following areas: words clearly relating to the environment and traditional life, such as flora and fauna, weather terminology and specific tools; colour terms, especially denoting the different colours of sheep; adjectives, mostly negative, describing people’s character and behaviour.

The input from Gaelic, beginning at least as early as the twelfth century, has resulted in borrowings such as the widely known and used cairn ’a heap of stones’, glen, loch, capercailzie ’wood-grouse’, tocher ’dowry’. There are also more recent borrowings, some of which were introduced by Sir Walter Scott: clan, galon ’in abundance’, gillie, especially in the sense of ’a sportsman’s attendant’, sporran ’the leather pouch worn in front of a man’s kilt’, whisky and ceilidh ’an organised evening entertainment’.

As exemplified by rax, other elements of the distinctive vocabulary of Scots come from Anglo-Saxon, such as bannock ’a round, flat girdle-cake’, bu and kn ’a two-roomed cottage’ (also recorded in transported varieties in Canada and New Zealand), baggie (the famous dish), leal for ’loyal’, ’honest’, ashet ’serving plate’, aumry ’pantry’, Orkney pidie and Shetland peerie (cf. the Fair Isle letter) from petit. As a result of contacts with craftsmen and traders from the Low Countries, there are also borrowings from Dutch: cut ’ankle’, pukie ’the little finger’, gelf (from Du. kolf, a club used in a similar game), tine (from Middle Du. schenbout, fine bread’).

For various reasons, most of the Scots words exemplified above are probably quite stable. Some of them, such as the legal terms, are institutionalised, others have come to enjoy symbolic status, and some have become part of General English. There is also
popular interest in the dialect vocabulary of Scots, promoted on T-shirts, mugs and so on, which will help towards preserving a fair selection of the words. Yet it is inevitable that many words inherited from the past will fall into disuse. In rural areas especially, as in most parts of the world, changing lifestyles have caused massive lexical attrition (cf. 4.1.5.3). This is sadly realised by the Orkney writer George Mackay Brown (incidentally, the word voar is very much alive in Shetland dialect):

What lovely words have gone into the silence! Vore, the springtime, for example. Another is ice-lowsing, meaning the thaw — a marvellous word that ... Still, in lonely crofts, there is the sae-bink, a stone shelf for water vessels to be set. There is excuse for the vanishing of such a fine word, for now there is little need for the sae-bink. (From an article in The Orcadian, 27 November 1980)

4.3.4 Further reading

Review questions:
1. What is the difference between Scots and SSE?
2. Where else has dark /l/ been vocalised?
3. Explain Aitken’s Law (the SVLR) in relation to the words mess, mace, maze and rod, road, rove.
4. What is the difference between borrowing and substratum in terms of the Scandinavian element in mainland Scots and Shetland dialect?
5. Identify Scots/SSE features in the following example of informal writing:
yeh been quite a wee while, am workin the day then doin summut with ma parents n tht the night then am off 2moz yasss! cnt wait till i get paid ma 306

4.4 Ireland
... Green English is a grafted tongue, an English foliage on an Irish stem, still nourished by an Irish root.
(Loreto Todd, Green English (2000:23))

Focus questions:
• What is the main function of the Irish language today?
• In what ways does Northern Irish English differ from English as spoken in the Irish Republic?
• Listen to the online recording 7.
The two countries and their founder populations

Ireland, 'the Emerald Isle' west of Great Britain, has an area of 82,400 sq.km, of which well over four-fifths constitute the Republic of Ireland (Éire), while the remaining fifth, Northern Ireland (Ulster), is part of the United Kingdom. We will describe Ireland and its varieties of language in one section, as explained in our introduction to this chapter.

Ireland is divided into four provinces, formerly independent kingdoms: Connacht, Munster, Leinster and Ulster, which in turn are divided into a total of 32 counties. Northern Ireland as a political unit comprises six of Ulster’s nine counties.

It is now believed that the Celtic population of Ireland came directly from Gaul, though there may have been early settlers from Britain as well (Thomson 1984:241). The Old Irish name of Ireland was Ériu, and the Romans, who – like the Anglo-Saxons – never invaded the island, referred to it as Hibernia.

Even before the fifth century, the Celts must have been well established; there are early records of their language in a special runic or linear script. There are substantial records of Ireland’s history from about the seventh century, written in both Latin and Irish. These languages continued to flourish in spite of the Viking raids from the end of the eighth to the early eleventh century.

As in England, the Vikings did not only come as occasional raiders; many settled in the new country and gradually amalgamated with the indigenous population. The Scandinavian linguistic contribution to Ireland is particularly found in place names, for example the element vig ‘bay’, as found in Wicklow, and -ford, related to fjord, as in Waterford, Wexford.

The Normans came to Ireland about a century after the Battle of Hastings, not directly from France but from Wales and south-western England. They also left some traces in place-names, such as the elements -ville and -cour ‘courtyard’.

The first speakers of English who settled in Ireland were hardly conquerors but appear to have come mostly for religious reasons. The actual colonisation from England began in the south-east towards the end of the twelfth century and by the year 1100 two-thirds of Ireland had been conquered. From the very beginning, English law was introduced with the purpose of protecting the colonists and disadvantaging the Irish. Still, these early colonists appear to have amalgamated with the population in much the same way as the Vikings, and there is evidence from the mid-fourteenth century that they had adopted the manners as well as the language of the Irish (Leith 1996:187).

By the end of the fifteenth century, only a small area around Dublin, which had been colonised by settlers from Bristol, was strictly under English control. This area is known as ‘the Pale’ (from pale in the sense of ‘boundary’, cf. the phrase beyond the pale).

During the Tudor and Stuart periods, English control was forcefully reasserted and it was ruled that the English language should be used throughout Ireland. A further complication in the relations was caused by the difference in religious practices after the Reformation in England. Elizabeth I, who saw Irish Catholicism as treachery, especially during the war with Spain, sent troops to Ireland. The Irish were defeated and a new group of colonisers took over their land. Among these were a considerable
The number of Protestant Scotsmen from the Lowlands, who settled in the north-east, that is today’s Northern Ireland. The county of Derry was taken over by a group of London merchants; this is why the town of Derry was renamed Londonderry, though the Catholics never called it anything but ‘Derry’.

The outcome of the war and the massive colonisation in the North caused a major resettlement of the Irish who moved or were forced to move to the poorer, partly barren, west of the country. Naturally, anti-English feelings grew stronger and stronger, and a movement for independence from English rule, also embraced by some Protestants, resulted in an uprising in 1798, the outcome of which was the incorporation of Ireland into the UK (the Act of Union of 1800).

At the time of the Act of Union, it is believed that English was the first language of half the population of Ireland. During the following century, Irish suffered massive abandonment. There were several reasons for this: the famines in the 1840s which led to death as well as large-scale emigration, particularly to North America; the enforcement of universal English-language education; the transfer to English in the Catholic Church.

The movement towards independence kept growing stronger during the nineteenth century; in 1921 the Irish Free State was established, and in 1949 southern Ireland was declared a republic, which meant that 26 of the 32 counties gained independence from the UK.

4.4.2 Ireland as a linguistic area

4.4.2.1 The status of Irish

The Republic of Ireland has two official languages: Irish Gaelic, usually referred to as Irish, and English. Article 8 in the constitution of Éire states that Irish is the national language is the first official language and that English is recognized as a second official language. In 2005 Irish was granted the status of an official and working language of the European Union (6.2).

The revival and maintenance of the Irish language was part and parcel of the independence movement. ‘Ireland with its language and without freedom is preferable to Ireland with freedom and without its language’ (Eamon De Valera, one of the first leaders of Sinn Féin and Prime Minister of the Irish Republic during several periods). Not surprisingly, the maintenance of Irish in Northern Ireland is very much a political issue (cf. Kallen 1994:188 and http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/issues/language).

Despite all efforts, the number of native Irish speakers has continued to decline. By the end of the last millennium there were only a few thousand people left in isolated pockets of Western Ireland, especially in the area known as the Gaeltacht ‘Irish-speaking district’, who still used Irish every day. There are no longer any people who speak only Irish. In the most recent census (2006) about 40 per cent claimed the ability to speak and read Irish, but this is believed to be ‘a level of moderate ability’, such as speaking a few simple sentences, not active use of Irish in conversation (Ó Riagáin 2007:229).

It would appear that this is partly a reflection of a positive attitude or wishful think-
In ordinary Irish life, there are places for the Irish language. Almost all of them are either ceremonial, trivial, or exist only in tandem with English. Bus scrolls, street signs, bits and pieces of advertisements, ... the beginnings and endings of official letters, e.g. the salutation A chara [literally ‘Oh, friend’ but translated as ‘My friend’, ‘Dear Sir’] – then the text of the letter in English – then, at the end, Mise, le meas [(I am) (yours) respectfully], and so on. (Edwards 1984:488)

Nevertheless, Irish is available all over Ireland every day through radio and television. The restoration of Irish as a subject as well as the medium of instruction is actively encouraged officially at all levels of education. The University of Galway, for example, is an all-Irish seat of learning.

Irish belongs to the q-Celtic group of Celtic languages (cf. 4.2.2.1), and is thus closely related to Scottish Gaelic. The Irish substratum pervades the English language as spoken in Ireland at all levels of language, most markedly in grammar and discourse.

4.4.2.2 Varieties of English in Ireland

As can be deduced from the account in the previous section, the history of English in Ireland is characterised by a high degree of discontinuity and regional variability. This has resulted in a rich and somewhat confusing terminology denoting minor and major varieties of Irish English (IrE). It is particularly confusing since some of the terms seem to be used synonymously. The following terms are found in the literature: Yo1a, Planter English, Anglo-Irish, Ulster Scots (‘Ullans’) (cf. 4.3), Hiberno-English, Irish English.

Yo1a (derived from Old English, especially West Saxon yald ‘old’) refers to the old, first form of English spoken in Ireland that survived in pockets, especially in Wexford, until the nineteenth century.

Planter English is sometimes used to denote one of the two main traditions of English in Ireland, the other being Hiberno-English. It refers to language varieties descended from the varieties spoken by the founding populations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and is represented by two varieties, namely Anglo-Irish and Ulster Scots.

Anglo-Irish is descended from the English brought to Ireland by planters, that is settlers, from England, modified by contacts with Irish, Ulster Scots and Hiberno-English. It is socially and regionally variable; a well-known characteristic variety is, for example, the dialect of Kerry in the south-west. Kerrymen are stereotypically viewed as ‘different’ and subject to so-called ‘Kerryman jokes’ (the same kind of silly jokes featuring in ‘Irish jokes’ in other parts of the British Isles). Anglo-Irish is sometimes used as a generic term for ‘English as used in Ireland’, which is not much appreciated.

Ulster Scots is a variety of Scots/SSE spoken mainly in the counties of Antrim, Donegal and Down, thus not throughout Northern Ireland although its influence is noticeable in the entire region and beyond. As in Scotland, there is a linguistic continuum, relating to social as well as regional factors.
Hiberno-English, in contrast with Planter English, is a range of English spoken by people whose ancestral mother tongue was Irish, that is a kind of counterpart to Highland English in Scotland. This is a “grafted English”, at one and the same time comprehensible to other speakers of English and yet still in communication with the Gaelic language that was the mother tongue of its speakers’ ancestors (Todd 2000:71). It preserves certain Gaelic features at all levels of language. Confusingly, this term, too, is sometimes used as a generic term.

Irish English is a neutral, generic term, simply referring to English as used in Ireland. This is the term we generally use in our descriptive account which, especially in the phonological section, sometimes makes distinctions between Southern Irish English (SIrE) and Northern Irish English (NIrE).

4.4.3 Irish English (IrE) – a descriptive account

A ‘shortlist’ of particularly salient features:

● the LOT, THOUGHT, NORTH, and FORCE vowels are normally unrounded [a, ɑ]
● /l/ is clear in all positions;
● in SIrE dental stops /t, d/ often replace the fricatives, as in think, thirty
● in SIrE post- and intervocalic /s/ may have a quality almost like [ʃ] or [ts]
● NIrE is most easily distinguished on account of its intonation: ‘a rise is the un-marked tone not only for questions but also for statements and commands’ (Wells 1982:447). In one of her autobiographical works, the actress Shirley MacLaine describes a meeting with a man from Northern Ireland, who confused her by ‘asking questions all the time’
● the ‘hot-news’ perfect, indicating a recently performed action, expressed through after + -ing, as in We’re after booking our holidays
● the non-use of you and we; that is the answer to a question such as Are you thirsty? will be I am
● it-clefting constructions, such as It’s staying in the hotel you are.

4.4.3.1 Phonology

In the following description, distinctions are often apparent between NIrE and SIrE, which, at least according to phonological criteria, belong to two different ‘types’ of inner-circle varieties (cf. 3.2.2). Since neither accent can be classified as ‘English-based’, it makes sense to make comparisons with General American as well as Received Pronunciation. The latter accent, according to Wells (1982:418), is ‘in no way taken as an unquestioned norm of good pronunciation’ in Ireland. The vowel system of SIrE, in fact, shows close correspondence in quality with the vowel system of Irish.

IrE is firmly rhotic, but unlike some other rhotic accents of English, it has a wide range of vowel oppositions in pre-r positions, as seen from NURSE [a], NEAR [e], SQUARE [ɛ] and so on. In Dublin speech, NURSE and SQUARE are often merged, as in Scouse (cf. 4.1.5.1), and there is often hypercorrection. A recent British Prime Minister was, for example, often referred to as Mr [blæz].
As mentioned among the salient features, LOT tends to be unrounded, with a socially variable degree of fronting, sometimes approximating to TRAP. This is illustrated by the following anecdotal evidence from a quiz show:

In answer to the question ‘Which breed of dogs is particularly well known for hunting rats?’, a participant immediately came up with *rottweiler* ([ˈroʊtveɪlər]) instead of the expected *terrier*. (Mícheál Ó Flaithearta, personal communication)

STRUT is often centralised, to the degree of [ə]. In ‘popular’ Dublin accents FOOT and STRUT are unsplit, as in the north of England. In parts of the west of Ireland, KIT and DRESS have merged, with a varying degree of closeness: The word *vet*, for example, may be realised as [vɪt] (cf. the motto for the New Zealand presentation in 4.8).

Some FLEECE words, namely those spelt with <ea>, have retained the more ‘historical’ [e:], for example *must*, *peak*. Since FACE also has [e:], the following rhyme produced by Alexander Pope in the early eighteenth century would be perfectly possible in Ireland today, thus demonstrating the extremely traditional character of SIrE, a ‘Type I’ accent (3.2.2):

Here thou, great ANNA! whom three realms obey,
Dost sometimes counsel take – and sometimes Tea.

BATH and PALM may be identical, but there is a great deal of social and regional variation here. On the whole, ‘the opposition /æ–ʊ/ carries a low functional load’ (Wells 1982:421), which includes TRAP as well. Most Irishmen, with the exception of ‘sophisticated middle-class Dubliners’, pronounce both *aunt* and *ant* as [ənt]. A well-known stereotype of SIrE, often represented in fictional dialogue, is the realisation of PRICE as [ɔ]. In actual fact, there is (recessive) absence of the PRICE–CHOICE opposition, but the quality of the diphthong is extremely variable. KIT and schwa have merged into [ə] in weak checked syllables, making *abbot* rhyme with *rabbit* (Wells 1982:427).

With regard to consonants, the characteristic dental stops were mentioned among the salient features. Thus *tin* and *thin*, *tree* and *three*, may be homophonous, but there are also hypercorrections, that is replacements of stops by fricatives (cf. for example, the written representation of *trust* as <thrust>).

The existence of the salient *slit fricative* is a substratum effect; all Celtic languages display a kind of rule-governed ‘weakening’ of consonants (lenition). An example of this is seen in the Irish phrase *A Chara*, mentioned in 4.4.2.1, where the vocative *A* causes lenition; *chara* is the lenited form of *cara*.

IRe has clear /l/ and is firmly rhotic. /r/ is usually a postalveolar approximant before stressed vowels, but retroflex inter- and postvocally. There is no h dropping and initial [hw] is generally retained. A recessive feature, well known as an Irish stereotype, is the use of [ʃ] and [ʃ] instead of [s] and [z]. In the play *The Irish Masque at Court* (1611), Ben Jonson wrote <faish> for ‘face’ and <sherve> for ‘serve’.

IRe is further characterised by schwa epenthesis, as in *Dublin* ([ˈdʌblən], *kaɪlən*).
The inner circle

['kætəli:n]. Like ScotE, IrE has certain word stress patterns that differ from RP (in
-ise verbs, for example), but there are few categorical differences and a great deal of
variability. The intonation of ShE is RP-like.

A comparison between the realisations of the lexical sets of NIrE and those of
ScotE tells us that there is striking similarity: there are hardly any phonemic vowel-
length distinctions. The Scottish Vowel Length Rule (SVLR) also applies to some
extent.

With regard to vowel quality, there is enormous variation in NIrE, conditioned
by social class, region and allegiance as well as style and phonetic environment. This
variation is also extremely well researched (cf., for example L. Milroy 1980, J. Milroy
1981, Harris 1984, McCafferty 2007). Here we have to limit ourselves to a few
points:

● /u/ tends to be virtually unrounded and centralised
● MOUTH words have a characteristic pronunciation, which can be perceived as the
  PRICE diphthong by outsiders
● in the north (for example Coleraine) and Belfast, /ɛ/ and /ə/ are often neutralised
  before or after a velar consonant, making brisk and kettie-cattle homophonous
● the consonants are, on the whole, quite similar to those of ShE, but the dental
  sounds are firmly fricative. Although /r/ is generally a retroflex approximant, trilled
  r’s can still be heard in rural areas. /U/ is generally clear, but in Belfast dark /U/ of the
  Scots/SSE type is often heard.

The characteristic intonation described above can be heard in the recording of the
Northern Irish informant.

4.4.3.2 Grammar

The following presentation relies heavily on data and analysis from Harris 1993 and
Filppula 2008, describing nonstandard grammatical characteristics of IrE usage. As we
have seen, IrE phonology, especially in the south, is very conservative; the same can be
said about its grammar.

Like ScotE, IrE has unmarked plurality in nouns indicating measure, time, etc. (two
mile, five year). Another similarity is the use of ‘three-dimensional’ deictic systems: thi/that/yon (thon).

IrE makes an explicit distinction between singular you/ye and plural youse (also
found in other varieties, such as AusE and AmE). This is exemplified in passing in
3.1.2. Below follows a more telling example, recorded in Belfast for a project led by
Lesley Milroy.

So I said to our Jill and our Mary: “Youse wash the dishes.” I might as well have said: “You wash the dishes”,
for our Jill just got up and put her coat on and went out. (cf. Harris 1993:146)

Another characteristic of IrE is ‘nominalisation’, that is giving a word or phrase a
noun-like status which it does not generally have, as in If I had the doing of it again, I’d do it
different. (“If I could do it again, I’d do it differently”). This is no doubt related to the
Irish substratum; Gaelic is an extremely 'noun-centred' language (Todd 2000:86, 92).

With reference to the very characteristic 'hot-news' perfect, the use of after is also found in noun phrases such as *I'm only after my dinner* (I've just had my dinner'). These constructions are borrowings from Irish. Another feature relating to the tense system has to do with the description of a situation in the past and persisting into the present, as in Standard English *How long have you been here?* In IrE, as in Irish but also Germanic languages such as German and Dutch, the present tense is used in this case rather than the perfect, as illustrated in the example quoted in 3.1.2.

'Habitual be' is found in IrE, varying in form between be/be's (southern) and do/ does do (northern). There is thus a contrast between *He's sick now* (nonhabitual) and *He's sick often* (habitual). With verbs other than be, the habitual is formed by do plus an infinitive (Harris 1995:162). There are similar constructions in Irish, like ScotE. IrE often uses continuous forms of stative verbs (*I was knowing your face*, as also in Indian English, cf. 5.3.2.3).

A very striking feature is the tendency to represent the logical subject of a sentence by a noun phrase governed by a preposition, as in *The money is with them* 'They have plenty of money' or *There's great humour to him* 'He's very humorous'. It-clefting, as exemplified in the list of salient features, is a characteristic fronting device in discourse. Another focusing device is the use of sentence tags initiated by so as in *It's raining, so it is.*

### 4.4.3.3 Lexicon

The rich vocabulary of IrE stems from three sources: English, Scots and Irish. Many of the English metaphors, idioms and proverbs reflect the semantics of Irish (Todd 2000:88).

Irish words, which should perhaps be referred to as retentions rather than borrowings, are found particularly in the areas of culture, for example *banshee* 'fairy woman' and *cairn* 'sacred stone mound', rural life, for example *creel* 'basket', *culchie* 'someone from the back of beyond'; food, for example *bannock* 'homemade bread cake' (also found in ScotE) and social interaction, for example *ceili* 'evening visit' and *shannach* 'comfortable gossip'.

Considering the 'discontinuous' history of English in Ireland, it is not surprising that the words of 'Planter English' reflect various periods of time. As late as 1990, Todd recorded words in Donegal no longer used in other parts of the English-speaking world, many of which were known and used by Shakespeare and his contemporaries (Todd 2000:64f). 'Retained' words typically include vocabulary denoting people's character and behaviour (cf. Shetland vocabulary as described in 4.3.3.4): *atomy* 'small, insignificant person', *craudtherp* 'person who is overly religious', *mitch* 'play truant'.

A number of words that look like ordinary General English words have different meanings, such as *backward* 'shy', *thick-witted* 'stubborn', *doubt* 'believe' (also found in Scots). Not surprisingly, NiE shares a great deal of its lexicon with Scots/SSE. Scots words are experiencing something of a renaissance (cf. the Concise Ulster Dictionary (Macafee 1996)). The many dialect words of French origin in IrE are further
proof of the link with Scotland, where there is a considerable French element in Scots/SSE. Some examples of French borrowings: ashe ‘large plate’, brave ‘fine’, dishabès ‘night attire’.

In NIrE, according to Todd (1989:141, 347), Catholic speakers tend to prefer words and expressions derived from Irish, whereas Protestants use more Scots-based vocabulary.

4.4.4 Further reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the main function of the Irish language in Ireland today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Try to identify IrE features in the following fictional representation by Rudyard Kipling:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Army’s mate and drink to me bekaze I’m wan av the few that can’t quit ut. I’ve put in sixteen years…Bein’ what I am, I’m Privat Mulvaney, wid no good-conduc’ pay an’ a devoun’ thirst.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(The Taking of Lungtungpen</em>, <em>Plain Tales from the Hills</em> 1888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “The dental sounds are still firmly fricative” in the north. What does this mean and why is it so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Try to identify IrE features in the following piece of informal writing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wel hello there!!! ya was jus tinkn da oder day dat i havnt seen ya n ages!! feel lik i havnt talkd n years!!! so how are ya neway???....wat ya ben getn up ta ova da last few weeks??? dnt hav much craic 4ya</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 The USA

During the administration of President Jimmy Carter, a Georgian with a local Georgian accent, a popular American television program had a character representing a state department official, who spoke conspicuously like a Georgian. When a New Yorker next to him called attention to his Georgian accent, he replied, ‘We don’t have an accent any more. You do.’


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● What is the significance of the motto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Why is there less variety of accent in the west than in the east?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Listen to online recordings 8 and 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.1 An introductory note

The USA occupies a special position among the inner-circle countries in that it has by far the greatest number of first-language users of English. Like EngE, American English (AmE) is also a ‘reference variety’ and increasingly used as a model in teaching English as a foreign language throughout the world. Its impact on other varieties of English, including EngE, is undisputed (cf. 3.2 for some examples and Chapters 6 and 7 for further discussion).

In view of the worldwide impact of AmE, it may seem paradoxical that English is not legally declared the official language of the USA (it has that status in some 25 of its states, however). As in the UK (cf. 4.1.1), its status is simply taken for granted; it is a de facto if not de jure official language (cf. McArthur 1998:18). About 20 years ago, however, the first steps were taken towards making English the official language in the form of a proposal for a constitutional amendment. This proposal was not accepted by the Senate, but since then two major organisations, US English and English First, have been continuing the efforts. No decision has been taken as yet and there are also a number of groups opposing what they call the English Only movement (cf. Tottie 2002:240 and www.englishfirst.org [accessed 4 February 2011]).

In this section we focus on AmE as a variety in its own right, which means, in particular, that we do not view it so much against EngE as describe internal variation. We refer you to 3.2 and 4.6 for discussions and examples of British–American differences and to Tottie (2002) for a detailed account of this issue.

In view of its role as a ‘reference variety’, we do not highlight salient features for AmE, but include a discussion of the definition of ‘standard’, which is somewhat more problematic than in the case of Standard EngE/RP, at least with regard to phonology (see our motto for this section).

Figure 4.3 The USA
4.5.2 The country and its people

Area: 9,630,000 sq.km
Population: 310 million (of which about 250 million use English as their first language)
Capital: Washington, DC

About 80 per cent of the US population live in metropolitan areas. A telling proof of the thrust of domestic migration westwards is the geographical median for the population which is now near St Louis, Missouri, but was near Philadelphia 200 years ago.

When Europeans began colonising North America in the late fifteenth century, the continent had already been inhabited by humans for more than 10,000 years. It is estimated that the Native Americans numbered about four million at the time of the arrival of Columbus. In AmE, the linguistic heritage of the indigenous population is reflected in masses of place-names, for example Kalamazoo 'boiling pot', Mississippi 'the father of the waters', Tennessee 'winding river' and a number of lexical borrowings, many of which are now not only part of Standard AmE but also of General English, such as moccasin, hickory (KANGAROO words).

Before turning to the coming of the English, we would like to draw your attention to some other important early settlements in North America, which have left considerable traces in language and culture:

- in the early seventeenth century, the Dutch West India Company set up an important trading post along the Hudson River. In 1660 there were about 10,000 inhabitants and a real colony had been established, called Nieuw Nederland. Its capital was Nieuw Amsterdam, which later came to be named New York. The Dutch colony did not survive into the next century, but left its mark on place-names in New York City and all over New York State, such as Brooklyn (named after the Dutch city of Breukelen), Wall Street (from Du. wal, referring to the palesades erected against Indian raiders), Harlem. Lexical borrowings are also plentiful, for example stoop 'small porch' and cookie
- in the late seventeenth century the emergence of a French colony in Louisiana, with its thriving capital, New Orleans. The end of Louisiana as a French colony came in 1803 when it was bought by the US, but the English presence in the area 'came far too late to erase the heavy French influence, which only now is beginning to fade from New Orleans speech' (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998:102). The French element in Louisiana was later reinforced by the immigration of Acadians from Canada (cf. the term Cajun). There is also a variety known as Louisiana Creole, which is largely French-based
- in the late seventeenth century, the Quaker colonisation of Pennsylvania began. It soon attracted large groups of Germans who also came for religious reasons. A variety of German, known as Pennsylvania Dutch, is still spoken in inland Pennsylvania (as in the famous Hollywood film Witness).

The English came to North America in the late sixteenth century. The first permanent settlement was in Virginia, which became a colony in 1609. The best-known early settlement is probably that of the 'Pilgrim Fathers', Puritans opposing the teaching
propagated by the Church of England. In 1620 they sailed on the Mayflower from Plymouth (in England’s West Country) and gave the same name to their place of arrival in Massachusetts.

During the following century, 13 British colonies were founded, all along the east coast. Before the Boston Tea Party leading to the War of Independence, the colonies did not form a union but in 1776, they met in Philadelphia for the Declaration of Independence. In 1783, independence was acknowledged.

During the first half of the nineteenth century the USA expanded westwards, and by 1848 comprised roughly the area corresponding to the contiguous states today.

From the 1830s, massive immigration from Europe took place, beginning with Irish, Scots and German settlers, but later including virtually all nations. Many immigrant groups tended to concentrate in particular areas, such as Scandinavians in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Although the nineteenth and twentieth century immigration happened rather late in the history of the English language, it has resulted in noticeable substratum effects, such as the alleged influence of Italian speech on New York City English (cf. Trudgill 1995:45ff.). Since the 1970s, the majority of immigrants have come from Asia and from South and Central America. Statistics from 2005 show that 14 per cent of the US population were of ‘Hispanic’ origin.

Virtually all parts of the British Isles as well as all walks of life are represented in the English-speaking founder population. In reconstructing the origins and dialects of the Pilgrim Fathers, Wakelin (1986) found that among only three married couples of this little group the following areas were represented: Yorkshire, Lancashire, the Isle of Man, Somerset, Gloucestershire, London.

4.5.3 Regional and social variation in language – an overview

In the USA, as in Canada, it is in the east that we find the richest regional diversity in language. This is clearly related to the time depth of the settlement history; as we have seen, the first colonies were all situated in this part of the country. The mid- and far west, by contrast, was not settled by English speakers until the nineteenth century. The westward migration had a ‘band-like’ character, that is the inhabitants of each colony moved more or less straight in a westerly direction. This explains why dialect boundaries in the USA tend to run horizontally. There is, for example a grey/grey line, north of which the medial consonant is voiceless, and a pail/bucket line, where the first word typifies northern speech. In line with the above, the boundaries tend to break up in the west, however.

It is noteworthy that today’s most distinctive dialects of AmE had already been established by the late eighteenth century. Many of the dialects can be further subdivided (for details, cf. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998:102ff., Tottie 2002:210, and http://us.english.uga.edu [accessed 4 February 2011]). Some detailed information about regional characteristics is included below. The main dialect areas are:

The North

● New England, with Boston as its centre, at least formerly a very prestigious variety, which still shows the greatest affinity with EngE, for example in being non-rhotic
New York, comprising upstate New York with the Dutch-influenced (especially with reference to vocabulary) Hudson Valley area as well as New York City, which could, in fact, also be listed as a dialect region in its own right.

The Midland

There is less agreement as to what constitutes this region; the following reflects a traditionally based division:

- the Philadelphia area (the Delaware Valley)
- the Pittsburgh area (the Upper Ohio Valley)
- part of the inland areas of Virginia, North and South Carolina and Georgia
- a large area across Tennessee and western Arkansas, then spreading further incorporating virtually the whole of the western USA. In more popular, or folk-linguistic, classifications, the accents in this category are considered to be southern, however (cf. Niedzielski and Preston 2000).

The South

- the coastal and some inland areas of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, the ‘Gulf States’, that is Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and (eastern) Texas.

Before turning to a description of some recent work on AmE varieties, exclusively based on phonological criteria, we would like to comment on the popular belief that in some relic areas of the USA, notably in the Appalachians, people still 'speak like Shakespeare'. Although it is certainly true that a) AmE in general has undergone less phonological innovation than spoken EngE and b) a great many traditional dialect features are still used in certain remote areas, the whole concept of surviving Elizabethan varieties is a linguistic myth. Yet it is not without significance, since it has played a part in marking identity and taking pride in local dialect (Montgomery 1998).

Increasingly, dialect surveys tend to be based on phonological systems rather than isolated lexical items such as pail vs bucket or unsystematic phonetic details. This new type of survey is very much connected with the work of William Labov, who is particularly interested in vowel systems (cf. Labov 1994). In agreement with the preceding dialect divisions, he determined that there were three major dialect areas in the USA: Southern, Midland (comprising more than half of the nation and typically having the LOT/THOUGHT merger) and Northern (or rather ‘Northern Cities’, chain shift in the vowel system). According to Labov, the regions are diverging rather than converging. He has suggested that four main dialect areas may now be distinguished: North, Midland, South and West (cf. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998: 120ff. and http://www.ling.upenn.edu/phono_atlas/ICSLP4.html [accessed 4 February 2011] for more detailed information about the chain shift and Labov’s description of current dialect diversity in North America). A brief account of the chain shifts is also given in 4.5.6.1 below.
The USA, like the UK, is characterised by a high degree of social stratification. Through the pioneering work conducted by Labov and his research group in Philadelphia since the 1960s, a great deal is now known about the relationship between social class and the use of linguistic, often regionally based, features, about mechanisms of language change, and about the role of other factors such as gender and ethnicity. We now turn to a brief account of two important ethnic varieties in American English, regarded as 'varieties in their own right'.

4.5.4 Two ethnic varieties

4.5.4.1 African American Vernacular English (AAVE)

This variety, which used to be referred to as Black Vernacular English, can be characterised as a social as well as regional variety, which in popular usage has been referred to as Ebonics (cf. 7.1). This is a political rather than a linguistic term; it was introduced in the 1970s to highlight the African origin of the variety and became widely known during a heated debate in the mid-1990s on the legitimacy of the variety in a school setting (cf. Tottie 2002:239 for a report on the 'Oakland debate').

As the name suggests, AAVE is used by the black population of the USA, but not by all and to a varying degree; in other words, there is continuous variation according to social class, style and region. Characteristic age differences also emerge in that young speakers tend to use more AAVE features than older speakers for the purpose of marking identity.

During the last few decades, an enormous amount of research has been devoted to AAVE; yet there is no definitive agreement as to its origin. The three most common theories are: 1) it is a creole language, a native-speaker variety descended from a pidgin; 2) it is a dialect of English based on the varieties the slaves learnt from their masters, which explains its many Southern features; 3) it is derived from West African languages (cf. the definition of Ebonics above). Trudgill (1993:59f) identifies AAVE as ‘a separate ethnic-group variety which identifies its speakers as black rather than white’ and sees no problem in combining 1) and 2) above in speculating about the origin of the variety. (For further information on AAVE cf. Mufwene et al. 1998.) Without further comment, we have chosen the following brief extract from Alice Walker’s The Color Purple to illustrate some characteristic features of AAVE, many of which are also found in other nonstandard varieties of English.

He came home with a girl from round Gray. She be my age but they married. He be on her all the time. She walk round like she don’t know what hit her. I think she thought she love him. But he got so many of us. All needing somethin.

My little sister Nettie is got a boyfriend in the same shape almost as Pa. His wife died. She was kilt by her boyfriend coming home from church. He got only three children though. He seen Nettie in church and now every Sunday evening here come Mr. ... I tell Nettie to keep at her books. It be more than a notion taking care of children ain’t even yours. And look what happen to Ma.
4.5.4.2 Chicano English

This variety is spoken by descendants of Hispanics from Mexico (the word Chicano is derived from Mexicano). In contrast with other names of varieties arisen from Spanish–English contacts, such as 'Tex-Mex', 'Spanglish' and 'englónil', it is well defined (see also the account of Puerto Rico in 5.6.2). It should be regarded as a systematic form of speech acquired from childhood; its speakers are not only people who know both English and Spanish but also those who know no Spanish at all but are members of a Hispanic community of Mexican origin (for example in east Los Angeles). Speakers of Chicano English are known to codeswitch a great deal, shifting to a more standard variety when speaking to non-Chicanos.

Unlike AAVE, its characteristic features are virtually restricted to phonology; its syntax and morphology approximate to Standard English. Among its characteristics are: /ʃ/-/tʃ/ neutralisation to the effect that /ʃ/ is used exclusively; general devoicing of /z/; devoicing of /v/ in final position; dental stops instead of fricatives. (For an exhaustive treatment of Chicano English, cf. Bayley and Santa Ana 2008.)

4.5.5 Standard American English/General American – a 'reference variety'

The codification of American English begun by Noah Webster in 1789 was mentioned in 5.2.1. In 1828 he published An American Dictionary of the English Language, the American counterpart to Johnson’s dictionary, Webster’s dictionary, which is larger than Johnson’s by about a third, not only lists lexical items but also gives advice as to usage, suggests new, ‘American’ spellings, such as fibre, defense, color, and gives guidance as to pronunciation.

The codified American Standard variety is maintained and updated through the publication of dictionaries such as the American Heritage Dictionary. The Longman Pronunciation Dictionary (Wells 2008) is very reliable for AmE as well as EngE ‘standard pronunciations’. Yet, as our motto suggests, the concept of standard in the USA is not so easily defined, especially with regard to pronunciation, but also to vocabulary:

Classifications of standardness will ... be somewhat flexible with respect to the regional variety being judged. Thus, the r-less pronunciations which characterize Eastern New England or Southeastern American pronunciation (as in cat for car or hoot for hour) may be judged as standard English, as will the r-ful pronunciations that characterize certain other dialects. And people may be judged as standard English speakers whether they go to the beach, go to the shore, or go to the ocean for a summer vacation. ... there are regional standards which are recognized within the broad and informal notion of standard American English ... For the most part, Americans do not assign strong positive, or prestige, value to any particular native American English dialect. (Wolfram and Schilling Estes 1998:11f)

The term General American used throughout this book, referring to American accents without a great deal of regional colouring, is seldom used by Americans — linguists included — who prefer ‘Network English/Standard’. In comparing RP and ‘Network English’, Lesley Milroy (1999:174) points out that these accents are ‘horses of a
very different colour’. Whereas Network English is a majority accent, whose speakers describe themselves and are described by others as having no accent, ‘RP is saliently marked for class and in no sense is nor ever has been a mainstream accent’.

4.5.6 American English (AmE) – a descriptive account with special reference to regional variation in phonology

4.5.6.1 Phonology

Wells’ lexical sets as realised in General American (GA) were shown in 3.2.2. In the following brief description of regional variation, GA is contrasted with accents representing New England, New York City and the south. The third major dialect area, Midland, is not represented, since it is largely identical to General American. The data is based on Wells’ (1982), largely disregarding some variation in vowel quality due to phonetic environment. Note, for example, that the shifting quality of pre-<r> vowels in the South is related to variable rhoticity.

New York City

Note particularly the variable rhoticity, the quality of NURSE, the variability along the open-close dimension in TRAP and BATH, the CLOTH–THOUGHT merger and the realisations of the dental fricatives as affricates or stops.

Traditionally, New York City has been a nonrhotic accent, but it is now variably so. Non-prevocalic /r/ has become a socially significant variable, carefully investigated by Labov in his famous *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (Labov 1966). The results show that rhoticity is a prestige marker but also that there is great variability according to age and style. Nonrhotic New York City accents characteristically have linking and intrusive /t/, and sometimes add /t/ at the end of any word ending in a vowel.

A well-known but somewhat stereotypical New York City feature is the CHOICE-like quality of NURSE, as in the popular representation of thirty-third as toity-toid. Although this feature is said to be recessive, it can still be heard, at least in stage performances, such as in *West Side Story*. There are also hypercorrections as in *oat* for *oil*.

The quality of TRAP and BATH was also investigated by Labov, who recorded a spectrum of variants, from fairly open (more prestigious) to very close [æ]: this is what Trudgill (1995:46) has in mind when he talks about the ‘beard-like’ quality of bad ascribed to the Italian substratum. Varying degree of closeness in CLOTH and THOUGHT, on the other hand, is not seen as socially significant. This variability, conducive to change, is now seen as part of the major vowel shift known as ‘the northern cities chain shift’.

New England

Traditionally, this area shares many of its characteristic features with EngE, but the impact of General American is increasing. We have already (4.5.1) mentioned the nonrhoticity found particularly in the Boston area. As in New York City, linking as well as intrusive /t/ occurs, also in ‘end positions’ such as Cuba [ˈkjubɔɹ] (as once pronounced by John Kennedy, a famous Bostonian).
The linguistic South comprises a very large area, and the uniformity of its speech must not be exaggerated. Nevertheless, it is possible to list some particularly salient features that will apply to most areas, such as the tendency towards particularly marked differences in length between stressed and unstressed syllables, caricatured in *Urp Europe*, *fern* 'foreign', *Prezdet* 'President' (*The Jimmy Carter Dictionary*). This is popularly known as 'the southern drawl'. A contributing factor in the perception of the drawl is the fact that many vowels tend to have diphthongal off-glide, making, for example, *egg* rhyme with *vague* (cf. Wells 1982:515).

Another striking feature is the PRICE monophthong [aː]. In representing a southern accent the English writer Kingsley Amis wrote *Ah, Apollo jars for 'I apologise'* (quoted from Wells 1982:529). *TRAP* and *BATH* may be realised as diphthongs, which is the case in certain regions and to some extent dependent on the following consonant. This is caricatured in Jimmy Carter's Georgian accent as *glade* for 'glad'. In many southern dialects, *KIT* and *DRESS* tend to merge before nasal sounds, making for example *pin* and *pen* homophones (usually realised as [pɪn]).

Nonrhoticity is found in the South as well as New England. Some areas, however, such as the early settlements in Tidewater Virginia, are *r-ful* (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998:97) as are certain mountain areas. From a social point of view, nonrhoticity, interestingly, is associated with two quite distinct social groups, namely upper-class white people and black people (cf. Wells 1982:542). It is worth pointing out that nonrhoticity is not connected with low prestige as it can be in New York City. Southern accents tend not to have *r-liaison*, that is neither linking nor intrusive /r/.

Dramatic shifts are taking place in American vowel systems as studied by Labov and his research group and documented at www.ling.upenn.edu/phono_atlas/ICSLP4.html [accessed 4 February 2011].

The Northern Cities shift, which is based on evidence from recordings from Chicago, Detroit, Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse, begins with the raising and fronting of TRAP followed by the fronting of LOT (which moves into the position that TRAP used to have). THOUGHT, STRUT and DRESS then follow suit, that is taking the positions of LOT, THOUGHT and STRUT, respectively. KIT is lowered and centralised.

The southern shift is more complicated and the temporal sequences are not as well established. In his description, Labov begins by describing the monophthongisation of PRICE (see the lexical sets above). This has probably brought about the lowering of FACE, which in turn has triggered a similar movement of FLEECE. The most dramatic part of the southern shift is perhaps the remarkable fronting of GOOSE and THOUGHT.
4.5.6.2 Grammar

Regional, nonstandard AmE grammar shares most of the features described in the corresponding EngE section, such as unmarked plurality, multiple negation and a simplified verb agreement system. In the short extract from *The Color Purple* above, illustrating AAVE, some of these features are exemplified, as is also 'copula deletion' and 'invariant be'. Note also the nonstandard pronominal form 'yourn'.

The characteristic historically-based 'a-prefixing' verb forms indicating continuous action are still used in Appalachian English, for example *he was a-holding three dogs*. Here we also find double modals as in *I might could go* (a feature of Scots/SSE too, as described in 4.3.3.3). Another regional feature, typically found in parts of Pennsylvania and Ohio (and also in Scotland), is the preference for constructions like *my hair needs combed* instead of *needs combing*.

As in IrE, varieties of AmE have special second person plural forms, such as *yous(e)*. In the south, *you all* or *y'all* is the most frequent form, *you'uns* is found in the Pittsburgh area, and in informal English generally expressions like *you guys*, *you people* are used.

A well-known, but recessive, feature of regional AmE is so-called 'positive anymore', as in *Thy watch a lot of videos anymore*, meaning 'nowadays', 'currently' (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998:142). This usage is typically found in the Midland area.

4.5.6.3 Lexicon

In 3.2.1.2 a number of examples were given illustrating characteristics of AmE vocabulary, especially as contrasted with EngE. Here we will restrict ourselves to making a few comments on regional and nonstandard lexical variation. There is no point in producing some kind of random listing.

Regional AmE vocabulary is extremely well documented in the monumental *Dictionary of American Regional English (DARE)*. Items to be included in the dictionary were elicited by means of a questionnaire in which 41 different categories of lexical difference are outlined, such as food, animals and furniture, but also physical states and emotions.

According to Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (1998:60ff.), 'the number of dialectally sensitive words runs well into the thousands'. Based on their own research experience they suggest some sets of lexical items reflecting cross-dialectal vocabulary differences and illustrating broadening, narrowing and lexical innovation. These are some of their examples:

- *faucet/spigot/tap* ‘a device with a valve for regulating the flow of a liquid’;
- *Snap beans/string beans/green beans* ‘a type of vegetable with a stringy fiber on the pods’;
- *Earth worm/angleworm/fishing worm/nighcrawler* ‘a type of worm used in fishing’.

A great deal of dialect research in the USA has been devoted to lexical mapping, whereby isoglosses such as the *pail/bucket* line were determined. An excellent work of this kind is Carver (1987), using 800 lexical items from DARE. Although linguists often
claim that lexical differences are not very useful indicators of dialect areas. Carver’s findings support not only boundaries established in cultural geography but also phonological distribution patterns.

4.5.7 Further reading

Review questions
1. Read the following text from ‘When there’s an R in the mouth’ (English Today 6 1986). What does it tell us about accents of English in Britain, New England, New York and the South? Is the writer British or American?
To a Londoner, the strawbreez at Wimbeldon ah verry good with clotted cream…
We all know the American Cantahrian [from Cambridge, Mass., outside Boston], who packs his ca near Havwad Squayah…
When I lived in my native heath, Brooklyn, I vose only on Satiday mawning, put el in my cab — not the same as the New Englanders’s ca — and drove to the synagogue on Pennsylvaniav-Avenue to hear the vahi’s soimon…
Schalett, my friend with the raid haia, says the was bawn in Jawja…

2. What characteristic linguistic features can you find in the AAVE text in 4.5.4.1?

3. If you can find a speaker of American English (native or otherwise) ask about regional variation in terms like faucet/spigot/tap or terms for types of sandwich like hoagie/submarine.

4. Identify any features of American English in the following informal text.

hey taylor, hows things going for you? im pretty much bored out of my mind here. theres not much to do around here. hows your summer been. i dont do anything but play baseball pretty much everyday. i just got home from a game and its almost midnight here. ne wayz i really dont get on here much ne more. i have been on about twice in the last 5 weeks just cuz a lot of people have decided to leave me comments. well ne wayz im gonna go to bed now since i just threw 147 pitches tonight and im really tired, but ill 2u8b, bye. l8r g8r. luv yas. later babe.
4.6 Canada

Oot and aboot

Focus questions:
- What is the status of French in Canada?
- What varieties of English constitute the base of Canadian English?
- Why is spelling more of an issue in Canada than in other English-speaking countries?
- Listen to online recordings 10–12.

4.6.1 The country and its settlement history

Area: 9,984,670 sq km
Population: About 32 million (of which, according to the 2006 census, well over 58 per cent have English as their first language and about 22 per cent French)
Capital: Ottawa

With its almost 10 million square kilometres, Canada is the second largest country in the world. Its population is unevenly distributed: more than half of its inhabitants live in a relatively small area near the Great Lakes and the St Lawrence River, that is, in the southern parts of Ontario and Quebec. Canadian society is highly urbanised; three-quarters of the population live in cities.
The name 'Canada' is derived from the indigenous Iroquois Indian word 'kanata' 'village', 'settlement'. It was taken up in the sixteenth century by the first French explorers. When British exploration and settlement on a large scale began somewhat later, conflicts naturally arose between British and French interests. In 1763 the French were forced to cede all their North American colonies to Britain with the exception of the small islands of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon south-west of Newfoundland, which still belong to France. French colonists were expelled from Acadia/Nova Scotia and many moved to French Louisiana in what is now the USA (where the word Acadian was anglicised to Cajun), but in Quebec they remained and continued to use the French language, legal system and so on.

Although there were some earlier settlements, for example in Newfoundland, the English-speaking founder population of Canada can mainly be related to two significant waves of immigration in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries:

- the base of Canadian English is derived from a large group of pro-British 'loyalists' who left the USA for Canada after the War of Independence. To begin with, they came from coastal New England and settled on the Canadian coast, but later some of these incomers moved into Ontario and Quebec. Other groups came from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York and Vermont, settling in areas around the Great Lakes.
- in the early nineteenth century, in connection with the 1812–14 war with the USA, large groups of immigrants (more than doubling the population) were – for political reasons – recruited from Britain and Ireland 'to dilute the broad base of American ancestry' (Chambers 1998:xi). Another massive input from English- or Gaelic-speaking countries, especially Scotland and Ireland, came in the 1850s.

From the mid-nineteenth century to the late 1970s, general immigration on a large scale was encouraged by the Canadian Government. Canada has, in fact, been one of the world’s main immigrant-receiving societies (cf. http://atlas.nrcan.gc.ca/auth/english/maps/peopleandsociety/immigration/FF [accessed 4 February 2011] for the latest census figures) and has an official policy of 'multiculturalism' based on the ideology that the best way of catering for the demographic diversity is to view it as a 'mosaic' rather than a 'melting-pot'. In other words, people of diverse origins and communities are free to preserve and enhance their cultural heritage while participating as equal partners in Canadian society.

4.6.2 Canada as a linguistic area

Before turning to a detailed description of Canadian English (CanE), we give a brief general overview of some demographically and culturally-based aspects of the language situation in Canada.

4.6.2.1 Multilingualism, with special reference to French–English bilingualism

The Canadian government’s support of multiculturalism naturally includes a celebration and promotion of multilingualism, that is 'the ability to speak, at some level,
more than one language'. This policy is clearly implemented in the media and in education, especially in immersion schools, where the second language is the medium of instruction in all subjects and encouraged in free periods as well.

At the federal level, Canada has two official languages: English, which is the mother tongue of almost 60 per cent of the population (the anglophones), and French, with about 22 per cent native speakers (the francophones). This means that the two languages enjoy equal status in all federal departments, judicial bodies and administrative agencies. At the provincial level, New Brunswick is officially bilingual and Quebec monolingual French. This is not to say that any provinces are opposed to the idea of 'institutional bilingualism' (the obligation and capacity of state institutions to operate in two languages). At the grass-roots level, Canadian bilingualism is characterised by fluctuation rather than stability (Chambers 1991:95ff).

4.6.2.2 Conflicting norms and standards in anglophone Canada

In his presentation of Canadian phonology, Wells (1982:496) accounts for examples of hypercorrection not heard anywhere else in the English-speaking world: words such as *moon*, *noon*, *too* are pronounced with */-ju/*, that is mistakenly adhering to a perceived British norm without yod dropping. This is clearly symptomatic of the conflicting British and American norms and standards that characterise CanE, not only with regard to phonology but also spelling, vocabulary and, to some extent, grammar.

As a result of different settlement histories, there are regional differences: the Prairie provinces, for example, are clearly more American than Ontario, which is reflected, among other things, in spelling preferences among schoolchildren (Ireland 1979). The word *colour*, for example, was spelt with -*our* by more than 85 per cent of Ireland’s informants in Ontario, but only by 30 per cent of those in Alberta. ‘These double standards are the linguistic legacy of the first two immigrations in our history’ (Chambers 1998:264).

A less obvious but equally important reason for the existence of double, even conflicting, standards is of an attitudinal rather than regional character. Until fairly recently, it has been fashionable to imitate British, or rather EngE, speech as well as manners. The hypercorrect pronunciation of *moon* highlights this fashion. However, according to Chambers (1998:264), ‘the Anglo-Canadian gentlefolk have become relics, along with the Union Jack, the British Commonwealth and “God Save the Queen”’.

In part, the marked pro-British preferences had to do with anti-American attitudes. A widely used interdisciplinary academic textbook in ‘Canadian studies’ courses has the telling title *A Passion for Identity*. In particular, this passion has sprung from a need for establishing an identity clearly distinct from the USA.

The importance of the need for a marked Canadian identity vis-à-vis the southern neighbour is discussed in the article ‘The demise of the Canadianism “chestsfield”’ (Chambers 1994). It is suggested that the ‘demise’ of this word (as used in a generic sense) together with another well-known Canadianism, the so-called ‘Canadian raising’ in words such as *knife* and *house* (cf. below), is clearly related to more relaxed attitudes to the USA, especially after the free trade agreements in the
1980s (see also a more recent, detailed study of this phenomenon with the telling title "Canadian Dainty": the rise and decline of Briticisms in Canada' (Chambers 2004). The monumental Canadian Oxford Dictionary (1998) reflects current variability in CanE, which, according to Chambers (1998:269), 'admits more pronunciation and vocabulary variants than other English varieties' (this claim obviously refers to standard varieties only).

4.6.2.3 Regional diversity
As in the USA, the vast expanses in the west are indeed fairly homogeneous, whereas the eastern provinces where English first arrived are remarkably rich in dialects. The most distinctive region ethnographically as well as linguistically is Newfoundland. An important reason for its distinctiveness is that it simply has the longest history of the English-speaking communities. It is Britain's oldest transatlantic colony as well as Canada's newest province (1949). Other reasons are its special living conditions and ways of life, and the sizeable groups of early English-speaking immigrants from linguistically distinctive areas such as Devon, Cornwall, Scotland and Ireland. The typology based on A Handbook of Varieties of English (cf. Kortmann 2004) reveals that Newfoundland English displays 'one of the greatest ranges of internal variation in pronunciation of any global variety of English' (Clarke 2010:1).

It is no coincidence that another island-based speech community, namely Prince Edward Island, is also regionally distinctive (cf. the Dictionary of Prince Edward Island English (Pratt 1988)). There are many other interesting enclave varieties, such as the well-known German-influenced dialect of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia (cf. 4.6.3.2), and those founded by Scottish and Irish settlers in other Atlantic provinces and the Ottawa River Valley. In other areas, rural dialects reflect input from settlements representing various language groups: Ukrainian, Italian, Dutch, Scandinavian and, of course, French. These are largely unstudied, but the current Dialect Topography project is remediying this shortcoming quite rapidly and results are continuously shown on the website of the Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto: http://dialect.topography.chass.utoronto.ca/ [accessed 4 February 2011].

4.6.3 Canadian English – a descriptive account
A shortlist of particularly salient features:

- Canadian raising, a feature found in the lexical sets PRICE and MOUTH, so called because the starting-point of the diphthongs /au/ and /ou/ is raised, that is closer, than in the reference accents when followed by voiceless consonants, as in out, house, knife, night, but consequently not in loud, houses, knives, ride and so on. The motto for the section on Canada in this book is a stereotypical American representation of Canadian raising. Although the stereotype demonstrates awareness of a characteristic feature, its representation is not very satisfactory; in phonetic transcription the diphthongs are generally rendered as [æ] and [ʌ]. As indicated in 4.6.2.2 it may be recessive. Instructive examples can be listened to on the website www.yorku.ca/twainweb/troberts/raising.html [accessed 4 February 2011]
the use of the tag *eh* – another well-known Canadian stereotype; in fact, there is even a linguistic textbook called *CanEan, Eh*? (Orkin 1997). Although this tag is not uncommon in many other varieties, such as, for example, Scots, it is more frequent and has an extended function as a discourse marker in CanE. Examples of this feature can also be heard on the website mentioned above.

- the occurrence of EngE-type lexical-distributional pronunciations such as *shone* (with a short vowel), *corollary*, *capillary* with the stress on the first syllable; in most cases, however, there is regionally, socially and individually based variation between EngE-type and AmE-type realisations.

- the unique use of certain lexical items, often 'recycled' English words and French borrowings. Compare, for example, the distinction between *prime minister* (federal chief minister) and *premier* (provincial chief minister), the use of *province* and *provincial* referring to the major political divisions of the country, and the use of *riding* in the modern sense of 'constituency'.

4.6.3.1 Spelling

Until recently there have been no fixed spelling conventions for CanE to be, for example, recommended by editors, but with the publication of the Canadian Oxford Dictionary, based on some 20 million words of Canadian text, a form of codification has indeed taken place.

A quick check on some lexical items representing well-known differences in British and American spelling conventions reveals the following:

- *-our vs -or*
  - the British form is given as the first alternative, that is it has been found to be most commonly used, for example *colour* (also *color*). The headword entry for *color* is followed by ‘var. of colour’. All *-our* words seem to follow this pattern: *behaviour*, *favour*, *humour*, *neighbour* and so on.

- *-re vs -er*
  - here, too, the British form is generally given as the first alternative: *centre*, *theatre*, *meager*, *meter*, and -*er* forms are, like -*or* ones, listed as acceptable variants, without further specification. The headword entry *calibre*, on the other hand, is followed by: *(esp. US caliber)*

- *-ise* (or *-yse* ) vs *-ize* (or *-yze* )
  - here the American form is always given as the first alternative, with the exception of *advertis* which has no acceptable variant. *-ise* forms are given as variants but usually labelled ‘esp. Brit’. Admittedly, this American/British distinction is hardly valid any more: a look at a recent corpus-based British dictionary such as the Collins Cobuild reveals that a number of verbs such as *realise*, *criticise* are given as main headword entries followed by a note that *-ise* spellings are also used in Britain; *analyse*, on the other hand, is the first form, whereas *analyze* is said to be American.

Spelling is not a major issue in the description of World Englishes, but in the case of CanE it may function as a marker of identity and shifting attitudes (cf. the regional diversity described in 4.6.2.2). This is clearly a linguistic level which is characterised
by extremely high general awareness, as illustrated in the following plea from a Globe
and Mail columnist after reading a style book for Canadian Press, making -or spellings
the rule:

This may be a trifling matter. But language is a keystone of culture, and a culture is distinguished by many
subtle shadings of sounds, looks and behaviour. I say, with uncontrite and urful fervour, let’s keep vigour and
ardour (etc.) in our English! (Cochrane 1992)

4.6.3.2 Phonology

As we have already seen from the moon example, CanE phonology, like spelling, shows
signs of vacillations between British and American norms. It should be pointed out,
however, that this divided usage or conflict is almost exclusively restricted to lexical
distribution, although in some cases, such as yod dropping, sizeable groups of words
follow the same pattern. As for phonetic realisation, phonotactic distribution and
phonemic systems, on the other hand, CanE is in almost total agreement with GA.

Considering CanE realisations of the Wells sets, PRICE and MOUTH typically
show variation, being candidates for Canadian raising. A great number of Canadians,
especially in parts of the Atlantic provinces, do not produce this feature, but if used,
it constitutes a very interesting linguistic variable in the study of social variation and
change in CanE. It would appear, as already hinted at, that raising, at least in the /au/
diphthong, is recessive. Whereas sociolinguistic studies in the late 1970s still dem-
strate a great deal of allophonic variation, more recent research suggests remark-
able nationwide convergence (Chambers 1995:64ff.). The general picture is that the
sound change in MOUTH is towards the standard American phonetic realisation and
that it is led by young women.

The term Canadian raising indicates, obviously, that the phenomenon is the result
of a raising process. There is, however, no general agreement on this score. Britain
(1992:30) has emphasised that in analyses of ongoing linguistic change the focus
should not exclusively be on the end result of the change but also on what the change
has developed from. PRICE and MOUTH realisations similar to Canadian raising are,
in fact, attested from a number of other varieties of English such as those spoken in
St Helena, Tristan da Cunha and the Falkland Islands. In all these areas, there has – as
in Canada – been considerable dialect mixing. In Canada, however (cf. 4.5.3.2),
the distributional rules are not the same,

A few points will be made about some other aspects of the vowel system; notably,
virtually all the following comments have to do with open back vowels.

Most Canadian accents have a single merged vowel phoneme for the sets
THOUGHT, CLOTH, LOT, PALM and START. The quality of the vowel is open,
back and variably – but never more than lightly – rounded.

A well-known feature, used as one of the criteria for distinguishing varieties of
English from each other (cf. 3.2.2), is in fact the THOUGHT–LOT merger, as in
the US Midland accents (4.5.5), that is there is neither length nor quality distinction
in word pairs such as cot–caught, rot–wrought, stock–stalk, collar–caller.
An interesting sociolinguistic study (Clarke et al. 1995) shows that back vowels in CanE, that is \([u \, o \, a]\), are undergoing a shift to the effect that they are fronted (in contrast with the Northern Cities shift in the USA (4.5.6.1)). Language-external factors appear to be highly relevant in the interpretation of the results; teenage high school students, especially young women, are the trendsetters, who seem to participate in certain patterns of vowel shifting that are found in urban California as well. It has been suggested that the prestige of the new vocalic features are reinforced by association with the speech of many (particularly female) national newscasters in both the USA and Canada.

In Nova Scotian speech different pronunciations may be heard in PALM and LOT words, with the first set having more fronted vowels. Newfoundland speech, as always, is the most ‘deviant’. In parts of the province, for example, the short vowel system is reduced to five rather than six, since \(\text{bit}\) and \(\text{be}\) tend to be merged as \([\text{b}t]\) (KIT and DRESS merger), whereas \(\text{xe}\) is found in NEAR and SQUARE words such as \(\text{ker, heer, keer}\) (Wells 1982:500) and centralised \([\text{s}]\) in NORTH, FORCE and CURE (at least in broad accents). The realisation of the STRUT vowel demonstrates affinity with Irish English; it is back, rounded and centralised. PRICE and VOICE are often merged as \([\text{b}t]\).

The Canadian consonant system is virtually identical with that of GA, including the existence of certain recessive features, such as /hw-/ pronunciations in \(\text{wh}\)-words. For a recent study, see the Dialect Topography website, mentioned in 4.6.2.3.

Lunenburg in Nova Scotia is the only mainland white Canadian community to be nonrhotic, except when pronouncing words where /\(\text{æ}\)\(\text{t}\)/ occurs after /\(\text{æ}\)/ (Trudgill 2000:197). Whereas the nonrhoticity can be connected with the early loyalists from New England, settling here in the eighteenth century, other features in the accent point to input not only from German but also from Irish and Scottish English.

In broad Newfoundland accents, especially in Irish settlement areas, dental plosives are used instead of fricatives as in that (cf. the poem below). In some accents of the island, labiodental fricatives are used instead, as in Cockney or Estuary English, for example \([\text{bæf}]\) for \(\text{bath}\). Substratum effects of Irish and Scottish settlements are shown in the quality of postvocalic /\(\text{æ}\)/, which is generally clear in Irish areas but dark in Scottish areas and elsewhere (Paddock 1982:88). Finally, h dropping is widely used in broad accents, as also exemplified in the following beginning of a poem by Harold Paddock:

'Och I knows I'm A Newf'
(a pome fer Ray Guy)
Because of my langwich:

If'm a case
It comes from dat For Greatest Bay
And can’t fettle it'satches,
And ‘aves de h’resistible urge
To write h’readable pomes.
CanE prosody does not appear to be distinctive in any way. As in some other varieties, high rising terminals have been widely used during the last 30 years.

When Canadians argue about British versus American pronunciation, the phonology is not discussed but taken for granted; the questions at issue are just those of lexical incidence. Does schedule, they ask, begin with /ʃ/ or with /sk/? Does (or should) leisure rhyme with seizure or with pleasure? (Wells 1982:491)

The following brief presentation of lexical-distributional issues in CanE is based on data from the Canadian Oxford Dictionary and some findings of the Dialect Topography project (cf. above).

A general trend already emerging in the 1972 nationwide Survey of Canadian English, based on data from schoolchildren and their parents, is towards an increase in the use of the American variants at the expense of the British. Thus, for example lever with /e/, yod dropping in news, either with /i:/ were all favoured by the younger age group. On the whole, the Canadian Oxford Dictionary gives further evidence of the general trend, albeit with certain conflicting instances, especially with regard to yod dropping. Admittedly, present-day RP allows variation, too: yod-dropped forms of suit and super, for example, are the winners according to Wells (2008) and have been for some time.

A special case is that of genuine, with the alternative pronunciations /-n/ and /-ən/. Incidentally, Wells (2008) marks off the second alternative as ‘incorrect’ for both British and American English. Awareness of this pronunciation is interestingly reflected in the following poem written in 1837 by an English traveller:

To the Ladies of the City of Toronto.
Our ladies are the best kind
Of all others the most fine;
In their manners and their minds,
Most refined and genuine.

(cf. McConnell 1979:30)

Interestingly, the Canadian dictionary also accounts for a few ‘fudged’ pronunciations, such as tomato with /æ/, given as the only alternative after /e/.

4.6.3.3 Grammar

There are few truly distinctive features in CanE grammar; if any, they tend to be found in morphology rather than syntax or relate to discourse and the lexicon. Sentence-initial as well is claimed to be uniquely Canadian, as in As well, I include my CV. Some British-type structures linger on, such as Has the plumber been yet? rather than ... been here yet and the tendency to say Have you got ...? rather than Do you have ...?, but the American structures are by no means uncommon and are gaining ground (Boberg 2010:164).

It would seem that — from a language proficiency point of view — there is no need for a specific grammar of Canadian Standard English; yet ongoing research based on the large text corpora now available will probably reveal other cases where CanE occupies an intermediate position.
Morphological characteristics include certain forms in the strong verb system, of which some have been subject to sociolinguistic studies. In the Dialect Topography project, an apparent-time study demonstrates a rapid increase in the past tense forms dove and snuck, as also found in AmE, instead of dived and sneaked. A stable British form, on the other hand, is found in the past tense of shine, always realised as /ʃən/ not US /ʃən/.

The frequent use of the tag eh was included among the salient features. Its specific function as a discourse marker in CanE has to do with ascertaining the comprehension, continued interest, agreement and so on of the person or persons addressed (it’s way out in the suburbs, eh, so I can’t get there by bike); in other words, it has an important conversational and narrative function. It seems, however, to have declined among younger speakers (from http://www.billcasselman.com/cwod_archive/eh.htm).

Nonstandard – especially traditional-dialect – grammar typically reflects settlement history; the ‘hot-news’ perfect as in I’m after doin’ it, which is a Hiberno-English construction (4.4.2.2.), is found in the Ottawa River Valley and in Newfoundland. Another aspectual feature found in Newfoundland English, which has its roots in England’s West Country, is the use of habitual unstressed da’ do’ (and did), as in I da wear a heavy shirt all year round (Paddock 1982:77). Yiz or youse, that is plural forms of the second person pronoun, which are common in IrE, are also found in Newfoundland English, as are constructions like it’s sorry you will be for ‘you will be sorry’.

4.6.3.4 Lexicon

As indicated by the chesfield example, there is a general trend towards AmE vocabulary, but a quick search for British vs American priorities in the Canadian Oxford Dictionary resulted in a somewhat mixed pattern. Unlike spelling and pronunciation preferences, it is not quite clear which variant is the most frequent in the dictionary database. The following British terms were definitely given as ‘normal’ in CanE: bonnet and tap (given as head entries with cross-references from hood and faucet), autumn (also called fall), fortnight, queue, shop (line and store are labelled N.Amer). Gasolene, on the other hand, is the head entry with a cross-reference from petrol. As for the well-known pairs subway—underground, sidewalk—pavement, spanner—wrench, candy—sweet, it is not made quite clear where CanE stands. Finally, a person dispensing medicine is called neither druggist nor chemist but pharmacist.

The above is only one aspect of CanE vocabulary, which is also characterised by a great deal of innovation, partly due to the need for new words for new surroundings, and, naturally, borrowing as a result of long-standing and intense contact with other varieties of language. The following exemplifies some lexical categories:

- Extension of meaning is found in names for ‘similar-looking’ plants and types of vegetation: crocus ‘a type of prairie anemone’, bush ‘the back country’ (cf. AusE), and in a number of ‘revived’ words, as exemplified among the salient features.
- Ice hockey (or hockey in CanE) terms represent Canadianisms which have been adopted in General English: boarding, blue line, icing, whereas others are true foreignisms (cf. 3.2.4.1), encapsulating Canadian life: Quebec heater ‘a type of heating stove’.
bombardier 'a characteristic winter vehicle', metaphors such as corduroy road (a road made by putting down logs, making a bumpy surface like that of ribbed corduroy cloth) and (frost) boil (an eruption in a road produced by frost).

With reference to borrowing, French was an important donor language, but only before the mid-nineteenth century, reflecting the exploration and settlement history: voyageur, bateau, concession 'grant of land', prairie, rapids, chute, bayou 'lumbering area', dépot. Some words in this category are now more or less restricted to place-name elements: sault, dalles, grande, bois, butte. Many place-names are the result of misinterpretations of French words, that is folk etymology, such as Cape Spear and Cape Despair (both from Le Cap d'Espoir). Similarly, a winter vehicle known as a carry-all is an English interpretation of cariole. A great many French loanwords are restricted to certain regions: anses 'cove' as in L'Anse aux Meadows in Newfoundland, frazil (flaky ice-crystals formed in turbulent water), above all used in the east, and poudre (fine, drifting snow) used in the north. The linguistically and politically important French-based words Francophone and Anglophone are fairly recent. With their special implications, these words are indeed Canadianisms.

Borrowings from Indian languages include: pemmican (a meat dish), saskatoon (a shrub with edible berries), thousands of place-names, including the name of the nation, as already mentioned, and Toronto, whose etymology is disputed but sometimes given as 'meeting-place'. Yet, according to McConnell (1979:81), surprisingly few Indian words have entered CanE. Even fewer come from Inuit languages; some well-known examples are anorak, kayak and mukluk (a kind of shoe); the first two are of course now used in General English.

4.6.4 Further reading

Review questions
1. Try to classify the examples of Canadian vocabulary by applying the model supplied in 3.2.4.
2. Why could Canadian raising actually be a failure to lower? (What is going on here?)
3. What is going on with h in the Newfoundland poem?
4. Explain the relation of yod dropping to US, British, and Canadian pronunciation.
5. How does Canadian eh? relate to Welsh isn’t it? Why are tag forms so varied in English?
4.7 Australia

... I've not found it so easy to pass it ['correct', RP-like pronunciation] on to the grandchildren. They sound much more Australian than I think we would like them to be.

(Joan Hawker, Australian informant for the BBC series The Story of English)

John Clark, native speaker of Australian English

(Professor John Clark, introducing himself on the recording)

Focus questions:

- How do you interpret the significance of the mottos?
- What is the demographic history of Australia?
- Why is there comparatively little regional variation in AusE?
- Listen to online recording 13.

![Australia map]

Figure 4.5 Australia

4.7.1 The country and its people

Area: 7,686,850 sq km
Population: well over 22 million (of whom more than 2 million do not have English as their first language)
Capital: Canberra

Australia is a federation of the states of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and Northern Territory.
Before the first Europeans (the Dutch) arrived there at the beginning of the seventeenth century, there had been speculations about an unknown southern land, *Terra Australis Incognita*, situated somewhere further south than Asia and Africa. The Aboriginal people in Australia belong to different tribes, and at one time spoke about 200 different languages, related to each other but not to any other language family. Today, the Aborigines constitute no more than 2 per cent of the country’s population and their languages have suffered and are suffering massive death, with more than 90 per cent of the present languages moribund.

Continuing the history of the British settlement of Australia from where we left it in Chapter 2, it is worth pointing out that not until the 1840s did free settlers outnumber those with convict origins (Eagleson 1983:415). The 1850s saw an enormous population growth due to the ‘goldrushes’. The convicts and other early settlers in Australia came from various parts of Great Britain, but above all from the south-east region of England. Another sizeable group consisted of almost 2,000 Irish political prisoners who were transported between 1789 and 1803. As the prisoners got their ‘ticket of leave’, they began spreading out into the country, looking for suitable land for sheep farming in particular. Towards the end of the nineteenth century when Australia had more than three million inhabitants, it was very rural with more than 70 per cent of the population living in the countryside. Today, a century later, the situation is different, with more than 80 per cent living in cities.

Before 1950, immigration to Australia was dominated by British and Irish settlers, although there were also some well-known settlements by Germans in the Barossa Valley and Italians in Queensland. More recent immigration has been extremely varied, representing most European as well as Asian countries.

### 4.7.2 English in Australia – an overview

In contrast with some other countries described in this chapter, English was the only significant language from the outset of colonisation. Nowhere else is the characterisation of English as a ‘killer language’ more adequate; the death of Aboriginal languages as outlined above is directly or indirectly caused by the presence of English. The founder population in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was almost exclusively English-speaking. Today, Australian English (AusE) can certainly be described as a variety in its own right, if not a third reference variety. AusE is, for example, increasingly used in EFL teaching, especially in East and South-East Asia. Like other major varieties of English, it is also codified in major dictionaries (see in particular the 1997 edition of the *Macquarie Dictionary* and consult its website www.macquariedictionary.com.au [accessed 4 February 2011]).

#### 4.7.2.1 A historical perspective – changing attitudes

Considering the structure of the first English-speaking population of Australia, it is hardly surprising that early observations on language down under often comment on the connection with prison life, roughness, vulgarity and so on. In fact, a special variety called *flash language* ‘the cant or jargon of thieves’ developed, consisting of
slang vocabulary used to assert group solidarity. Some of these words have survived as cultural ‘keywords’ in Australia (cf. 4.7.3.4, for some examples). Paradoxically, the word flash has now come to be used about ‘deviating’ speakers in Aboriginal communities, using the language of educated whites.

Early observers of AusE usually commented – often with a critical undertone – on the predominance of Cockney-like speech. By contrast, others – writing at the same time – seemed to praise the pure speech heard in the new colony (exonormative consolidation, cf. 3.3). Opinions clearly vary among the early observers as to what characterises ‘pure’ English; it could mean ‘nonregional’, as well as ‘not American’, or ‘not Cockney’. The alleged similarity between AusE and Cockney is not just a myth or a biased stereotype; as we will see, especially in the description of AusE phonology, the varieties share a number of features. Yet the lingering view that Cockney and AusE are virtually the same is absurd. For one thing, both varieties, like all languages, have been subject to change. The accents can easily be distinguished (cf. Wells 1982:594), let alone other levels of language, especially lexical features.

AusE today is indeed a variety in its own right, as signalled by the second motto of this section. The first motto, recorded some 20 years ago, reflects lingering expressions of allegiance to EngE, especially RP, but today the high regard for this accent seems to be virtually gone.

Like most varieties of English, including EngE, AusE is currently subject to influence from AmE, for example with regard to word stress, as in harass with the stress on the second syllable. Another American-like phonological feature is the voicing of intervocalic /t/, but its origin in Australian speech is not absolutely clear. As exemplified in 4.7.3.1, there is a degree of Americanisation in spelling, but – not surprisingly – it is above all the lexicon that has been influenced. This is demonstrated in detail in Burridge and Mulder (1998:285f.), who also point to the ‘double competence’ of Australians, which is often apparent in ‘global’ word quizzes, where Australians tend to beat American as well as British competitors since they master two varieties.

4.7.2.2 Regional variation

In 3.1.1 we mentioned that regional linguistic variation is comparatively limited in Australian English, which may seem strange considering the vastness of the country. ‘From Perth to Sydney is over 3000 kilometres, yet their accents are practically indistinguishable’ (Wells 1982:591). However, according to Burridge and Mulder (1998), it is likely – since regional diversity is partly a function of time – that physical and social distance will eventually have the effect of increasing regional differences (cf. 3.3, ‘stage 5’). It is actually possible to exemplify regional differences in vocabulary; a type of sausage is known as polony or sausley in most areas, but in Adelaide it is fritz and in Brisbane and Sydney devon. There is also some phonological variation (cf. Bradley 2008 and Burridge 2010). Among the features studied are L-vocalisation, which is a new feature in AusE, and variation in BATH. It appears, for example, that Melbourne speakers use a vowel whose quality approximates to northern EngE, In
the Barossa Valley, the German substratum is the source of some characteristics, such as the use of bring/come/take with (cf. German mitbringen/mitkommen/mitnehmen) and final devoicing (Auslautverhärtung).

4.7.2.3 Social variation

The best-known and most comprehensive early investigation of AusE accents was conducted by Mitchell and Delbridge around 1960 (reported in their 1965 monograph). It can be described as the first large-scale sociolinguistic survey ever, preceding even Labor’s early work on Martha’s Vineyard by a few years. It is true that the range of the informants was narrow: they were all schoolchildren of the same age, but large numbers were recorded and the results show clear social stratification, relating to gender, type of school, family background and place of residence (town or country).

The vowels represented in the following words, read by all informants, were found to be particularly socially significant: bet, boar, say, so, high, bow. On the basis of the overall results, Mitchell and Delbridge distinguished among three main varieties of AusE: Broad, General and Cultivated. The third category, sometimes referred to as ‘acrolect’, shows the greatest affinity with RP. The distribution of informants over the three categories was as follows: Broad 34 per cent, General 55 per cent, Cultivated 11 per cent. Mitchell and Delbridge emphasise that the figures should not be taken too literally; we are dealing with a continuum and the percentages should be viewed as suggestive of relative tendencies. On the recording, you can hear the six test words used by Mitchell and Delbridge, realised in three versions, and a brief comment on them made by an Australian phonetician. For a detailed description of their phonetic realisation, cf. 4.7.3.2.

4.7.2.4 Aboriginal English

The most important and probably also best researched ethnic variety of AusE is Aboriginal English. It is not easily defined, since it covers ‘the full range from broken and Pidgin English, through a creole to nonstandard to a complete mastery of standard English’ (Eagleson 1983:432); in other words, it is used both as a first and as a second language.

Towards the ‘English’ end of the continuum, Aboriginal English is characterised by a retroflex articulatory setting (a substratum effect) and some nonstandard grammatical features reminiscent of AAVE, such as copula deletion (he half-caste), unmarked plurality (how many huncle you got?) and bin as a marker of past tense (that man bin come inside bar). These examples are from northern Australia (Eagleson 1983:433).

Aborigines living in urban settings, who have generally lost their indigenous languages, speak varieties even closer to the ‘English end’. Their language is usually a nonstandard variety of English sharing features that are found worldwide: multiple negation, differences in verb agreement, nonstandard forms of irregular verbs. Note that Standard English is generally not considered a prestige variety within the Aboriginal community, as signalled by the use of the term flash language mentioned above (4.7.2.1).
4.7.3 Australian English (AusE) – a descriptive account

A ‘shortlist’ of particularly salient features:

- the front [a:] in PALM and START (a feature shared with NZE)
- the wide, ‘Cockney-like’ diphthongs in FLEECE, FACE, PRICE, GOOSE, GOAT and MOUTH
- the close (but not as close as in NZE) front vowels, especially DRESS
- the use of two extremely productive noun suffixes: -ie and -o (wharfie ‘docker’, smoko ‘a stop for a rest and a smoke’)
- the special use of she as a generic pronoun: she’s jake ‘it’s fine’
- a highly characteristic vocabulary, for example sheila ‘girl’, tucker ‘food’, billabong ‘a waterhole formed by a broken meander of a river’, drongo ‘idiot’, yacker ‘work’.

4.7.3.1 Spelling

The spelling of AusE, as laid down in the Macquarie Dictionary, for example, basically follows the British tradition. Making some searches from the Macquarie website (see the beginning of 4.7.2) we were surprised to find both colour and color but only labour. Yet, according to Burridge and Mulder (1998:92ff.), ‘the Australian Labor Party has spelt its name without a u since early this century’. Corpus-based studies of AusE show that ratios between -or and –our vary considerably, depending on the word. On the other hand, verbs like realise, sympathise tend to stick 100 per cent to the spelling used in the second word.

4.7.3.2 Phonology

The three socially variable accents of AusE described by Mitchell and Delbridge (cf. 4.7.2.3) are basically distinguished by the six vowels/diphthongs listed among the salient features. In characterising the Australian vowel system, Wells (1982:595) aptly remarks: ‘Phonologically, all Australian English is very close to RP phonetically, it is not’. In other words; the phonemic inventory, the number and distribution of distinctive units is identical, but the quality of virtually all vowels is different (as exemplified by the front rather than back vowel in PALM and START).

The realisation of the six distinctive lexical sets further demonstrates that ‘Cultivated’ approximates to RP in having ‘unshifted’ diphthongs. ‘Broad’ differs from General not only in having wider, more radically shifted diphthongs, but also in diphthong length (Wells 1982:597). In addition, Broad MOUTH often begins with a nasal vowel, exemplifying the Australian ‘twang’. Note that in Broad and General as distinct from Cultivated and RP PRICE and MOUTH have very different starting points ([n] vs [ŋ]).

As mentioned among the salient features, the front short vowels in DRESS and TRAP tend to be a great deal closer than in RP. The Australian speaker on the recording, for example, pronounces ten virtually like [tən]. In a number of BATH words, especially those where the vowel is followed by a nasal plus another consonant, such as dance, plant, the TRAP vowel is often heard. This could be due to American influence, but may also be related to a dialect background in England (cf. 4.7.2.2).
It would appear that there is a general fronting tendency in AusE vowels, affecting NURSE as well; this vowel can be quite fronted as well as close and rounded. In addition, there is a tendency for the centring diphthongs, for example NEAR, to be monophthongal, although AusE is firmly nonrhotic.

Although schwa is replacing /æ/ in RP in a number of unstressed affixes such as the adjectival ending -ate, it is much more dominant in AusE, regularly used in inflectional endings such as -ed, -et ['wʊmtəd], ['bɒksə] (the second transcription could represent to boxes as well as fevers).

The nonrhoticity of AusE has already been mentioned, as has the tendency towards intervocalic T voicing (4.7.2.1). H dropping may occur as well as hypercorrect forms, as evidenced in one of the examples of Aboriginal English (4.7.2.4).

The HRT intonation pattern (cf. 3.2.2) is very common in AusE and sometimes even referred to as ‘Australian Questioning Intonation’ (Burridge 2010:139). It was observed as early as the 1960s by Mitchell and Delbridge, who called it ‘the interview tune’ and characterised it as ‘abnormal’. More recently, it has been carefully investigated in Sydney by Horvath (1985), who found that it was predominantly used by teenagers, females, lower working class and either Greeks or ‘Anglos’. The most common function of HRT, according to Horvath, is to request the heightened participation of the listener.

4.7.3.3 Grammar

Among the salient features we mentioned a morphological characteristic, that is the striking productivity of -ie (sometimes a process of clipping and expanding (Cramley 2001:95) but also representing other types of affixation) and -o suffixes. Other types of clipping are also common, as in koor for ‘beauty’ or ‘beautiful’, uni for ‘university’, Oz for ‘Australia’, roo for ‘kangaroo’.

Corpus-based studies of AusE grammar as compared to other varieties generally display tendencies rather than categorical differences. Hundt (1998a), studying subjunctives in BrE, AmE, AusE and NZE, found that the southern hemisphere varieties were virtually the same, and that they occupied an intermediate position in relation to the two reference varieties.

As in AmE, collective nouns, such as committee, government, nearly always take singular verb forms in AusE, in contrast with Standard EngE, where the perception of the collective noun as a ‘monolith’ or as a group of individuals determines the choice of verb form.

4.7.3.4 Lexicon

As we have seen, Aboriginal languages have not had an impact on AusE phonology or grammar, with the possible exception of the word-formation pattern known as reduplication, as exemplified in the term waa-waa for the desert regions. For various reasons, lexical borrowing has not been extensive either: there was not a great deal of close contact; the Aborigines spoke many different languages; they were essentially nomads and had very different ways of life. A number of place-names have been adopted,
however, such as Wagga Wagga and Wollongong. Since the Australian landscape, flora and fauna were so markedly different from anything the early settlers had experienced, it is not surprising that they borrowed a number of words denoting animals, plants, etc.: kangaroo, wallaby, koala, kookaburra, dingo, budgerigar, coolabah, billabong. The animal names are mostly KANGAROO words, the others more or less heteronyms, THUMB TACK words. In all, the Australian National Dictionary (1988) records some 400 borrowings from Aboriginal languages.

The flash language, originating among the prisoners and their keepers, has contributed many words that have come to symbolise Australian life, such as the heteronyms (THUMB TACK words) new chum ‘a novice’, originally a new fellow prisoner, old hand, originally referring to an ex-convict, swag, now in the sense ‘large quantity’ but originally referring to a thief’s loot (see also swagman as used in Waltzing Matilda, referring to a tramp).

The convicts may have had the gift of the gab, but owing to their mostly urban background, they had brought no adequate vocabulary for the ‘pastoral’ life they began to lead when they left the prisons. This explains the somewhat military, technical and rather ‘bleached’ vocabulary for rural activities and certain topographical features in AusE, exemplified by the following lexical items: unit for ‘flat, apartment’, station for ‘stock farm’, squatter ‘occupier of public land without a title’, oak for an Australian tree that does not belong to the Quercus family (like ROBIN), paddock for ‘meadow’, river and creek denoting all categories of running water replacing a number of terms in English dialects.

A special type of idiom demonstrating the input from the London area is the extensive use of rhyming slang (cf. 4.1.5.3) in AusE: Noah’s Ark – shark, Joe Blake – snake, Captain Cook – a look, willy wag – swag.

Considering the impact of AmE, AusE appears to be somewhat more ‘American’ than NZE with regard to certain food terminology as investigated by Burridge and Mulder (1998:288). Whereas New Zealanders used eggplant as well as aubergine, Australians exclusively used the American term. The same pattern applied to snow pea/sugar pea and zucchini/courgette. In other cases both AusE and NZE used the British as well as the American term, sometimes adding a third form, for example patty tin (BrE), muffin tin (AmE) and patty pan (found in AusE).

4.7.4 Further reading

Review questions
1. Give further examples illustrating John Wells’ statement: ‘Phonologically, all Australian English is very close to RP, phonetically, it is not’. Is this statement applicable to other ‘transported’ varieties of English as well?
2. ‘Australian English is just like Cockney.’ Discuss.
3. What is remarkable about the use of she in AusE as mentioned among the salient features?
4. Try to identify AusE features in the following example of informal writing:

heyyy how r ya? tried callin ya on sun to see if you wanted to come out with me and kirsty to get ya outa ur unit! lol. must suck having no licence.
newayz.... wb-bye cya bye x
p.s. i believe my car deserves a spot in your album of hot cars

4.8 New Zealand/Aotearoa

Focus questions:
• In what ways does the founding population of New Zealand differ from that of Australia?
• What is the status of the Maori language today?
• Listen to online recording 14.

4.8.1 The country and its settlement history

Area: 268,000 sq.km
Population: 4.4 million (of which 98 per cent speak English)
Capital: Wellington
It is proper to refer to the country whose language is described in this section by two names: New Zealand, originally called Nieuw Zeeland, after the province of Zeeland in the Netherlands, by the Dutch explorers in the seventeenth century, and Aotearoa, ‘land of the long white cloud’, named by the Maori settlers, perhaps on first sighting the islands more than a thousand years ago. In the 1980s, the term Aotearoa New Zealand was coined as a symbolic name to represent the joint Maori and Pakeha (people of predominantly European descent) components of New Zealand culture and society. For convenience, however, the country will usually be referred to as New Zealand in the following presentation.

The Maori were first recorded in European history by the Dutchman Abel Tasman who reached the west coast of the South Island in 1642. It was not until 120 years later that attempts were made at making territorial claims by European explorers, and it was only in 1840 that the Union Jack was hoisted and most of the Maori chiefs were induced to accept Queen Victoria’s guardianship.

New Zealand was granted self-government in 1852, and a full parliamentary system was set up in 1856. The following decades were characterised by a great deal of turbulence, especially the conflict between the white settlers and the Maori in the North Island, which ended in 1872 and resulted in substantial loss of land and general humiliation on the part of the Maori.

As indicated in the introductory paragraph, things have improved in present-day Aotearoa. In 1987 the Maori Language Act was passed, giving official status to Maori coequally with English, and establishing a Maori Language Commission. Although the language has gained increasing official recognition, it is endangered and has been ‘brought to the edge of extinction as a language of everyday interaction’ (Bell and Holmes 1990:153). The Maori today constitute about 14 per cent of the population (cf. the 2006 census). The census results also show that immigration from South Pacific islands has escalated during the last few decades. There are also sizeable groups of immigrants from various European countries as well as Chinese and Indian minorities.

In the settlement history of NZ, three main ‘types’ of English-speaking immigrants can be distinguished (cf. Bauer 1994:383ff.):

● in the period 1840 to well into the 1880s, groups of immigrants from various distinctive parts of the British Isles (London, the West Country, Scotland) came to New Zealand, often for religious/ideological reasons. The place names in the south-eastern part of the South Island, for example, bear witness to the dominating Scottish settlements, for example Dunedin and Invercargill

● in the early 1860s, Australians dominated a wave of immigrants who came because of the discovery of gold on the west coast of the South Island

● in the 1870s, ‘assisted’ (subsidised) immigration, took place on a large scale, dominated by immigrants from southern England.

Since then, immigration has continued to be an important factor in the growth of New Zealand’s population, for example from various European countries after the Second World War. Yet, towards the end of the nineteenth century there were more New Zealand-born Europeans in New Zealand than immigrants, and from this time
onwards it can be assumed that the development of the English language in New Zealand reflects New Zealand rather than British or Australian trends.

Although New Zealand has two national languages (English and Maori), it can—in contrast with Canada, South Africa, and even Australia—be described as an unusually monolingual country. Only Pacific Island Polynesians who settled in New Zealand from the 1950s and some very recent immigrant groups, especially from Asia, use their native languages extensively outside the home domain (Bell and Kuiper 2000:15).

New Zealand is not characterised by strongly stratified social classes as found in the UK and USA. Although the gap between the rich and the poor has widened somewhat during the 1990s, New Zealand can still be described as an egalitarian society, with neither a land-owning upper class aristocracy nor an industrial proletariat (Bell and Kuiper 2000:11). Judging by NZ sociolinguistic research (for example Bell 2000, Britain 1992, Stubbe and Holmes 2000) the most significant social parameter is ethnicity, in particular with reference to Maori vs Pakeha English. There is also a strong correlation between ethnicity and class in that Maori are over-represented in lower socioeconomic groups (Bell 2000:224).

4.8.2 The emergence of New Zealand English (NZE)

Comments on a distinctive variety of New Zealand speech date back to the turn of the last century. In line with observations on language use in schools in most Anglophone countries, anything perceived as deviating from Standard EngE/RP was viewed as impure and corrupt (cf. 3.3).

School inspectors in New Zealand were particularly keen to pick on realisations of the four closing diphthongs /ɛɪ/, /ɑːɪ/, /əʊ/, /ɑːʊ/, which were perceived as wider than the RP-like norm: ‘... the word is house not houwe’, ‘... they will call lady lidy ...’. The ‘impure’ pronunciation was generally ascribed to laziness and slovenliness, and compared to lower-class speech in England. Other characteristic features of NZE which are known to date back to this early period, such as the raised quality of front vowels (cf. the Shitland example quoted in Chapter 3), are never mentioned in the school inspectors’ reports. They were probably not seen as socially significant in the same way. In fact, they may not even have been perceived; for some reason changes in short-vowel quality tend to stay below awareness for a long time after initiation.

In recent years, great strides have been made towards tracing the emergence of NZE by the ONZE (Origins of New Zealand English) project (cf. Hay et al. 2008). Among other things, data from the project indicate that some of the oldest informants already had close realisations of /ɛ/ and /ɑː/ and had merged NEAR and SQUARE (see further below). A general characteristic of the early stages of the formation of NZE is the high degree of variability (Gordon and Trudgill 1999).

In a lexical study on the dialectal origins of NZE, Bauer (2000) found that a high proportion of the earliest British dialect words have come in via AusE, but over the twentieth century the number of dialect words ‘travelling direct’ to New Zealand has increased. In contrast with the sizeable component of regional dialect words from all over the British Isles, as documented by Bauer, NZE phonology exhibits a striking
likeness to accents in south-eastern England, as indeed to the Australian English accent.

The origins of Maori Vernacular English (cf. Bell 2000:222) are simply described as 'the transference of features from the Maori language by the first generations of Maori who learned English as a second language.' To some extent, these features have been maintained and transmitted across the intervening generations. The maintenance, even revival, of some Maori features can also be related to consciousness-raising and marking of identity.

4.8.3 New Zealand English – a descriptive account

A 'shortlist' of particularly salient features:

- the centralised quality of the KIT vowel: [ə] rather than [i]. This is what the spelling 'sux suck' in the motto, an Australian stereotypical perception of NZE, suggests. This is, indeed, the most salient feature in distinguishing between an AusE and a NZE accent. The rest of the motto indicates that the DRESS vowel is also perceived as different from AusE, that is extremely close.
- the merging of the diphthongs in NEAR and SQUARE, that is words like beer and bear are homophones.
- the front [æ] in BATH, PALM and START.
- the rounding and fronting of the NURSE vowel; in some broader accents it is also raised and realised as [ø: ], as in German Möwe.
- the Maori element in the lexicon, increasingly used in everyday conversation.

4.8.3.1 Spelling

NZE spelling, as codified in DNZE, follows British conventions. Alternative spellings are only given for certain nonstandard entries and Maori words, such as early forms of the word Maori itself: Mahrie, Māodi, Mowrie ...

4.8.3.2 Phonology

With the exception of the NEAR/SQUARE (variable) merger mentioned among the salient features, the phonemic inventory of NZE remains identical with that of RP. It is in the phonetic realisation that we find the differences, but they are indeed considerable, at least among the vowels.

Until fairly recently, RP enjoyed very high prestige in New Zealand. As late as a few decades ago, parents often made their children take elocution classes given by a teacher from England, as reported by one of our New Zealand informants. However, changing attitudes to the 'mother country' and increased awareness of national identity as in so many other regions throughout the world have largely done away with the view of RP as a norm. Anyway we’re not British is the telling title of a thesis submitted at Wellington University (Vine 1995). Yet in some domains, such as television commercials, where it is often used for advertising quality products, RP 'remains a “classy” acrolect' (Bayard 2000:322). Attitudes to American accents are positive, but have not resulted
in major influence on NZE phonology; if any, it is restricted to lexical distribution and is largely identical with changes observed in RP such as schedule with initial [sk] and research with the stress on the first syllable.

With a few exceptions, the symbols used for NZE phonology, as found in Wells (1982:699), look deceptively similar to those used for RP. Further qualification is called for, especially with regard to the short front vowels, which are closer in NZE than in AusE and very much closer than in RP. A kind of chain shift appears to have taken place: TRAP is realised as [ε] rather than [æ] and DRESS is often closer than [e], which means that it approximates to [ɪ].

There is some controversy concerning the origins and development of these vowels (cf. Woods 2000:98ff.). Whereas some linguists argue that their quality represents innovation and change, the ONZE group has demonstrated that the vowels were in a relatively close position in the input dialect (there is, for example, evidence of a very close TRAP vowel in traditional Cockney). Yet the fact that they have become closer over time, that is that we are indeed dealing with a kind of shift, is now largely undisputed. The central quality of KIT has long been held to be due to input from Scottish English, but recently Gordon (1994) has shown that in stressed position it represents an innovation in NZE. To non-New Zealanders the quality of these vowels is not only striking but extremely confusing, and there is an abundance of anecdotal evidence of cross-dialectal miscomprehension. Gordon and Deverson (1998:37) relate the following story:

When Ivan Illich the educationalist came to New Zealand he rang a friend and the phone was answered by his friend’s young daughter. When he asked to speak to her father he thought she replied, “He’s dead.” After his momentary shock he realized that she was saying, “Here’s Dad”.

As in present-day RP and Estuary English, the final unstressed vowel in words such as happy is realised as [ɪ], even [iː]. The diphthongs in FACE, PRICE, GOAT and MOUTH are variable, especially along a social continuum. In comparison with RP they are generally wider, although less so than in AusE. The quality of the merged diphthong of NEAR and SQUARE is variable, approximating either to /iə/ or to /eə/, as the following story, reported by Elizabeth Gordon, illustrates:

Once when my family was having a meal my son began to recount a story he had heard at school about a knight who had been engaged in a fight. During the fight the knight’s spear was broken. My son then said, “He went back to the castle to get his spare spear”. My niece who was with us at the time said, “No, that’s not how you say it — you should say, “He went back to the castle to get his spare spare'” (Gordon and Deverson 1998:44)

The ‘Scottish area’ used to be characterised by rhoticity (‘the Southland burr’). An astonishing number of ONZE informants, born at the end of the nineteenth century, from all over New Zealand are rhotic. This is one of several findings from the project that have provided increased knowledge about the phonology of nineteenth-century EnglE.
Another Scottish-like feature that used to be heard in New Zealand is the realisation of <wh-> as [hw], that is making a distinction between words such as wine and whine, wail and whale (see also AmE and CanE phonology). This distinction used to be encouraged in elocution classes.

In contrast with RP, /l/ is always dark in present-day NZE. As in Cockney and Estuary English, it may be vocalised at the end of a word or before a consonant, as in pull, children. A characteristic of NZE is also that /l/ influences the preceding vowel, in particular /i/, so that the stressed vowel in a word like culture is realised as [ə].

On the suprasegmental level a striking feature of NZE is the frequent use of high rising terminals (HRTs) (cf. 3.2.2). This feature was not listed among the top salient ones, because it is reported from a number of other varieties, but there is, in fact, a possibility that HRT originated in NZ. There is scattered evidence of HRT in some ONZE data from the late 1940s (Gordon and Trudgill 1999), but it was really first noted in the early 1960s in the speech of Maori schoolchildren. Since then, HRTs have been widely studied and found to be ‘clearly a characteristic of the young, of women, and of Maori’ (Warren and Britain 2000:155). A recent detailed sociolinguistic study (Britain 1992) suggests that the feature may have been initiated by Maori speakers. One of its main functions is to emphasise speaker-hearer solidarity and it was found to be most used ‘by those members of New Zealand society for whom the affective meaning of conversation is an important cultural characteristic, namely Pakeha women and Maori’ (Britain 1992:98). In fact, Maori speakers could be expected to use a higher proportion of addresser-oriented devices overall than Pakeha. In analysing narrative structure, Stubbe and Holmes (2000:257) found that there is ‘a more general tendency in Maori interactions to leave meanings relatively inexplicit’ and that from a Pakeha perspective ‘ideas often appear to be introduced in fairly sketchy fashion’. Indeed, the use of HRT seems to fit very well into this general pattern.

4.8.3.3 Grammar

‘NZE is different from other national varieties of English in terms of preferences for certain variants rather than categorically different grammatical rules.’ These words introduce the publisher’s presentation of Marianne Hundt’s New Zealand English Grammar: Fact or Fiction? A Corpus-based Study in Morphosyntactic Variation (Hundt 1998b). NZE constitutes a typical mix of variants available in General English and it cannot be described as definitely British or American.

Comparing NZE with AusE, Hundt finds that ‘the two are virtually indistinguishable when it comes to grammar’.

Some of the preferences/characteristics of NZE grammar are:

- -ves plurals rather than -fs in words such as hoof, roof, wharf
- increasing use of unmarked plurality in words of Maori origin (cf. for example the word Maori itself and iwi ‘tribe, tribes’ (the two local iwi), but the plural of Kiwi is Kiwis
- the use of the indicative in mandative sentences, as in I recommend that this meeting pass a motion tonight commissioning me to travel to Wellington (Hundt 1998a:166).

Nonstandard features include the use of plural yous(e), especially frequently used in
representations of the language of Maori speakers of English, and, as in AusE, she as a nonreferring pronoun (she’ll be jake, expressing confidence in a happy outcome, reassurance, agreement and so on).

4.8.3.4 Lexicon

One of the salient features of NZE must be the impact of Maori on its lexicon. There is, however, much more of interest in NZE vocabulary than this markedly foreign element. The Dictionary of New Zealand English (DNZE) contains some 6,000 main headword entries, providing a historical record of New Zealand words and phrases from their earliest use to the present day. It is true that some 700 entries are shared with AusE, but the dictionary’s format – well over 900 large, three-column pages in small print – does not include General English lexical items, at least not if they carry the same meaning. Under the headword cow, for example, we find various senses relating to ‘an extended use of Brit. Slang a derog. term for a woman’, for example in phrases such as a cow of, cows of, with the intriguing example These tricky cows of boars.

Yet the bulk of the vocabulary used by New Zealanders is definitely shared with other inner-circle varieties, especially Standard EngE. Next to the Maori language, American English is probably the most obvious source of new lexical items in NZE. It is not clear whether people actually know whether the origins of the words they use are British or American, or whether they consciously favour one or the other. A study by Vine (1995) reports that New Zealanders often assign different meanings to British/American word pairs.

One of the most interesting aspects of NZE, as richly documented in DNZE, is the alteration of form and extension of meaning affecting general English words. A well-known example is the clipped form bach ‘a holiday house’, probably derived from bachelorize ‘to live alone’. As in AusE, -y/-ie is an extremely productive suffix in creating familiar forms of the names of common objects, creatures, and people: cardie ‘cardigan’, fleecie ‘fleece-picker’, humpie ‘humpback whale’, lippy ‘lipstick’, relie ‘relative’, sammy ‘sandwich’. A characteristic example of conversion is the use of farewell as a verb: The Child Care Centre is holding a party brunch to farewell Maggie Haggerty.

A great many words relating to NZ society, topography, flora and fauna have developed additional and new meanings of the BONFIRE NIGHT or CHIPS types: elder ‘a person of recognised authority in a Maori community’, creek ‘small river’ rather than ‘inlet’ (see variation in AmE described in 4.3), bush ‘rainforest’ (in the South Island sometimes ‘a clump of native trees’). Countless names of plants and animals are of the ROBIN type and like birch, beech, magpie, robin, bream, refer to different, but similar-looking, species in the new environment.

A great deal of the material presented in DNZE also demonstrates that this is an extremely innovative variety of English. Distinctively NZ lexical items have been created from a wide range of domains and many are related to present-day, everyday life, not exclusively restricted to NZ (hence THUMB TACK words): mob ‘a herd (flock) of cattle (sheep)’, watersider ‘docket’, glide time ‘flexible work hours’, stair-dancer ‘thief in multistorey buildings’, half-pie ‘unsatisfactory’ (cf. Holmes 1998:18). The last word is probably a hybrid in that the second element is derived from Maori pai ‘good’. 
Among its 6,000 headwords, DNZE includes 700 Maori words. Early borrowings from Maori have been described as 'receiver-oriented', 'Pakeha-driven', whereas recent ones are 'donor-oriented', 'Maori-driven'. The Maori borrowings relate to a variety of domains: flora and fauna, obviously, but increasingly also to social and cultural concepts (BONFIRE NIGHT words); kia oui 'hello', 'goodbye', 'good health', kohanga reo 'language nest', providing preschool children with immersion in Maori language and culture, hangi 'a traditional earth oven and the meal cooked in it', haka 'dance with chant', taonga 'treasure, valuables', hui 'meeting', powhiri 'welcome ceremony', kia a 'old or senior woman', whakapapa 'family tree' and the particularly emotive word papakainga 'homeground', 'the area where one's original kinship group came from and lived'.

4.8.4 Further reading

Review questions
1. Which varieties use the subjunctive in mandative sentences? What does EngE use?
2. In the final paragraph borrowings from Maori are said to be either 'Pakeha-driven' or 'Maori-driven'. What does this mean and why do you think the character of the borrowings has changed?
3. Some anecdotal evidence was given of cross-dialectal miscomprehension involving NZE. Explain the reasons for these miscomprehensions and try to think of examples relating to other varieties of English.
4. Try to identify NZE features in the following example of informal writing:
   How you been? Man I hear your going to see Christina??? Man I so wish I was coming with yous grrhhh... We're coming home for xmas so maybe we can go out for a little bit of a kanikani yeah??? Just the girls!! Well hope all is well, love you muchly!!

4.9 South Africa
No English word conveys the exact meaning of the word 'veld', nor indeed can England be said to have the thing meant.
(The Revd J. P. Legg in Cape Illustrated Magazine, 1891, quoted from Silva (1998))

Focus questions
- What is the status of English in South Africa? Has it changed during the last 150 years?
- Explain why South African English is presented as an inner-circle as well as outer-circle variety.
- Describe the English-speaking founder population of South Africa.
4.9.1 Introduction

Since English in South Africa is not predominantly used by first-language speakers, the full presentation of the country as a linguistic area will be found in Chapter 5. Here we merely supply a linguistic description of the first-language variety. As recently shown by Fitzmaurice (2010), it shares a number of phonological and grammatical features with some other varieties of L1 varieties spoken in Southern Africa.

English came to South Africa around 1800, roughly at the same time as it arrived in Australia. The first real settlement took place in the eastern Cape in 1820 as a result of the British Government’s attempts to recruit prospective immigrants. The early settlers came from various parts of the British Isles, yet predominantly from southern England, and were mainly of working-class or lower middle-class backgrounds. In the 1850s a new wave of immigrants, mostly from the Midlands, Yorkshire and Lancashire and of middle- and upper-middle-class origin, arrived and settled in Natal on the eastern seaboard. Major settlements later in the nineteenth century were particularly related to the diamond and gold mines.

As a result of the rather different regional and above all social structures of the early settlements, two South African varieties of English emerged: in Natal, which maintained closer ties to Britain, Standard EngE was emulated as the prestige model, whereas ‘Cape English’, which was characterised by Cockney-like features, carried low prestige. As in other southern-hemisphere varieties of ‘transported English’, RP was the model until long after the Second World War, but has now been replaced by ‘respectable SAfE’, largely based on the Natal accent.

SAfE differs from other transported varieties such as AusE, NZE, CanE and AmE in always having existed in a complex multilingual and multicultural environment (Silva 1998:70). Hence the influence from other languages is more marked, especially in the lexicon, and it is more difficult to ‘isolate’ the first-language variety from English as used by competent L2 speakers. It should also be pointed out that first-language users of present-day SAfE represent a range of different societal and regional groups, for example ‘coloured’ speakers in Cape Town, white speakers of East Cape origin, Indian speakers (mainly in Natal), white speakers with a Natal accent, and white members of the Transvaal working class (Brandford 1994:472).

As a variety in its own right, South African English (SAfE) has been codified in several dictionaries, most recently in A Dictionary of South African English on Historical Principles, published by Oxford University Press in 1996. This dictionary represents all ethnic varieties of English in the country but gives information on the provenance of regional or ‘group’ vocabulary for words that may not be widely familiar to South Africans (Silva 1998:82).

4.9.2 South African English (SAfE) – a descriptive account

A ‘shortlist’ of particularly salient features:

- [ə] in BATH, PALM, and START, that is like RP but unlike AusE and NZE
- allophonic variant in KIT (the ‘KIT SPLIT’): [ɪ] adjacent to velar consonants, after /h/, word-initially, usually before /ʃ/, and sometimes before affricates, that is
in words such as king, ding, pitch, fish; [ɔ] in other environments, that is in words such as fit, thin, risk, still
● unaspirated /p, t, k/, probably due to a substratum effect from Afrikaans
● extensive borrowing in the lexicon from African languages as well as Afrikaans, as exemplified in the motto above.

4.9.2.1 A note on spelling
SAfE, as codified in the Oxford dictionary mentioned above, follows British conventions. Borrowed lexical items from Afrikaans and African languages are usually not anglicised in any way; e.g. (roughly equivalent to German ach), braai ‘barbecue’, wild() ‘open grassland’, lekker ‘nice’, tokoloshe ‘malevolent spirit’.

4.9.2.2 Phonology
The following description of first-language SAfE is based on Wells (1982) and Bow-ereman (2008).

In our list of salient features we referred to the KIT split as a case of allophonic variation, which seems to be the prevalent view today (cf. Lass 1987:304, Bow-ereman 2008:170). According to Wells (1982:612ff.), however, it is possible to argue for the existence of two different phonemes, namely /e/ and /ə/, at least in broad accents, in which words like kit and bit do not even rhyme.

As in AusE and NZE, the quality of DRESS and TRAP is quite close and clearly diverging from RP which is undergoing a shift in the opposite direction (cf. 4.1.5.1). The starting point of SQUARE is [e] and it is often realised as a monophthong.

PRICE has also undergone a similar development, that is reducing the second element. In some speakers virtually all diphthongs are characterised by weakening of the second element whereas others have diphthong shifts similar to AusE.

As described among the salient features, START, BATH and PALM are characterised by a very back quality. In broad accents, the vowel is even slightly rounded [ʌ]. As in AusE and NZE, NURSE tends to be closer and fronter than in RP, and also weakly rounded [ʌ]. GOOSE is often central [ʌ] as in ‘modern’ RP.

SAfE is firmly nonrhotic to the degree of not even having linking or intrusive /r/ as observed in a great number of its speakers. Prevocalic /t/ is a fricative, tap or trill (the last-mentioned quality is probably an effect of the Afrikaans substratum); /l/ is generally clear but nevertheless seems to have a lowering effect on a preceding DRESS or GOAT.

The lack of aspiration, as described among the salient features, is variable but not stigmatised (Wells 1982:618). Afrikaans-based lexical items, such as ag, often exemplify the voiceless fricative [x], which has become a feature of SAfE, although it does not enjoy phonemic status.

4.9.2.3 Grammar
The morphology and syntax of formal SAfE can hardly be distinguished from Standard EngE or General English. In informal speech, the following characteristics are often found:
as sentence-initiator, as in the following conversation (quoted from Bowerman 2008:479): A: Isn’t your car ready yet? B: No, it is. Afrikaans has a parallel construction (see also the sentence-initiator ag, mentioned in 4.9.2.1, a borrowing from Afrikaans)

• as a reinforcing marker of the progressive aspect, busy is used with certain verbs where it does not have its normal sense of ‘activity’, as in He was busy lying in bed

• is it? is used as a kind of ‘all-purpose response’, as in A: He’s left for St Helena. B: Is it?

4.9.2.4 Lexicon

In the following brief description of SAfE vocabulary, we take a theme-related approach, since many aspects of South African life, culture and environment are encoded in the vocabulary (Branford 1994:445).

Landsscapes

Most of the basic topographical vocabulary, such as veld [velt, felt], ‘open country’, ‘broad high grassland’, mentioned in the motto and often used as a national symbol, was established in SAfE as early as the first half of the nineteenth century and the bulk of this vocabulary is indeed of Dutch/Afrikaans origin. Other words in this category include bakveld ‘back country’, drift ‘ford’, rand ‘ridge’, platteland ‘inland countryside’. Among the words listed here, veld tends to be the only one included in general dictionaries such as the Encarta World English Dictionary, but they should probably all be classified as local form foreignisms with exclusively local referents (BONFIRE NIGHT).

Settlement

Dorp ‘small town’, locaion originally ‘an area of land granted for settlement’, but later ‘segregated urban area for blacks’, township, replacing location in its later sense, shacklands, also denoting areas set aside for the black population. Location and township represent the categories ‘partial tautonym + heteronym’ (MOB).

Flora and fauna

There are many examples of borrowings from Dutch/Afrikaans denoting similar-looking but often unrelated species: boekenhout ‘beech’ (BONFIRE NIGHT), tigre ‘leopard’ (ROBIN); these can both be seen as examples of partial tautonyms, although only one as seen from an English perspective. Other BONFIRE NIGHT words are loan translations or Dutch coinages: stinkwood ‘a hardwood tree’, fynbos ‘delicate bush’, denoting a special vegetation type found in the coastal areas of the Cape, which has now become a key environmental term. A study of 100 randomly selected names in this category showed that 80 per cent were of Dutch/Afrikaans or English origin and only 11 per cent were from indigenous languages (Branford 1994:450).

Words denoting people

Owing to the ethnic diversity in South Africa and the dramatic social and political changes, this is a very rich and complicated category, which has been the subject of a
great deal of research (Branford 1994:411ff., Silva 1998, Smit 1998). One example is the notorious *kaffir*, characterised as offensive and a misnomer as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century, but living on in nonstandard spoken language. Its more neutral counterpart is simply *native*. *Bantu*, as a human noun, is also controversial; it has become very much associated with apartheid, since – during the 1950s – it replaced *native* in legislation. As the name of a language, however, it has remained neutral. The well-known *boer*, derived from the Dutch word for 'farmer', has become a multifaceted word; Branford recognises at least seven different meanings, ranging from 'Dutch-speaking farmer' to 'the South African government' (at least before 1994). *'Coloured'* has long been used in the sense of 'South African of mixed descent', distinguished from 'black' as well as 'white'. Its status is now somewhat questionable, as usually indicated by the use of single quotes around the word.

*Kinship, relationships, politics*

There are a number of early borrowings from Dutch/Afrikaans: *oom* 'uncle', 'respectful third-person address', *oupa* 'grandpa', *baas* 'master', *trek* in the sense of 'emigrate' (originally 'pull'). This word has many senses and derivatives and has become 'a powerful symbol of national endeavour. Both as noun and verb, it is one of the most widely used South African words in the English-speaking world' (Branford 1994:464). Yet, sadly, the best-known word in this category is probably *apartheid* 'separateness', first recorded in 1929 and used in the sense of 'segregation' from 1947.

4.9.3 Further reading


Review questions

1. ‘Southern Hemisphere Englishes’, that is, AusE, NZE and SAfE, display a great many similarities but also differences. Describe some of these and give examples.

2. What is the KIT split? How would the following be pronounced in SAfE: *tick*, *pig*, *dish*, *dip*, *tin*, *bit*?

3. Why do you think Afrikaans has had so much more influence on SAfE vocabulary than French has had on Canadian English?
4.10 Liberia

‘Liberia’, ‘Librarian’, from Latin liber ‘free’ (as founded as a settlement for freed Black slaves from the US).

Focus question:
Why is Liberia included in the chapter on inner-circle varieties?

The Republic of Liberia is situated on the Atlantic coast of West Africa (cf. Figure 5.3). Liberia was founded in 1822 as a settlement for freed slaves from the USA, and was proclaimed independent in 1847. The link with America is clearly symbolised in the Liberian flag, which has red and white stripes as well as one white star against a blue background. Liberia deserves its own section in this chapter because English is its only official language and is also used as a first language by part of its population. Most of the first-language speakers of English in Liberia are descendants of nineteenth-century black American settlers, who were encouraged and helped by a group of philanthropical societies to leave the USA for what was conceived as their own homeland. These descendants, known as Americo-Liberians (Mericos or Congos in more popular usage), have established English in the area.

Several varieties of Liberian English can be distinguished along a social continuum, but Liberian Settler English, which is clearly related to AAVE in the USA, is the true first-language variety, which will be briefly described here. We will refer to the variety as LSE, although according to Singler (2008:101) most English-speaking Liberians now speak Vernacular Liberian English (VLE), which is characterised as a pidgin, yet diverging sharply from pidgin English in the rest of West Africa.

Phonology
In comparison with other African English varieties, LSE has a rich vowel system, for example with qualitative contrasts between KIT and FLEECE as well as between FOOT and GOOSE. Another difference is the realisation of the final vowel in words such as happy, where LSE has [ɛ] but other varieties have [ɪ]. A characteristic also found in AAVE is the tendency to delete final consonants, especially /t/, /d/ and any fricative, for example [blɛd] blood, [grɛhɛpɛr] grasshopper, [klo] clothes (Wells 1982:655). Consonantal reduction is also found in words such as [kɛʃ] catch and [riʃ] reach, in which the affricate has been simplified to a fricative. As in AAVE, stops replace the dental fricatives in initial position, but Cockney-like [f] and [v] are used in final position: [dæ] that, [briv] breathe. LSE is nonrhotic with frequent loss of /r/ also intervocally as in AAVE and some accents in the American South. According to Wells (1982:616), care and carry may be homophones, realised as [kε]. Final /r/ is lost or vocalised. A conservative feature of LSE is the retention of initial [hw], also found in American accents. Another link with AmE is the tapped realisation of intervocalic /t/.
Grammar
LSE generally shows great affinity with AAVE, for example in the use of nonstandard forms in the verb phrase: *I do see boy all de time* (habitual), *I ain see him*, verbal -s used with first and second person pronouns (cf. Poplack and Tagliamonte 2001), *he done come* in the use of *done* carries affective force as a "badge" of Settler identity. It is used only by Settlers, and it is identified by Settler and non-Settler alike as being a distinctively Settler feature (Singler 1987:89).

Lexicon
LSE vocabulary includes reduplicated forms such as *bugabug* 'termite' and retains older meanings, such as *favour* in the sense of 'resemble'. *Outside child* 'a child acknowledged although born outside marriage' is an example of a localism.

As representing traditional language in an early AAVE exclave, LSE has attracted increasing attention, since it provides important evidence in the debate on the history of AAVE (Poplack and Tagliamonte 2001).

4.10.1 Further reading

Review questions:
1. Why does Liberian English have more vowel distinctions than other West African (non-settler) varieties?
2. Why is Liberian English of great interest to researchers on AAVE?

4.11 The Caribbean
In recent years a BBC Television producer asked me what African languages I spoke, and if I spoke them when I'm with other West Indians.

(Caryl Phillips, The European Tribe (1987))

'What did you say? You know it will take me some time to understand everything you say. The way you West Indians speak!'

'What wrong widi it?' Galahad ask. 'Is English we speaking.'

(S. Selvon, The Lonely Londoners, quoted in Morris (1993))
Focus questions

- How do you interpret the two mottos above?
- What other languages are spoken in the Caribbean as first-language varieties?
- When did English come to the Caribbean? What languages were spoken there before the advent of English?
- Listen to online recording 15.

Figure 4.7 The Caribbean

4.11.1 Introduction

There are three main island groups in the Caribbean: the Greater and Lesser Antilles and the Bahamas. In addition, some adjacent areas in Central and South America are culturally and historically connected with the West Indies. Bermuda is situated to the north of the Caribbean proper but belongs linguistically with the English-speaking West Indies (Wells 1982:561).

The name *Caribbean* is derived from *Carib*, denoting the indigenous Amerindian people once inhabiting the area and known to Columbus. It was in his time that some of their words were borrowed into European languages, such as *canoe* and *tobacco*; incidentally, the word *cannibal* is derived from *Carib*, as perceived and taken down by Columbus. Of the Caribs themselves there is hardly a trace, however; they had literally vanished only a few decades after the advent of the European conquerors. It is known that in some areas a French-led ethnic cleansing, ‘the Carib expulsion’, took place in the seventeenth century. It is also believed that they were afflicted by contagious diseases due to lack of resistance. Contrary to what the BBC producer figuring in the motto seemed to believe, there are no speakers of African languages in the West Indies but a great number of first-language English speakers. This is not the case on all of the islands, however (cf. further 5.6.2).
The English language came to the West Indies with the first settlements (St Kitts, Barbados) established in the early seventeenth century, which makes the Caribbean varieties some of the oldest in the history of the expansion of English (Schreier et al. 2010:8). From a typological perspective, they can be fitted into the dynamic model of postcolonial Englishes (cf. 1.3) although they display an unusual contact scenario and are characterised by creolisation and very early structural nativisation (Schneider 2007:219). Gupta (1997), categorising them as monolingual contact varieties, writes:

The largest population are descendants of those who learnt English informally when forcibly migrated (they often have British Isles ancestry too). English has been now transmitted normally for several generations to the majority of the population. There are also minorities who use other languages domestically, often alongside English. There is a range of varieties of English with huge syntactic differences between them, and individuals move from one variety to another depending on who they are speaking to and how they want to present themselves … Some of the contact varieties may be referred to as creoles, at least by linguists.

English is an official language in Jamaica and the Cayman Islands, the Virgin Islands, Anguilla, St Kitts and Nevis, Montserrat, Antigua, Dominica, St Lucia, St Vincent, Barbados, Grenada, Trinidad and Tobago, the Bahamas and Bermuda. In many of these island speech communities there is now a language continuum, with Standard English at one end and a basilectal English-based creole at the other, that is a ‘postcreole continuum’, but in St Lucia, Dominica and Grenada the creole is French-based. Caribbean English at the creole end of the continuum is probably derived from the pidgin forms of communication used first between the slaves and the sailors during the time of the notorious ‘Atlantic triangle’. More importantly, as argued by Mufwene (2001), history suggests that the European indentured servants, most of whom spoke nonstandard English, with whom the slaves interacted regularly, played no smaller part than the Africans in the development of American southern English.

The study of English-based creoles, not least in the Caribbean, has played an important part in sociolinguistics during several decades and there is an ongoing debate on their origin and relatedness. It is beyond the scope of our book to do justice to this research and rather than try to present it in a simplistic fashion we refer the interested reader to major publications such as Mufwene 2001, Schneider 2010. We define the terms pidgin and creole very traditionally as ‘a mixed and reduced, often transient form of language used in contact situations’ and ‘a mother-tongue variety derived from a pidgin’, that is ‘the acquisition of native speakers by a language’ (phrase attributed to G. Sankoff). In the West Indies, creoles are of long standing, well established as early as the end of the seventeenth century. Locally, they are usually referred to as patois (patwa).

The Caribbean islands have rather different settlement histories, disputed by several European colonial powers, and this is of course reflected in the language situation. We have already mentioned the prevalence of languages other than English in many areas, but there is also characteristic variation in English itself, in phonology for example. Here we provide an account of three significant, well-known varieties.
4.11.2 Jamaica

Jamaica is the largest island with the largest English-speaking population, has its own tertiary education at the University of the West Indies and has considerable cultural influence worldwide. Its lexicon is documented in the Dictionary of Jamaican English, which has been instrumental in the development of fictional writing in Jamaica and the Caribbean at large. The Jamaican postcreole continuum covers the full range from basilect to acrolect and is well researched. Devonish and Harry (2008:256f) characterise the Jamaican speech community as diglossic, with two varieties of English: 1) Jamaican Creole, popularly called Patwa (the ‘low’ variety, basilect–mesolect continuum), and 2) Jamaican English (the acrolect and ‘high’ variety). The educated minority are able to function in both varieties, using the former in private, informal and predominantly oral interaction and the latter mainly in public, formal and written discourse. Jamaican English can be described as ‘the idealised form of English usage targeted by the educated population of Jamaica’ but Jamaican Creole, too, must be viewed as an idealised form of speech. Real-life spontaneous speech characteristically shows a considerable – if not infinite – number of levels of interaction between each of these two idealised systems.

Jamaican Creole (Patwa) is not only the language of ethnic identification for more than two million inhabitants of Jamaica but also for many thousand speakers in the diaspora, notably in the British Isles. Patrick (2008:609) refers to this variety as ‘a canonical example of an Atlantic creole’. Its status has recently been raised through serious efforts on the part of the Jamaican Government to explore language planning and recognition of Jamaican Creole as a national language.

To illustrate differences between basilectal and acrolectal varieties, we quote some examples from DeCamp (1971:355): *pikni*, *nyam*, *nana* (basilect) correspond to *child*, *eat*, *granny* (acrolect); initial /t, d/ (basilect) sometimes correspond to dental fricatives in the acrolect; *no ben* (basilect) corresponds to *didn’t* (acrolect). For historical reasons, Jamaican English, like most Caribbean English varieties, has been more British- than American-oriented, which means that the acrolect approximates to Standard EngE/RP. Yet recent years have seen ‘the functional dethronement’ of Standard English as the exclusive language of public–formal domains and there is a shift towards a local variety as the new standard, which has been described as ‘a projection of a native linguistic identity’.

4.11.3 Trinidad

Trinidad, by contrast, has been English-speaking for less than two centuries. The first colonisers were Spanish and in the early nineteenth century French was the predominant language, owing to the increased presence of French-speaking planters and their slaves. The first creole variety spoken on the island was French-based, surviving well into the 1800s, but there is also evidence of an emerging English creole from the beginning of that century, among other things due to sizeable immigration from Barbados. This language-shift or ‘crossover’ background in the linguistic history of the island is reflected not least in the phonology of the present-day creole. On the whole,
Trinidad has a very mixed population, with immigrant groups from other parts of the West Indies, Asia and Portugal (certain phonological mergers can probably be ascribed to French, Spanish or Indian influence). Today, English is the mother tongue of most Trinidadians, however. Despite the difference in founder population, Trinidadian creole has many similarities with Jamaican (Sebba 1997:248), but is clearly different in its nonrhoticity. This may have to do with the lateness of English settlements in Trinidad, that is, when nonprevocalic r had been lost in urban speech in the south-east of England, but nonrhoticity is also found in some very early English settlements in the Caribbean, for example St Kitts (Wells 1982:578).

The propagation of English through the school system began in the mid-nineteenth century by Canadian missionaries. The creole in Trinidad, like that of Tobago, with which it has formed a political entity since 1889, is characterised as 'mesolectal' (Youssef and James 2008:325) and was officially recognised as a language in its own right in 1975. It is now used increasingly by teachers in schools, and there appears to be a domain loss for monolingual Standard English. There is a strong ethnic identification with the creole, 'the language of solidarity', but as in Jamaica, appropriate language use entails an ability to adapt to the situation in the use of two varieties, one of which is more standard-like, that is, at theacrolectal end of the continuum.

4.11.4 The Bahamas

The Bahamas, a large and scattered archipelago of more than 700 islands south-east of Florida and north of Cuba and Haiti, were virtually uninhabited when the first English settlers arrived in the mid-seventeenth century. They were religious dissidents and came from Bermuda as well as directly from England. Towards the end of the following century, the Bahamas became a haven for American loyalists, who also brought their slaves. Most of the loyalists came from the American south, New York, and New England, which explains the general nonrhoticity of Bahamian English (Trudgill 2002:35). In comparison with most Caribbean islands, they are indeed—for geographical as well as historical reasons—more closely linked to North America, but the linguistic background of the founder population is unusually complicated. ‘Few Caribbean varieties have such a full range of potential English input dialects’ (Childs and Wolfram 2008:240).

In contrast with the linguistic situation in the two previous island communities presented here, the diversity found in the Bahamas makes labelling the variety problematic (Reaser and Torbert 2008:592f) and opinions have varied as to its status. The general consensus now, however, appears to be that Bahamian English (as it is usually called) is a creole variety, displaying similarities to AAVE but also to Jamaican Creole. As in other Caribbean speech communities, there is register and situational shifting along a continuum (prototypical Anglo-Bahamian English – mesolectal Afro-Bahamian English – basilectal Afro-Bahamian English).

In presenting some phonological features of the above three varieties of Caribbean English, we rely chiefly on Wells (1982). The features presented are not taken from the most acrolectal part of the continuum.
4.11.5 Phonology
The vowel systems are generally simpler than in RP, with several mergers, especially involving TRAP, LOT, BATH, CLOTH, PALM, and THOUGHT. The presence of rhoticity in Jamaica explains some of the differences in the vowel systems, such as long monophthongs vs. diphthongs. In weak syllables, final and preconsonantal historical /r/ is lost, however (cf. Wells 1982:577 for a detailed account of the complex rhoticity situation in Jamaica). The quality of STRUT is generally back and rounded, especially in Trinidad and the Bahamas. In nonacrolectal Trinidadian it may merge with several other sets, for example LOT, CLOTH, and NURSE. In nonacrolectal Bahamian English, NURSE and CHOICE have merged into a diphthong with a central starting point.

Th stopping, that is, the use of [t,d] instead of [θ,ð] as exemplified in the general account of the Jamaican continuum above, is characteristic of most nonacrolectal Caribbean accents. The use of dental fricatives is viewed as a prestige marker, which is demonstrated by hypercorrections such as [fuθ] for foot. Another general characteristic is the reduction of consonant clusters, especially in final position. Initial clusters beginning with /s/ tend to be reduced in the basilect, as in [kratʃ] for scratch, [tamp] for stamp.

As in traditional Cockney, there is v–w confusion, mostly to the effect that initial v- is realised as [w]. This is especially the case in the Bahamas, where – also as a result of the NURSE–CHOICE merger – voice, worse, and verse may be homophones.

H dropping is found in Jamaica, especially in Kingston, its capital, and to some extent in the Bahamas. A characteristic of Jamaican creole is also the use of the ‘glides’ [j] and [w] after stops before vowels, as in [kjat] for cat, [bwa] for boy.

Finally, a general feature of Caribbean English is its syllable-timed rhythm (cf. 3.2.2), possibly – but not exclusively – attributable to an African substratum. This has resulted in word stress patterns different from RP or GA, for example final stress in verbs ending in -ise, and also in nonreduction of vowels in unstressed position.

4.11.6 Grammar and lexis
The following brief presentation of grammatical and lexical features refers to Caribbean English in general.

Grammar
Caribbean acrolectal syntax approximates to General English, as can be seen in the difference between basilect and acrolect exemplified in the description of Jamaica above. An illustrative example of the full-range Jamaican continuum is given by Sebba (1997:211): realisations of the phrase I am eating ‘from top to bottom’ run: /aɪ əm ɪːtɪŋ/, /ə am iːtɪŋ/, /a iz ɪːtɪŋ/, /a iz iːtɪŋ/, /am a ɪːtɪŋ/, /mi a nyam/. The examples towards the basilectal end show the characteristic marking of tense and aspect by a particle. There are also habitual markers, taking various forms, such as doz, da, iz, z (Holm 1994:575ff.). A marker of completed action is don, placed before or after the verb in Jamaican creole, and there is also an irrealis marker, go, indicating that the action of the following verb is not (yet) a part of reality. Plural forms of nouns are also indicated
by particles, placed before or after the noun, for example *di man dem*. The following example from Trinidad exemplifies the lack of a genitive marker: *mi faka kuzn kous* 'my father’s cousin’s house’. In some varieties, two forms of address are retained: *yu vs /wana/* (Barbados), *yu vs all-yu* (Trinidad).

**Lexicon**

Most of the Caribbean creole vocabulary demonstrates clearly that English is the ‘lexifier’ language, and the portion of African-derived words has been estimated at less than 5 per cent (Holm 1994:357). Still, African languages have probably affected the lexicon in the common use of reduplication as a word formation device: *poto-poto* ‘slimy’, *batta-batta* ‘to beat repeatedly’, *big-big* ‘huge’, *picky-picky* ‘choosy’. Creole word-formation, in general, is very free and innovative, as exemplified by *jokifying* (Crystal 1995:345) and *broughtupcy* ‘the state of being well brought up’ (Holm 1994:361). In contrast with phonology and syntax, Caribbean vocabulary is characterised by striking regional variation. A comparative study of Jamaica, Trinidad and the Bahamas showed that only about 20 per cent of the non-General English vocabulary was shared (Crystal 1995:345).

4.11.7 Further reading


Review questions

1. It now seems likely that African slaves worked alongside non-standard English-speaking (Scottish and English) and Gaelic-speaking (Irish) indentured labourers in the West Indies. How would this have affected the linguistic forms available to second-generation Africans in developing a variety of native English?

2. To what extent, if at all, does this reggae lyric represent Jamaican basilect?

*Si We Dem Nuh Know We Transcribed by Azzdem and Nerd*

*Murder bwoy…*

*Si wi dem nuh know we dem nuh know we pon dem si wi*

*One come arrest me and charge me wif da murder*

*They take me to the station one lock me down*

*I want a phone call to link up with me lawyer*

*I say who adopt the bwoy me say look what they took*
4.12 Some ‘lesser-known’ minor varieties of English

‘... thy every mood so varied, doth our hearts but closer bind, 
To the Isle with none compared, and our friends we've left behind’
(written about a century ago by an anonymous exile from Fair Isle)

The concept of Lesser-Known Varieties of English (LKVEs) was recently introduced in a publication by that name devoted to varieties that have not received much attention in the literature (Schreier et al. 2010) and that are generally regarded as marginal and insignificant. In their selection the editors focused on varieties that represented direct transmission of English by settler communities, thus excluding ESL and EFL varieties. The editors point out (p. 4) that LKVEs "provide model cases of natural language evolution and change "on the ground"".

Here we will conclude our chapter on ENL speech communities by presenting our own selection of some LKVEs. They differ dramatically with regard to location, history, language contact scenarios, political status, size, population and linguistic characteristics, but they have at least one thing in common: they are all islands or groups of islands. This is no coincidence, since island communities for obvious reasons tend to be quite special from a linguistic point of view:

- they are close-knit, which makes them resistant to change
- they function as identity carriers for their communities
- they are identified as distinct varieties by their speech communities
- they often represent low-contact situations, which tend to result in elaborate phonology, irregular morphology and unique vocabulary
- they were formed by processes of dialect/language contact
- they constitute little 'universes' which seem surveyable; conceivably, they ideally lend themselves to reconstruct the social history of a community and to give complete descriptions of the linguistic situation
- they are very often endangered.

This is, of course, not to say that by definition all LKVEs are small island communities: Schreier et al. (2010), for example, also feature chapters on large, sometimes land-locked areas such as Zimbabwe, but most of the chapters in their book, too, refer to islands.

It is true that island communities of this kind have been highlighted elsewhere in this book: the Shetland Islands were, for example, described in 4.3 (Scotland) and some, albeit major, Caribbean islands in 4.11. The reason for devoting a special section to ‘others’ is that these areas less clearly constitute parts of larger geographical, political or cultural entities. We are, of course, aware that the selection is somewhat random and definitely very limited, but hope that the reader will be inspired to look for other remarkable outposts in the English-speaking world.

During the first decade of this century, pioneering and laborious research has been carried out and documented on LKVEs such as Tristan da Cunha, St Helena and the...
4.12.1 The Isle of Man

Although situated in the Irish Sea and easily reachable from England as well as Ireland, Scotland and Wales, the Isle of Man (Ellân Vannin) has a politically unique position. Its status is that of a British Crown dependency, but it has home rule, with its own legislature and parliament, the Tynwald (the same etymology as Thingvellir, the historical seat of Iceland’s Parliament). The island’s population is about 75,000 (2001 census), having grown considerably in recent decades. The growth is entirely due to immigration; it appears from the latest census results that only 48 per cent of the resident population were born on the island. The overwhelming majority of immigrants have come from England and large numbers also from Scotland and Ireland.

As the name of the parliament suggests, the Isle of Man was once under Viking rule, superseded by a period of Scots rule from the mid-thirteenth century. Until the end of the eighteenth century the main language on the island was Manx Gaelic (or simply Manx), a Celtic language closely related to Irish and Scottish Gaelic. The terminal speaker of Manx died in 1974, but serious attempts are made at reviving it and sustaining it as the second language on the island. Some local heritage sources claim that there are now a handful of native speakers. A widely used Manx expression is traad ilootar, meaning ‘time enough’, said to represent a stereotypical view of the Manx attitude to life.

Manx English today is not a very distinct variety but characterised by dialect levelling (Hamer 2007:171). This is particularly due to the input from Lancashire (especially Liverpool) immigrants and also from RP speakers. Irish and Scottish accents, by contrast, are conspicuous by their absence. The levelling was observed as early as the time of investigation for the Survey of English Dialects (SED) in 1958, which nevertheless recorded some interesting syntactic and lexical features relating to the Celtic substratum, such as the use of at expressing possession: They’d money at then ‘They possessed (plenty of) money’ (cf. 4.4.2.2) and the expression Them things wasn’t in ‘Those things didn’t exist’. One hundred and twenty-six lexical borrowings from Gaelic were elicited, especially related to farming, but also to relationships and emotions, for example grany ‘feeling unwell’, peevish, he’s in a jarod ‘in an absent-minded state’, and greetings, such as kyne ta shuo? ‘how are you?’. Michael Barry, the SED fieldworker on Man, writes: ‘Manx Gaelic died first, traditional regional Manx dialect seems to be following quite quickly’ (Barry 1984:168). In spite of the strong feeling of identity and heritage on the island, it is doubtful whether the local English dialect could be subject to revival by enthusiasts. Regrettably, data from SED, collected more than half a century ago, remains the only important source for knowledge about traditional Manx English (cf. Hamer 2007 for a thorough account of the phonology, displaying evidence of levelling, including the spread of glottal stops).
4.12.2 The Channel Islands

These islands, of which the largest are Jersey, Guernsey and Alderney, are also situated quite close to England but even closer to the north-west coast of France. They are the only portions of the former Duchy of Normandy that still owe allegiance to England, which they have done ever since 1066. Like the Isle of Man they are not part of the UK but dependencies of the British Crown. Norman law and custom still largely form the basis of Channel Island governance and the islands are not represented in the UK Parliament, nor are they part of the European Community. The official languages are English and (Standard) French, the latter used only on formal and ceremonial occasions. A variety of Norman French, however, was the dominant language well into the nineteenth century, but English has gradually replaced this variety, which is now seriously endangered through loss of most of its domains. Each island of Jersey, Guernsey and Sark, in fact, has its own native local Norman French dialect — respectively Jerriais, Guernesiais and Sercquiais — but the 2001 census tells us that only about 3 per cent of Jersey’s population and 2 per cent of Guernsey’s were able to speak it fluently.

The evacuation of the islands’ children in the Second World War meant that when they returned they had become more at home with English and their families tended to speak in English too. It is only within living memory that English has replaced French as the language of legislation. Jones (2010:42) comments on the census results:

> These figures imply that, if the decline continues at the present rate, no speakers of Channel Island French will remain by, at least, the middle of the present century.

It is intriguing to note therefore that, should such a situation come to pass, Norman will persist only in terms of a few place names, patronyms and … the distinctive variety of English spoken in the islands, which may well prove to be the last indicators of their linguistic heritage.

In spite of the increasing dominance of English, dialectologists have persisted in viewing the Channel Islands as a French-speaking area. Hence not much research has been devoted to the local varieties of English with the exception of a thorough study of Guernsey by Ramisch (1989), from whose work most of the following information is drawn.

4.12.2.1 Phonology

Thopping, that is plosives instead of dental fricatives, believed to be an ESL feature (cf. Trudgill 2002:42); West-Country-like (or French-based?) rhoticity; a palatal glide after a velar as in ['gja:dn], incidentally also found in Jamaica (cf. 4.11) and a relic feature in English dialects; a back and rounded STRUT vowel, believed to be a transfer from the local French variety.

4.12.2.2 Grammar

The Norman substrate is more clearly demonstrated in the morphosyntax, as in Four years I don’t smoke, But yes ’Yes, of course’ and I can’t say, me. Other features, such as the frequent use of ‘th’ and invariant tags, may be attributable to various sources.
4.12.3 Lexicon
Borrowings, not surprisingly, tend to be connected to local administration, traditions
and scenery: verge (a special unit of measurement), branchage (hedge-trimming and
official inspection), patin (a device for catching spider crabs) (Jones 2010:52f).

By way of conclusion it should be pointed out that many of the features presented
above arose in the speech of bilinguals via transfer. Hence Channel Islands English
may not quite comply with the LKVE criteria mentioned in the introduction to this
section.

4.12.3 Pitcairn Island
Pitcairn is a British dependency, situated in the South Pacific east of French Polynesia,
with a population of no more than 50 people (233 in 1937). It was named after the
British sailor who first sighted it in 1767. Only some 20 years later it was famously
settled by the Bounty mutineers and their Tahitian companions (consorts, in par-
ticular). The nine mutineers came from various parts of England, Scotland, the West
Indies and the USA, which in itself made for a mixed dialect input, but they probably
also used a kind of seamen's jargon.

The local language variety, known as Pitcairnese or Pitkern, must have developed from
the communication between speakers of English dialects and Tahitian. The inhabitants
of Pitcairn have always been bilingual in English and Pitcairnese, 'with Pitcairnese
often being the first and dominant language until 1930' (Mühlhäuser 2010:349).

Even though the island's population has always been very small, there has been a range
of varieties along a basilectal–acrolectal continuum, and Pitcairners are generally able
to switch between higher and lower varieties. According to Trudgill (2002:196), the
basilect exemplifies a 'dual source creoloid', creoloid being the term for a language
variety which has been subject to a certain amount of simplification and mixture, but
where a continuous native-speaker tradition has been maintained throughout. Since
1930, however, English has taken over a number of the Pitkern domains, such as work-
place and even family.

Present-day Pitcairnese, with particular reference to vocabulary, has been thor-
oughly investigated by Källgård, whose fieldwork in 1980 among other things resulted
in a word-list amounting to 923 items. These include a number of British dialect
words and archaisms, such as musket for any firearm, sailors' words such as all-hands for
'everybody', conversions not known in Standard English, such as the use of crazy as a
verb and dark meaning 'to become dark' but also 'to be still working at dusk', and redu-
plications such as dry-dry 'unpalatable'. According to Källgård (1991:81), individual
Pitcairners have been able to influence the vocabulary to a much greater extent than in
most other languages, and idioms and sayings are full of references to earlier inhabit-
ants. Fredfeet, for example, means 'very big feet', since a certain islander, Fred Christian,
is said to have had unusually big feet.

Since the future of the colony is itself at risk, Pitkern is threatened by rapid ex-
tinction; alternatively it will probably undergo gradual attrition. The possibility of a
raised status and maintenance of the variety could depend on the creation of a written
language and a dictionary. In drawing up his word-list, Källgård has taken a first step
towards this goal and the list has been used on the island. More importantly, there is now an attempt to reverse the shift to English on Pitcairn as well as the related, larger speech community on Norfolk Island (Mühlhäusler 2010:362).

4.12.4 The Falkland Islands

This group of almost 800 islands is situated in the South Atlantic, to the east of Southern Argentina, in which country they are known as Islas Malvinas. In the UK the political status of the Falklands is that of an Overseas Territory. According to the latest census (2006) the islands have a resident population of nearly 1,000, 85 per cent of whom live in Stanley, the capital. In addition, a sizeable number of British military personnel are still based on the islands.

Although the islands had been known to sailors and map-makers since the fifteenth century, the islands remained uninhabited until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when they were settled at different times by the English, French, Spanish, Americans and Argentinians. In 1832–3 the British expelled a garrison that had been set up by Argentina on one of the two largest islands. Towards the end of the nineteenth century a British community of about 2,000 residents had been established. According to the 2006 census, the largest group in the population not born in the Falklands are from Great Britain (28 per cent of the population), followed by St Helena (15 per cent), another English-speaking community. Determining the origins of earlier settlers is problematic due to the shortage of reliable records (Britain and Sudbury 2010:212f.). It is known, however, that there were a number of immigrants from Scotland, including Gaelic speakers, as well as England’s West Country.

Overall, though, it is clear that the predominant accents and dialects of English shaping the emergent Falkland Islands English are those of the south and southwest of England, and the northwest of Scotland. (Britain and Sudbury 2010:213).

Settlements in the western, more rural parts of the islands have tended to retain regional features whereas a new focused dialect has developed in the capital (Trudgill 2002:41).

Summing up the results of her extensive, pioneering research on Falkland Islands English (FIE), Sudbury (Britain and Sudbury 2010:219f) concludes:

... what is most remarkable about FIE is just how unremarkable the variety is, despite its settler origins in the southwest of England and Scotland which the traditional dialectological literature portrays as divergent varieties in the British context.

There is, for example, no evidence of voiced initial fricatives or pronoun exchange as found in the West Country, nor velar fricatives [x] or evidence of the Scottish Vowel Length Rule. It is known that FIE used to display rhoticity, as found in both the major input varieties of English, but it has now largely disappeared. Overall there has been considerable levelling of forms, which is symptomatic of a great deal of dialect contact as well as the general turbulence of this speech community.
4.12.5 St Helena

This is a solitary, volcanic island in the South Atlantic, about 2,000 kilometres west of Angola, with a population of approximately 4,000. The island is known by most people as the place of Napoleon’s exile and death.

Like the Falklands its political status is that of a British Overseas Territory. It has a well-established political and legal system and a Governor who is appointed by Her Majesty’s Government. The island was discovered by the Portuguese around the year 1500 and was used mainly as a kind of supply stop during voyages to and from the East. The English East India Company began coming there about a century later and Britain competed successfully with the Netherlands in claiming sovereignty. In 1834 it became a British crown colony.

The origins of St Helenian English, which is held to be the oldest variety outside the British Isles, are unusually complex. This is clearly documented in written sources from around 1700, which have recently been analysed (Schreier and Wright 2010). The complexity is due to the diversity in regional and social background among the founding populations, which came to the island as settlers, planters, administrators, soldiers and slaves, from England, France, a number of African countries and China. A recent detailed study of St Helenian phonology ‘reveals complex genetic affiliations with varieties of English around the world’ (Schreier 2010:233). There are, for example, features similar to Canadian raising as well as close front vowels approximating to other southern hemisphere varieties. PALM is fully back as in SAfE, that is, not front as in AusE and NZE, and PRICE and CHOICE are Cockney-like.

Grammatical features, too, display features found in varieties elsewhere, including different parts of the British Isles. There are, for example, double modals as in Scots, but also preverbal tense markers (done, been) as in English-based creoles. Since St Helenian English has few direct links with other southern hemisphere varieties of English, it constitutes an ideal testing ground for the analysis of founder effects (Schreier 2010:243).

4.12.6 Tristan da Cunha

Tristan da Cunha English, by contrast, is one of the youngest native-speaker varieties of English around the world. It is also the most isolated one – Tristan in fact is said to be the most remote inhabited location in the world, situated 2,800 kilometres west of Cape Town and 5,400 kilometres east of Uruguay. The island now has a stable population of 275 (Schreier 2010:248) and has the status of a British Overseas Territory. As the name of the island suggests, it too was discovered by the Portuguese (1506), but the first settlement, by the British, was actually connected with Napoleon’s imprisonment in the early nineteenth century. The names of the first nonmilitary settlers are known, and their descendants still live on the island. They came from various parts of England, Scotland, St Helena and also from nonanglophone European countries.

In 1961 the islanders were evacuated after a volcanic eruption, but nearly everybody returned in 1961. During the time of evacuation, recordings were made in England of Tristan speakers (Zettersten 1969), who found that the basis of the phonology was
clearly British English accents, mainly Southern or Cockney, confirmed by Schreier (2010). The phonology as well as morphosyntax also displays some creole features, such as the use of *done* marking completive aspect: *she’s done gone and done it now*. The lexicon clearly reflects the social history of the community, with name references to earlier inhabitants, encapsulating life on the island in a beautiful way. Some British dialect words that are obsolete elsewhere have been preserved, and there are also a number of loanwords from Dutch/Afrikaans. As in many transported varieties, English words are re-used for new terms, for example *canary* for the local ‘Tristan bunting’ (ROBIN) and *canteen* for ‘store’ (THUMB TACK) ‘supermarket’.

4.12.7 Further reading

**Review question**
1. Suggest some other LKVEs, that is, ‘English-speaking outposts’, and write a presentation of one of them.
5.1 Social and political issues surrounding the use of English in the outer circle

Focus question

Why is English still used in government and law in so many postcolonial countries?

5.1.1 The survival of English

As we mentioned in Chapter 2, English was introduced in outer-circle countries because they were colonised – mainly by military force – by English-speaking countries. So it would not be surprising if the independent postcolonial states had rejected its use. And indeed when they became independent in the period 1947–65, many ex-colonies accepted the argument for a local official language put forward by the President of India K. R. Narayanan on 14 September 1999, the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of Hindi as national language in India:

Ours is a democratic country in which the people and their welfare are supreme. In such a situation it becomes necessary that official work is carried out in a language spoken by the common people. Maybe Mahatma
Gandhi had the same thing in his mind when he said, ‘... The first and the greatest social service we can render is to revert to our vernaculars, to restore Hindi to its natural place as the national language and to carry out provincial proceedings in our respective vernaculars and national proceedings in Hindi.’ Today while the official language of the Union is Hindi in Devanagari script, the multilingual character of India has been maintained.

Some countries carried this kind of policy through. In Malaysia, for example, government policy since 1969 (Gill 2002) replaced English with Malay throughout the administration and education systems and made Malay (more precisely its codified form ‘Bahasa Malaysia’) the national language. This was part of a general reform of the country which consciously favoured the indigenous ethnic groups, primarily Malays, and thus disfavoured the non-Malay-speaking Chinese and Indian groups, who had previously been economically more powerful. Clearly it met some resistance from those who were less fluent in Malay than in English, but it was implemented anyway. English remained dominant in the business sector, where non-Malays remain powerful, and by the turn of the twentieth century was seen as a resource in the globalised world and was being reintroduced in some sectors of the educational system.

However, Malaysia’s limitation of the domains for English is the exception. As a consequence of population movements under colonialism, and of boundaries drawn to suit European interests rather than local conditions, many of the postcolonial states were multinational, or multilingual, but in most it was not politically feasible to select one local language for official purposes. Arguments often put forward for the maintenance of English are its neutrality in conflicts within states between rival national languages, its established position (the fact that within states educational materials, government documents and so on already exist in English) and in particular nowadays its association with ‘modernity’: science, education, development and globalisation. Continuing grass-roots demand for English and the association of English with rapid development in India and China (6.4.2) have tended to strengthen this view of English as a fairly neutral resource rather than necessarily an instrument of cultural and economic domination (Graddol 2006).

5.1.2 The language pyramid

The ‘pyramid’ above (Figure 5.1) illustrates a very common situation in postcolonial territories. There are three ‘layers’ of competing languages. At the top is English. Then there is one or several national languages which have nationalist value and are spoken by a majority or dominant group (Bahasa Malaysia and Hindi in the examples above) or are lingua francas, that is languages used by non-native speakers to communicate with one another. Then there are the languages of minority groups. The ruling classes
typically are educated in English and use it for many purposes, often paying mere lip service to extended use of the national language(s). A large group use the national languages for most purposes and sometimes seek to impose them on all citizens, at least as the medium of instruction. Minority groups may prefer English to the national languages because of its ethnic ‘neutrality’, in the sense that because English is not the language of any group, no ethnic group has an advantage if it is used.

In any case, the majority of proposals to replace English as a language of administration and higher education (and often nearly all education) have failed. In India and other multinational states this can be ascribed to the ‘neutrality’ of the language but it is less clear why English remains predominant among the elite in largely monolingual states like Botswana (Southern Africa) or states with a local lingua franca, like Swahili in Tanzania and Kenya. One may suspect that continuation of English maintains the advantage of the elite who know the language (Phillipson 1992, see section 7.1), but it must be considered that in Africa independence brought a massive increase in educational provision for the majority, and it was doubtless thought more important to bring some education to most of the population than to spend resources on developing new media for that education. Now, in the globalised world, English offers the chance or illusion of mobility in search of a better future, so that its continuation usually has grass-roots support.

Thus many postcolonial states continue to use English for a variety of functions (just as others continue the use of French or Portuguese). But as we have seen (3.4.3.2), in most cases it is only a minority of citizens that master the language. Michieka (2009) gives a vivid description of the Kisii region of Kenya where English has basically no local functions and is generally not acquired. Kisii may be located in an outer-circle country, but English has no real function in the community.

This leads to unequal access to power and justice. Schmied (1991), for example, reports that parliament in Botswana is conducted in English although all members can speak Setswana and not all are proficient in English; in Malawi there was an English-language test for MPs and in Ghana (as in many other countries) proficiency in English is a prerequisite for political activity (contrast the European Parliament, 6.3). In many African countries, moreover, law courts are conducted in English, so the accused will often only understand proceedings via an interpreter, who may not be proficient both in the particular dialect of an African language spoken by the accused and in English. Nevertheless the use of English is not seriously challenged at the grass roots in most cases, and its role as ‘modern’ and practical is accepted.

5.1.3 Language policy and norms in the outer circle

As the motto to this chapter suggests, attitudes in the outer circle to inner-circle varieties are complicated. In sections 3.3 and 3.4.1.2, we discussed the notions of endonormative and exonormative varieties. In the outer circle, the degree of endonormativity is sometimes a political issue. In fact in Schneider’s third phase, as endonormativity starts to develop, a ‘complaint tradition’ often appears, worrying about declining standards. Where there are basilectal varieties they are often condemned
by authorities who are anxious for the benefits of an internationally effective variety (3.4.5.2). Simo Bobda (2010) cites slogans from the University of Buea in Cameroon like ‘English is the password, not Pidgin’ and ‘Speak less Pidgin and more English’. Singapore has a lively basilectal variety called Singlish, but it is seen as a threat and has been the object of an official ‘Speak Good English’ campaign since the year 2000. As endonormativity starts, a recognisably local version of Standard English may be acceptable, but it seems a common assumption that the development of a local variety is a threat to the economic benefits to be got from English. In practice, though, people seem to be able to move up and down lectal scales and the mesolects and basilects seem to attract a good deal of language loyalty.

5.1.4 Resources for studying the outer-circle varieties

In the years since 1995 an increasing number of corpora of outer-circle English have become available. The most ambitious is the ICE series (International Corpus of English http://ice-corpora.net/ice/ [accessed 4 February 2011]) of comparable corpora which include examples of the same spoken and written genres from both inner- and outer-circle varieties. Canada, East Africa, Great Britain, Hong Kong, India, Ireland, Jamaica, New Zealand, the Philippines and Singapore were completed by 2010, and many others are in preparation. Many of the national corpora can be downloaded freely on application for a licence.

5.1.5 Further reading


**Review questions**

1. How many reasons can you think of for states to retain English as the language of government and the law? Which apply in India? In Malaysia? In Botswana?
2. Why is international intelligibility important for Singaporean English? Why might people want to continue to use Singlish?

5.2 Some common features of the ‘New Englishes’

**Focus questions**

- The outer-circle Englishes are influenced by the local languages. What characteristics might these Englishes have in common?
- Listen to the examples of Malaysian, Indian and African English at IDEA (http://web.ku.edu/~idea/).
The varieties of English spoken in outer-circle countries have been called ‘New Englishes’, but the term is controversial (cf. Chapter 2). Singh (1998) and Mufwene (2000) argue that it is meaningless, in so far as no linguistic characteristic is common to all and only ‘New Englishes’ and all varieties are recreated by children from a mixed pool of features, so all are ‘new’ in every generation. These points are certainly true, and it is important to avoid suggesting that the new (mainly non-native) varieties are inferior to the old (mainly native) ones. It is also certainly true that the ‘new/old’ dichotomy is only one of many that could be established: rhotic vs nonrhotic, British spelling vs American spelling, autonomous vs substrate and so on. Nevertheless the Englishes of India, Nigeria and Singapore and many other outer-circle countries do share a number of superficial linguistic characteristics which, taken together, make it convenient to describe them as a group separately from American, British, Australian, New Zealand, etc. varieties (Platt et al. 1984). The explanation for many of these shared features is that English has odd features not found in the substratum of these varieties; for others it is that the varieties are or were mainly acquired by formal learning at school and have characteristics deriving from that past. The varieties conventionally regarded as resulting from decolonisation in the Caribbean (4.11) may occupy a middle position, sharing some but not all of the features to be listed below (Platt et al. 1984).

5.2.1 Some sociolinguistic features

Outer-circle varieties are usually spoken as part of a multilingual repertoire which may include two or three other languages spoken in different circumstances: English at work, one local language at home, another with one’s peer group, for example. Hence it used to be the case that outer-circle varieties were not as well developed in some registers as others. One can imagine that Indian English baby language or even love language is less frequently used than scientific or administrative Indian English, for example. Increasingly, however, urban elites in many countries and the bulk of the population in a few, like Singapore, are using English for almost all purposes, and thus have registers for them. This blurs the distinction between native and non-native to the extent that it is not very useful.

Furthermore, because of this multilingualism, the outer-circle varieties are characterised by internal variation of proficiency. In an inner-circle region like Yorkshire there will be a wide variation among speakers (and within a speaker for different situations) from strongly local speech features to completely standard or nonlocal ones. Some members of the community will have difficulty in expressing themselves in formal or written Standard English. But most (excepting recent immigrants, for example) will have full proficiency in some kind of English. Outer-circle speakers will vary not only in the degree to which their English (in a given situation) has local features, but also in their proficiency in English at all. In some situations those with low proficiency in English may be much more proficient in pidgin or creole; in others the dominant language will be a local one. In any case, there are learner errors as well as varietal features. Where pidgin English is widely used for communication among
less educated speakers with different mother tongues, or as an informal register, the pidgin will be the basilect (3.4.1.4) and it will have a reasonable-sized vocabulary and range of functions; where another language performs these functions, the ‘basilect’ is the English of low-proficiency learners, characterised by limited vocabulary and efficiency as a means of communication. In this respect — variable proficiency in English — the outer-circle varieties are like the expanding-circle varieties. But they are like the inner-circle varieties in that proficiency in a form which is only comprehensible locally or nationally is useful and effective within that scope. Nigerian English that is comprehensible to other Nigerians is performing one of its main functions, while China English that is only comprehensible to other Chinese is redundant.

5.2.2 Phonology

5.2.2.1 Segments

Some phonological features are common to most of the languages of the world — for example front unrounded vowels, /u/, /au/ /a, /d/, /b/. Others are found in fewer languages (and are often learnt relatively later by children learning their first language): front rounded vowels like French u and German ü, and English /θ/ and /ð/. Crudely and non-technically, the first type of features can be called unmarked, the second marked. Sounds and distinctions in English which are unmarked are likely to be found in substrate languages and so to be represented in outer-circle varieties. Sounds and distinctions which are marked will probably not be found in substrate languages and so may not be represented in outer-circle varieties, particularly if they do not distinguish many words or are very difficult to learn.

In general the inner-circle vowel systems, with 20–24 different phonemes, are complex in relation to those of most languages. Consequently substrates tend to result in simplified systems. For example, the distinction between short lax /u/ and long tense /i/ is rather infrequent in the world’s languages and is typically missing in outer-circle varieties. Long monophthongs like /æ/ and /ʌ/ are more frequent than diphthongs like /eɪ/ and /ɒː/ (/əʊ/ in languages in general, and therefore also in the substrate languages). Consequently /e/ and /o/ are frequent realisations of the diphthongs in FACE and GOAT, in the outer-circle varieties as well as in Caribbean (and Scottish and so on) English.

Many outer-circle varieties (like the Caribbean postcreoles, AAVE and the substrate variety Irish English) do not have ‘marked’ /θ/ and /ð/, often replacing them with dental or alveolar stops of some kind. English also has more and longer consonant clusters at the ends of words like *hosts* and *filmed* than many other languages and so these are simplified in many varieties.

An alternative explanation of shared differences from inner-circle norms would lay more emphasis on the internal logic of English making some distinctions dispensable (cf. Peng and Ann (2000) and the discussion of English in lingua-franca situations in 6.3). Thus /ð/ very rarely distinguishes words from one another and substitution of /d/ causes little communicative difficulty (even inner-circle speakers who say /ð/ often write *da* for *the* in conversational writing).
5.2.2 Suprasegmentals

Although it is not clear whether there is a convincing acoustic basis for the claim, some languages appear to be stress-timed (3.2.2), like British or American English. Most of the substrate languages for outer-circle varieties are syllable-timed, as is Caribbean creole, so that the corresponding varieties of English are less strongly stress-timed than most inner-circle varieties. An effect of stress-timing is that unstressed syllables are reduced in length and their vowels are often reduced to /ə/ or /ɪ/ or to syllabic /l/, /r/, /n/. In a syllable-timed variety unstressed vowels may retain the ‘full’ pronunciation suggested by the spelling. Many speakers will have learnt English first at school, where the written language may be emphasised, so avoidance of reduction may also be due to pronouncing words as they are spelt.

Since stress and intonation are closely related, the intonation systems of outer-circle varieties are usually very different from those of inner-circle ones, but they are usually fairly different from one another as well, as the substrates have different systems.

5.2.3 Syntax

As with phonology, the outer-circle varieties often have features in common because they tend to eliminate features which are typical of inner-circle English but not of other languages (or which are inherently dispensable in English). For example, British/US Standard English has an unusually complicated system of tag questions (c.f. 5.2.5) – phrases like don’t you, aren’t you, should he, will he in the following examples.

You like fish, don’t you? You don’t like fish, do you?
You’re having fish, aren’t you? You’re not having fish, are you?
He should eat more fish, shouldn’t he? He shouldn’t eat so much fish, should he?
He’ll come, won’t he? He won’t come, will he?

In most languages, including the main substrates, all these phrases can be translated by one or two short phrases irrespective of whether the sentence to which the tag is attached is positive or negative and irrespective of the auxiliary or subject in the main verb. (German nix (wahr)? oder?, French n’est-ce pas?, Thai caj nai?, Hindi-Urdu na?, West African Pidgin no bin sa?) Consequently, many varieties of outer-circle English also use a single phrase or a few variants for this function: examples are listed in Table 5.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Countries used, according to Platt et al. (1984) and Schmied (1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no?</td>
<td>India, Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isn’t it?</td>
<td>India, Sri Lanka, Singapore/Malaysia, East and West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not so?</td>
<td>East and West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is it?</td>
<td>Singapore/Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The details of usage are different in each variety, but the principle of using one or two invariant phrases instead of the complex and variable system of inner-circle English is constant. Similar but different simplifications occur for confirmation questions:

A: He's lost his job.
B: Has he? (US, UK, etc.)/Is he? (South African English, all varieties, Indian English and so on.)

5.2.4 Lexis

Another example of elimination of a complex and unusual system found in inner-circle English concerns a set of words which is singular but refers to plural or collective concepts: words like software, luggage, furniture, cutlery, crockery, faculty (‘the teachers at a university as a whole’), staff (‘the workers in an organisation as a whole’), alphabet (‘the set of letters as a whole’), toast and so on. Inner-circle varieties typically have singular count nouns referring to individual items (program, suitcase, chair, knife, plate, and so on) but these are too specific and alongside them there are general phrases with piece, item or another classifier (piece/item of luggage/software/furniture, member of staff and so on). This is a rather complex system and the relation between the ‘plural’ sense and the singular form is not transparent. Outer-circle varieties tend to simplify the system and make these words ordinary singulars with a general sense, so that one can speak of a software, some softwares, a staff of the school, some staffs, or an alphabet (‘a letter of the alphabet’).

Platt et al. (1984) note that singular noncount words which refer to genuinely uncountable substances like mud or abstractions like hope are not converted in this way, making it more a rationalisation than a simplification.

Sometimes specific items thought to be typical of a particular variety are actually more widespread. Thus Adegbija (1999) took trouble shooter ‘one who stirs up trouble’ (by contrast with Brit/US ‘one who solves problems’) to be a Nigerian feature, while Nihalani et al. (2006) record it as an Indian one. Similarly fill a form (rather than fill out/in) has been reported as typical of both Nigeria and Kenya. The latter is probably just a ‘natural’ simplification, but it would be interesting to know whether ‘causer’ is merely a ‘natural’ reinterpretation of shooter, or if there is some common source here.

Some THUMB TACK items where the same thing has different names in different varieties are very widespread even though they are quoted as local. Thus hawkers (older British ‘door-to-door salesperson’) means ‘stationary street food salesperson’ in Ghana and South Africa, and also in South East Asia, and stay means ‘live/dwell fairly permanently’ in South Africa, Uganda and Nigeria, Scotland, Singapore/Malaysia and Guam. Bungalow means ‘upmarket tropical house’ in Asia and East and West Africa so the meanings ‘barrack’ in South Africa and ‘one-storey house’ in Britain are local deviations from an international norm.

5.2.5 Pragmatics

Some aspects of pragmatics are linguistic. In many languages the equivalent of yes means ‘what you said is true’ and no means ‘what you said is false’. So in West Africa one may get interactions like:
A: You’re not tired, are you/is it?
B: Yes. "It is correct that I am not tired"

Other aspects are determined by culture rather than language. For example, cultural change in Western countries has meant that forms of address have changed rapidly in the last 50 years, but this cultural change has not necessarily taken place in other societies. Consequently it is not uncommon for outer-circle varieties to use more formal or hierarchical types of address. On the other hand, intimacy and solidarity are often established by the use of kinship terms (brother, sister, aunt, uncle) instead of terms like mate, dear, honey and so on, and this often reflects substrate usage as well as perhaps cultural difference.

This distinction between culture and language is hard to maintain, however. Situations seen as distinct by one variety may be merged in another, and this may be cultural or simply linguistic. In many parts of Africa people say sorry both where people in Britain and America might say bad luck, that is, when something bad happens to the addressee, and where they say sorry, that is where the speaker has caused something bad for the addressee. On the other hand, in West Africa there is a specific greeting to one who is working: well done, which has no specific equivalent in inner-circle English. Thus West African English recognises a distinction not made by inner-circle English (but made, for example, in Danish God arbejdslust, ‘Enjoy your work’ a greeting to people working or on the way to work).

5.2.6 Paralanguage

Paralanguage — gesture, facial expression and so on — and proxemics are largely culturally determined. Many Indians and Sri Lankans shake their heads for ‘yes’ and nod for ‘no’, for example, whether speaking English or another language. The only generalisation would be that the paralanguage systems of outer-circle varieties are usually very different from those of inner-circle ones, being based in different cultures.

5.2.7 Further reading


Review questions

1. The outer-circle varieties are like inner-circle ones in terms of who they must be understood by, but like expanding-circle ones in terms of who knows them well. Explain.
2. Why do many New Englishes have pure vowels, not diphthongs, for the GOAT and FACE vowels?
3. What is the difference between syllable-timing and stress-timing?
The outer circle

5.3 South Asia: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, etc.

... it is impossible for us, with our limited means, to attempt to educate the body of the people. We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population.

(Thomas Babington Macaulay. Minute on Education (1835))

Focus questions
- What role has English played in the history of India? Is it divisive or uniting?
- List any words of Indian English you may know.

5.3.1 The countries and the history of the introduction of English

5.3.1.1 The languages of South Asia

Many hundreds of languages are spoken in South Asia, many by very small numbers. The dominant positions are held by Indo-Aryan languages related to Hindi/Urdu in the north, Dravidian languages such as Tamil in the south, and English as the ex-colonial language in most areas. The main Indian languages have been written as long as or longer than European ones. Old Indo-Aryan literature dates from 500 BC, Tamil from around 0 AD.

4. Can you describe the rules for question-tags in inner-circle English? Why are they often different in other varieties?
5. Do an internet search on staffs or researches. It will probably be useful to search for some or the or these staffs/researches so that you get plural nouns, not third-person verbs. Who uses these supposedly uncountable words as countable?
6. What are the pragmatic rules for using well done in inner-circle societies? Is it a greeting?
Hindi-Urdu, as a typical Indo-Aryan language, has many features familiar from European languages – noun gender, various declensions of nouns inflected for subject and non-subject cases, and singular and plural, verbs inflected for tense and person and so on. The Dravidian languages are agglutinative and thus also have complex affix systems indicating tense, case, prepositions and so on. Both Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages have rich consonantal systems, with aspirated and unaspirated stops, both voiced and voiceless, and characteristic retroflex stops in contrast with dentals.

5.3.1.2 History
In the second millennium BC Indo-Aryan languages spread over much of Northern India, and classical Hindu literature and religious texts are written in one of these – Sanskrit, a language related to Latin and Greek and of a similar age and status. In the thirteenth century Islam was brought to India and Muslim (Persian-speaking) Mogul emperors controlled much of the country from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Thus when Portuguese traders arrived in the sixteenth century, Persian was the language of the court, Sanskrit that of Hindu literary and religious writing, and Arabic that of Islamic theologians, although most people of course spoke their own vernaculars, Indo-Aryan, Dravidian or others.

In the course of the eighteenth century the British East India Company, based in Calcutta, achieved a dominant position and took more and more power from the Mogul emperor. As it gradually assumed responsibility for civil government and education, the company government was torn between ‘orientalists’ who favoured education in local languages and ‘westernisers’ who favoured English-language education. Indians themselves were divided as in other similar situations, with some seeing English as the key to Western knowledge, and others wanting to
maintain the local classical languages Persian, Sanskrit and Arabic. The westernisers won the argument. The revealing quotation from Macaulay that is the motto of this section encapsulates the case for the westernisers – and the reason that some people are sceptical of the use of English today:

By the time of Macaulay’s Minute English had become necessary for career success, and so education in English was taken up quite widely. Increasing English-language education throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries led to the establishment of English as the common language of the elite. The first half of the twentieth century was dominated by the struggle for freedom from Britain which culminated in independence in 1947 and unfortunately in the partition of the country, in which millions of people from areas of mixed religious population were driven out, Muslims (many of them Urdu-speaking) to Pakistan and what was later Bangladesh, then East Pakistan, Hindus to India.

Towards the end of the twentieth century India, in particular, experienced dramatic economic growth based in part on IT and data processing expertise. The accompanying internationalisation of economic life gave a further boost to English within the language ecology of India. In particular Graddol (2010) notes that the least privileged have started to see English as an aid both to improving their individual positions and to uniting to ‘fight for a common political cause’ across language boundaries. In fact English in India has reached stage 4 in Schneider’s scheme (cf. 3.1) at least, with spectacular literary use of English and a well-established national norm in broadcasting and newspapers, even if it is not codified and enshrined in authoritative dictionaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2 South Asian countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbados</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ireland</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current situation

A small group of South Asians (100,000 or so) have English as their mother tongue and ethnic identity. They are the 'Anglo-Indians'—descendants of mixed marriages many generations ago.

For other South Asians, proficiency in English varies widely and the education system is the main source of input. South Asians typically live in fairly large and relatively linguistically homogeneous areas comparable to European states, so there is little need for a pidgin or basilect (but Mehrotra (2000) shows that something of the kind does exist). Graddol (2010:56) quotes 16.5 per cent of Indians claiming that they can speak English and 35 per cent claiming that they can read it. Numbers depend on the proficiency thresholds set for 'knowing' English.

Krishnaswamy and Burde (1998) list five domains for English in India: bureaucracy, education, print-media communication and advertising, intellectual and literary writing and social interaction. English continues alongside Hindi and local languages in national administration, in quasi-state bodies like medical councils and the higher courts. Banks in the south often use English alongside the local language even though legislation requires them to train staff in Hindi and use that language with nonlocs. State schools theoretically operate a 'three-language policy’ so that children learn the local language, or at least that of their state, Hindi (or in Hindi-speaking states another Indian language) and English. However, this has been diluted so that Hindi and English may be alternative second languages in some schools, and at the same time private and state-supported English-medium schools of varying quality take more and more children. Although each state has thriving local-language newspapers, English-language papers are widely read. Graddol (2010:42) says, 'A survey of affluent families … in 2009 found that English is their preferred language for newspapers, but television is consumed more in regional languages’, but Krishnaswamy and Burde (1998:42) say, ‘English is now on the MTV and STAR TV network and is increasingly becoming the carrier of pop-culture’. The flourishing ‘Bollywood’ industry produces films in Hindi with code-switching into English.

Finally, a proportion of South Asians use spoken English in daily life. Most commonly there is code-mixing of English words and phrases into local languages; travellers may use English outside their own states; formal conferences and discussions may be held in English; and people use English to show off or as a mark of their age or position. Some families in the urban upper class may have gone over to English almost entirely.

Rahman (1997) describes the three-way conflict in Pakistani education between English, Urdu and the regional languages, a conflict which is characteristic of the whole subcontinent. In Pakistan, it appears, Urdu is the normal medium of school instruction. However, the elite has always ensured the existence of a few high-status schools using English as a medium and they want to retain these and retain English as the medium of higher education. The Islamic ‘Urdu proto-elite’ (many of them descendants of people expelled from India at partition) would like to see Urdu as the medium of all education. The regionalists and ‘ethno-nationalists’ want to increase the proportion of education delivered in local languages and consequently oppose the
extension of Urdu as a medium. The result is a stalemate in which English retains its position, and in fact expands in the school system.

5.3.2 South Asian English – a descriptive account

5.3.2.1 Salient features

Here is a shortlist of particularly salient features of South Asian English:

- retroflex stops for /d/ and /t/: these are the stereotype feature of the variety
- syllable-timing, and relatively lightly marked word stress
- intonation characterised by rather short intonation units (so that the placement of sentence stress may seem uninformative)
- a characteristic vocabulary borrowed from substrate languages: to gehrao is to prevent someone from leaving his office as a protest, a lakh is a hundred thousand, a crore is 10 million
- stylistic features which may strike inner-circle readers as mixture of level.

South Asian English is predominantly spelt in the British style.

5.3.2.2 Phonology

The phonology of South Asian English depends on the substratum and on the degree of accommodation to RP (or nowadays GA): speakers of different South Asian languages will have different accents, and consequently, as in Britain and the USA, many speakers have strongly regional accents which are hard for outsiders to understand. Mahboob and Ahmar (2008) say, for example, that Urdu speakers deal with consonant clusters by adding an initial vowel (start /stårt/), while Punjabi speakers insert a vowel: speak /spiːk/. The vowel system is therefore variable, but acrolectal speakers make most of the distinctions characteristic of RP. Our description is based on Gargesh (2008). The phonemes /a/ and /ɛ/ are not distinct, giving a characteristic low mid final vowel in words like comma. KIT and FLEECE are distinct for most mother-tongue groups, as are FOOT and GOOSE. BATH words have /æ/ on a Southern English model, CLOTH, LOT and THOUGHT may be merged. Both Gargesh (2008) and Wells (1982) present NORTH and FORCE as distinct, which seems likely to be an inheritance of older forms from the introduction of English into India. As in most new Englishes, FACE and GOAT are monophthongs.

Wiltshire and Harnsberger (2006) found that rhoticity varied across and within individuals. /r/ is often a tap (as in Scottish, for example) or trill (Gargesh 2008), sometimes retroflexed. The most striking feature of most South Asian English is the retroflex alveolars /ʃ/, /θ/ /ð/ /ɻ/ /ɹ/ which correspond to alveolar /ʃ/, /θ/ and so on in other varieties. Correspondingly, the dental fricatives may be pronounced as dental stops, as in Irish English. The voiceless stops /p/, /t/, /k/ may be unaspirated. Postalveolars /ɹʃ, ɹθ, ɹʃ/ may be pronounced with contact between the blade of the tongue and the roof of the mouth (rather than its tip as in other varieties). There may be merger of /ʃ, ʒ/ as /ʃ/. Differing mother tongues of course lead to
different consonant systems. In some varieties /v/ and /w/ fall together or clusters may be simplified by inserting an initial vowel as cited above for Urdu and Punjabi, for example.

South Asian English has a number of characteristic prosodic features, but these are not very well described. It is broadly syllable-timed, so that unstressed syllables are not much reduced and word stress is not very prominent. Stress is probably not distinctive and varies widely among individuals. It may also vary with the placement of stress in the speaker’s mother tongue (Platt et al. 1984). Bansal (1990) gives examples like / ne’sessəri/ necessary/ /æ’tAndy/ do/.

For intonation, Wiltshire and Harnsberger (2006:102) say, ‘IE utterances appeared to have many more pitch accents assigned to words prior to the boundary of the intonation phrase than one would expect for AE or RP readings of the same sentences’. The pitch range of South Asian English may also be rather wider than that of RP/GA, and the functions of volume change may be different, so that RP/GA speakers may appear cold to South Asians, while South Asians may appear excited or angry to RP/GA speakers.

5.3.2.3 Grammar

As with other outer-circle varieties, published written usage shows relatively more syntactic differences from British and American standard than they have from each other. It is not easy to tell which of these are to be treated as varietal features and which as differences in standards of subediting, particularly as greater tolerance or inclusiveness may be a varietal feature of some outer-circle varieties. This means that we can find written varieties which are very close grammatically to British usage, some that differ noticeably, and some that differ so much that they are nonstandard. It is reasonable to regard the language of the ‘quality’ Indian newspapers The Times of India and The Hindu as representative of ‘standardising’ Indian English.

Corpus studies based on these newspapers by, for example, Olavarría de Ersson and Shaw (2005) and Mukherjee and Hoffmann (2006) show statistical differences in the frequency of various verbal constructions: in British English give occurs most commonly in a ditransitive construction like give someone something, and pelt occurs most often in pelt stones at someone, where British or American speakers would do without the particle/preposition. On the other hand one can side someone, or grapple a problem, where other varieties require with.

In speech South Asian English often uses the progressive with certain verbs that are stative verbs in other varieties, so that I am knowing is possible. This can be regarded as a neutralisation for these verbs of the stative/dynamic contrast and is perhaps parallel
to the neutralisation of the count/noncount distinction that produces *luggages*. Bhatt (2008) mentions **topicalisation** patterns typical of New Englishes: *All of these languages, we speak at home.* In vernacular speech WH-questions may be made without inversion — *What he has eaten?* A final example of syntactic difference that could be mentioned is the neutralisation of the distinction found in many other varieties between *a bottle of beer* ‘a bottle full of beer, a certain quantity of beer’ and *a beer bottle* ‘a type of bottle’. This leads to usages like *fish tins* ‘tins containing fish’ and *chalk piece* ‘piece of chalk’. These fit into a general pattern of local noun + noun constructions which includes more abstract compounds like *pindrop silence* and *dagger look* from *You could hear a pin drop* and *to look daggers at someone* (cf. Irish English 4.4.3.2.).

### 5.3.2.4 Lexis

Many of the characteristic lexical items of South Asian English are borrowed BONFIRE NIGHT words referring to local phenomena. In political contexts one might come across *lathi* ‘type of baton’ or *gherao* ‘besiege someone in his/her office as a form of protest’. In discussion of Indian costume there will be many foreignisms as in this quotation from an article in *The Hindu* (25 December 1997) which we refer to again later.

> Rarely does one find a young Tamil boy in mundu or a young girl in pavadai in New Delhi or Mumbai. Jeans and T-shirts form the outdoor wear while at home it is the lungi for the boys and jeans again for the girls. For a consideration, the girls may change over to salwar-kameez and the boys to formal pants but the mundu and pavadai are definitely out.

In such a text the foreignisms are perhaps not items borrowed into South Asian English, but code-mixing which relies on the reader being bilingual and familiar with the words from another language.

Other BONFIRE NIGHT words, however, use English elements (including General English borrowings from South Asian languages): *military hotel/Brahmin hotel* ‘non-vegetarian/vegetarian hotel’; *finger-ring* as opposed to *nose-ring*; *collector* ‘type of senior district official’.

Local words which lexicalise general concepts not lexicalised in other varieties include borrowed forms like *CRORE* ‘10 million’ and *lakh/lac* ‘100,000’. Others use English elements. *Furlong* ‘220 yards’ has been retained as a frequent measure although it has become archaic in other varieties. New formations include *sdaughter-in-law, co-brother/husband’s brother’s wife*, ‘wife’s sister’s husband’ (which may somehow reflect the local culture); *shoe-bite* ‘blister caused by ill-fitting shoe’. There is a compounding element which lexicalises ‘illegal remover of fairly large items’, combining ‘thief’ and ‘kidnapper’: *lifter*, as in *baby-lifter, bicycle-lifter, cattle-lifter, car-lifter, child-lifter, taxi-lifter* (Kennedy 1991).

Most tautonyms (ROBIN words, that is, words that have different meanings in two varieties) are English words adapted with a different meaning. In South Asian English they include: *lorry* ‘carriage’, *cracker* ‘firework’, *fire* ‘be angry with’, *cut* ‘slaughter an animal’, *copy-book* ‘notebook’. In some tautonym pairs South Asian English shares a form with US English but differs from British English, perhaps because of separate
inheritance: on ‘light bed for an adult’ and dresser ‘dressing table’ (British ‘bed for small child’ and ‘cupboard with open shelves above’). Tautonyms can arise from borrowing as well. Kennedy (1993) mentions a Pakistani English form looter ‘bank robber/robber of bus passengers’, which she derives from Hindi/Urdu lutera.

Some heteronyms (THUMB TACK words, different names for the same concept) are borrowings from local languages: goonda ‘hooligan’, dacoit ‘bandit’, channa ‘chick peas’, puca/pucka ‘genuine/good quality’. Others derive from English roots: eveninger ‘evening newspaper’ (in Pakistan), schoolgirl ‘schoolchild’, slang glasses ‘sunglasses’, finger chips ‘US French fries/UK chips’, carcade ‘motorcade’. South Asian English may also (according to Nihalani et al. 2006) retain the older forms kons and talkies for ‘cinema/movies/movie house’. There are many heteronymic idioms: an egg double-fry ‘a fried egg, flipped over’; collar him out ‘throw him out’; I have a soft corner for him ‘... a soft spot...’. Some of these are loan translations like stop eating my head ‘stop getting at me’ from Hindi.

There is also a heteronymic compounding element – the borrowed form wallah (3.2.4.1) which forms nouns meaning ‘person associated with’ and so is equivalent to suffixes like -ite and -ian in other varieties. It compounds with (local) English words rickshaw-wallah ‘rickshaw driver’, elements from South Asian languages: panwallah ‘seller of betel-chewing ingredients’ and proper names: Congresswallah ‘member of the Congress Party’, Delhivala (sic) ‘person from Delhi’.

Finally, we note that idioms are often restructured in IndE usage relative to their General English form. The article from The Hindu cited above includes the sentence In Mumbai schools, Marathi and Hindi are compulsory and there is no way the children can wag their mother tongues, where wag one’s mother tongue seems to be a restructured idiom.

5.3.2.5 Style and pragmatics

The stylistic values attached to words and expressions are often different in Indian English from those in British or American usage, or perhaps stylistic distinctions are neutralised. The article from The Hindu quoted above also includes the sentences:

A cousin of mine has married a Marathi lady and the lingo at home is Marathi. My aunt finds it amusing to keep up a conversation with the kid...

... The primary school teachers are not surprised, as the kids mix well the garbage Hindi of Mumbai with Marathi to effect communion...

Garbage Hindi and kid sound informal to British/American ears; finds it amusing to and to effect communion sound formal. Similarly lingo sounds old-fashioned British and garbage sounds American. It is possible that Indian English has stylistic differentiation, just using different markers from other varieties, but it is also possible that stylistic effects are achieved by switching to another language in the multilingual repertoire, and the stylistic range of English is thus narrowed.

The pragmatics of English in the subcontinent derive, of course, from the subcontinental cultures, and so pragmatic behaviour may be very different from British...
or American. Possible examples are that Sir and other polite forms may be more used in speech, and, as Bhatia (1993) has shown, that positive politeness (praise of the addressee, self-denigration) is more common in letters of application than in their American or British equivalents.

According to Kachru (1997), South Asian English texts may show ‘nonlinear’ patterns of development unlike the ‘linear’ pattern of US English. Since Kachru argues that there is more variety in South Asian patterns of development than in US ones, this may be another instance of lower prescriptivism or codification in South Asian English.

Even where two cultures create the same niche for an utterance, they may use different verbalisation in it. Thus when the person spoken of enters the room British English speakers use the jocular phrase *Speak of the devil*, but Indians in this context sometimes say the rather more positive *A hundred years to you*.

### 5.3.3 Further reading


### Review questions

1. In what sense is India an English-speaking country?
2. If it is true that Indians distinguish the NORTH set of words from the FORCE set, is this due to a substrate, or what?
3. In the ICE-India corpus (5.1.4) progressives with verbs like know occur in the spoken data but not the written. Can you suggest a reason why such verbs might develop progressive uses in a New English, and why it is not found in the written part of the corpus?
4. Do you think goonda is really a THUMB TACK word equivalent to hooligan? Could it be a BONFIRE NIGHT word for a particularly Indian phenomenon somewhat like a British hooligan? What examples of goonda can you find online and what do they seem to mean?
5. This chapter has focused on India. Have a look at Indian papers like *The Hindu* and *The Tribune* online and compare them with *The Daily Times* (Pakistan) or *Daily News* (Sri Lanka).
6. These Indian and other South Asian newspapers seem to have a very characteristic vocabulary and style. What does that say about the stage their countries have reached in the Schneider system (particularly when there are features of spoken usage that do not appear in writing)?
5.4 Africa

The basis of any independent government is a national language, and we can no longer continue aping our former colonizers... Those who feel they cannot do without English can as well pack up and go.

(President Jomo Kenyatta (1894–1978), Nairobi, Kenya, 1974)

I have been given this language, and I intend to use it.

(Chinua Achebe, novelist, Nigeria)

One of the things we want to avoid is to give the impression that we are promoting English and downgrading Afrikaans ... we know this is a highly sensitive matter.

(President Nelson Mandela, South Africa, original in Afrikaans)

Person no fit tire for dis Nigeria
Because why?
Look your rivers and de ocean
Full of fish and oder good tings
Look as every time de sun dey shine
And for night de moon come fine
And even de rain dey day fall plenty
No be him dey make de food come plenty?
Ah, Nigeria, you too fine for my eye.

(Ken Saro-Wiwa, Nigeria, executed 1996 by the military government)

Focus questions

- In the motto you see a comment by Chinua Achebe (who writes in Nigeria-coloured Standard English) and a poem by Ken Saro-Wiwan in Pidgin. Which other African writers do you know? Which have won the Nobel Prize for literature?
- Which parts of Africa have pidgin English? Which parts have Swahili, and why do they not have pidgin? Which domains do you think English is used for in ‘anglophone’ African countries?
- Listen to online recordings 17 and 18.
5.4.1 The countries and the history of the introduction of English

In Table 5.3 the West African countries are listed north–south round the coast of West Africa. The borderline between Eastern and Southern Africa as linguistic regions is fairly arbitrary (Bobda 2000b). The countries in that area are listed roughly north–south.

![Map of Africa showing countries mentioned in section 5.4](image)

**Figure 5.3** African countries mentioned in section 5.4

Four countries in East and Central Africa have some connections with English but are not discussed in detail here:

- Rwanda, where English is currently, quite remarkably, replacing French as the language of government and education. The process is driven by a desire to orient the country towards the English-speaking East African Community, and has public support because the Community is perceived as offering job opportunities not available in the French-speaking countries to the west.
- Somalia, where the Somali language coexists with English and Italian.
Ethiopia, where secondary and higher education are mainly in English, but most other state functions are in Amharic or a regional language.

Southern Sudan, where English is well established, and may shortly be the official language of an independent South Sudan.

### 5.4.1.1 Languages

Most sub-Saharan African states are extremely multilingual. In each state there are typically two or three major languages, a dozen or so minor ones, and many spoken only...
by a few thousand people. Ghana, for example, is the size of the UK, with less than a third of its population, yet it has 42 different languages. On the other hand, in Kenya and Tanzania (and to some extent Uganda) Swahili is a lingua franca and in at least Botswana, Swaziland, Lesotho and Zimbabwe, one language is spoken by a majority of the population. Even in South Africa 70 per cent of people speak languages which are mutually comprehensible with Zulu. These conditions, it should be remembered, are not radically different from the multilingualism of European states in, say, 1700. The modern European ‘monolingual’ states are the result of several centuries of aggressive language policy, border adjustment, ethnic cleansing and so on and nearly all include substantial linguistic minorities even so.

The indigenous languages in sub-Saharan Africa mostly belong to three groups: Afro-Asiatic, the group which includes Arabic, such as Hausa in Northern Nigeria and adjoining areas; Cushitic/Sudanic and Nilotic in Ethiopia; Somalia and northern Kenya and Uganda; and Niger-Congo. The largest group is Niger-Congo – Wolof in the Gambia, Akan and Iwe in Ghana, Ibo and Yoruba in Nigeria for example. Rather surprisingly, most of the languages all over Southern and Eastern Africa, including the best-known, Swahili, are closely related and belong to the Bantu family within Niger-Congo, so that most of the varieties of English we shall be discussing, particularly in Eastern and Southern Africa, have a Bantu substratum.

The Niger-Congo languages in general are often tone languages in which tone is used to distinguish word forms such as tenses or lexical items in general. Katamba (1989) gives the examples àwò (two low tones) ‘star’ versus àwó (two high tones) ‘guinea fowl’ from Igala (Nigeria). Another characteristic feature of Niger-Congo languages is restrictions on consonant clusters and final consonants, so that English street appears as a loan into Yoruba as títì.

Within the Niger-Congo family, the Bantu languages of West, East and Southern Africa are agglutinative, with numerous affixes, each with a well-defined meaning. Many morphemes are prefixes, so that the correct name for Swahili is KiSwahili ‘Swahili language’. Similarly, in Luganda the language of much of Uganda, Luganda speakers are Baganda, their kingdom (whose king still ‘reigns, but does not rule’) is Buganda, an individual member of the group is Muganda and so on. Crystal (1997b) is an excellent source for this type of background.

5.4.1.2 History

African tropical agriculture seems to have begun in the Nigeria–Cameroon area with the beginning of the Iron Age, perhaps with the Nok culture of around 500 BC in central Nigeria or maybe even earlier. Bantu languages seem to have started expanding south and east from roughly this area at this time, perhaps as a result of this technical progress. In the extreme south, which was difficult for Bantu-speaking arable farmers to occupy because their tropical crops were unsuited to the Mediterranean climate, there are still some people speaking pre-Bantu languages – the San (‘Bushmen’) – and there used to be another group called Khoi (‘Hottentots’).

By around 1000 AD there were (ignoring Christian Ethiopia) two kinds of African
states south of the Sahara: Islamic ones in contact with the Arabic-speaking world along the southern border of the Sahara and the east coast, and pagan ones to the south and west of them. In West Africa, successive cultures produced sophisticated bronzes from the ninth century. By the time the first Portuguese envoy entered Benin City in 1485 West Africa was a patchwork of empires and small kingdoms. On the east coast, trade with Egypt and Arabia had started by 200 BCE. By 1000 CE there were Muslim African trading cities and ports along the coast, importing cotton and luxury goods (including a great deal of porcelain from China) and exporting metals and ivory throughout the Indian Ocean and beyond. The products which the coastal cities traded came from states (presumably pagan and Bantu-speaking) in the interior. The city ruins at Great Zimbabwe and other sites in Zimbabwe and Zambia are relics of these inland commodity-trading states.

Swahili developed during this time on the coasts of what are now Kenya and Tanzania. It is a Bantu language with extensive borrowing of vocabulary from Arabic and Persian (rather as English is a Germanic language with extensive borrowings from French and Latin) and without tones.

On the west coast seaborne trade with Western countries increased quite steadily. In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries trade shifted from gold and ivory to slaves, and from the Portuguese and Dutch to the French and British. By the beginning of the nineteenth century English had become a useful foreign language. Traders at centres like Calabar in Eastern Nigeria sent young men to learn English and book-keeping in England and some locals in the main trading cities knew English well. Written Nigerian English dates from as early as 1786 (Banjo 1993), and it is likely that some form of pidgin existed.

The slave trade was abolished in the British Empire in 1807. In the West this led to its gradual end as other countries decided, or were forced, to follow. There was also some resettlement of freed slaves. From 1787 ex-slaves from Britain, North America and the Caribbean settled or were settled at Freetown in Sierra Leone (and some at Banjul (Bathurst) in Gambia). They spoke various kinds of creole English. English-language higher education was available at Fourah Bay College in Sierra Leone from 1827, and Sierra Leonean English and/or Creole speakers spread as officials, teachers and missionaries all over West Africa, probably contributing decisively to what is now West African Pidgin. From the 1820s freed slaves from the USA settled in Liberia and created a community speaking a variety of American English (see 4.10).

With continuing trade, missionary activity and political intervention, English became more than a foreign language in the coastal region. Many of the intermediaries were West Indians and others from the African diaspora. Thus the first mission station in Cameroon was opened in 1843/44 by Joseph Merrick, a Jamaican (Todd 1982a), and Echeruo (cited in Banjo 1993) speaks of the Lagos of ... the returning Brazilians, Americans, and West Indians, and later of Sierra Leoneans and West Indians, not the Lagos of Nigerians.

On the east coast, the first half of the nineteenth century saw a large and destructive increase in the slave trade (by Portuguese and Arab merchants), and the states in the interior were destabilised. During this period, missionaries with
various European languages as L1 started to spread Christianity, English and Swahili inland from the coast. Given the existence of Swahili, as a lingua franca, no pidgin developed.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, a Bantu clan in Southern Africa called the Zulus united a large number of Bantu-speakers into one state (Davidson 1984). Meanwhile, as noted in 4.9.1, Britain took possession of the Cape at the end of the eighteenth century, and launched an assimilationist policy towards the Afrikaners, Dutch-speaking settlers who had been in the Cape since the seventeenth century. This encouraged the Afrikaners to move north and create independent states in Bantu territory. As noted in 4.9, before the discovery of gold and diamonds, British settlement was largely in the Cape and – after the Zulus had been defeated – in Natal (now KwaZulu-Natal).

Late in the nineteenth century, rivalry among European powers led to a ‘scramble for Africa’ and the Congress of Berlin in 1884–5 ratified the division of the continent into zones belonging to seven European powers. One by one nearly all the states in Africa were conquered by military expeditions and incorporated into European colonial structures, among them the Afrikaner states in South Africa. After some adjustments the countries listed in 5.4.1 came under various forms of British control.

In West Africa the new rulers appointed local clerks and policemen who spoke English, creole (Krio from Sierra Leone, perhaps) or pidgin. In East Africa some use was made of Swahili, especially by the Germans in Tanganyika (now part of Tanzania), but most higher administration was through English. The pattern was the same in Southern Africa, even in South Africa proper, where Afrikaners was recognised but in practice not equal with English. British policy towards the Africans was not openly assimilationist, but in British-controlled territories English was generally now the language of administration and the higher courts, and a key language for career success in business and the extractive industries of Southern Africa. In the early part of the century schooling was mainly carried out by missionaries from Britain, other European countries and the West Indies, who were partly concerned to ensure that people could read the Bible in their own language. During the colonial period schooling was limited (out of 10 million people in Tanganyika in 1958, only 318 (Davidson 1984:304) finished secondary school), but what there was took place both in English and in local languages. In fact, although government policy aimed at primary education in African languages, English often played a part from the first years of education in response to mixtures of mother tongues among pupils, lack of material in a particular language and parental demands (Todd 1982b).

5.4.2 English in Africa today

In all the ex-British colonies throughout Africa (apart from Cameroon and to some extent Tanzania, see below) English remains the main language of education, administration and business, although it is not always the link language for informal communication between ethnic groups.
5.4.2.1 English as a native language

There are at least three groups in Africa that have always had English (or creole) as their mother tongue: the black settlers in Liberia, with a variety descended from something like AAVE (discussed in 4.10); those in Sierra Leone, with a creole which is fairly remote from English and ultimately more related to West Indian creoles; and the white settlers in South Africa (and those remaining in Zimbabwe and Kenya), whose variety is a typical southern hemisphere one (discussed in 4.9). The Indian settlers in South Africa have now shifted to English (Mesthrie 1996) and have a distinctive variety (while those in Kenya seem to have no distinctive English, other than a possible Indian accent). There are also indigenous groups who are going over to English or pidgin (thus creolising it). The Cape Flats coloured community in South Africa has traditionally spoken nonstandard Afrikaans, but parents are now speaking second-language English to their children, so that a variety of mother-tongue English with an Afrikaans substratum is developing (Finn 2008). In multilingual areas of West Africa with no local lingua franca, communities seem to be shifting to pidgin (which they do not distinguish from English); Schaefer and Egbokhare (1999) describe speakers of Emai, a language with 20–10,000 speakers, no written form, and no use at all in school, as gradually giving up the language. At the other end of the scale, the urban elite in countries like Zambia may also speak English to their children, so that they become native speakers of African English.

5.4.2.2 Domains for English and other languages

As in other places, the languages used in the African countries where English is the main European language used can be placed in a hierarchy. At the top comes English and at the bottom unwritten languages like Emai, with no function in school or in wider communication. In between are languages which have all or some of literatures, official uses, roles in school or religion, and lingua-franca functions. English is usually in practice the sole language used for official and public purposes. Attempts to expand the use of vernaculars in these domains have not been particularly successful (Oladejo 1993), although they are vital and widely used in others.

The Englishes of West Africa have formal similarities and the sociolinguistic situations in the various countries are somewhat similar. There was never any significant group of European settlers. In most West African countries pidgin is widely spoken between speakers of different African languages, although in Northern Nigeria, Hausa, rather than pidgin, functions as a link language for those without formal education, and in The Gambia it is Wolof. Another factor producing common features is that the main site for learning English is the school and teachers typically move about a good deal, both from country to country (Ghana has traditionally exported teachers, and earlier Sierra Leoneans spread their versions of English and pidgin) and from one part of each country to another (so that Northern Nigerian Hausa speakers might have a Southern Ibo speaker as teacher). Electronic media spread the same US, British and local models over whole countries. More subtly, it is said that the motivation for learning English is integration with the local elite, and there may be one usage or pronunciation that supports this.
The varieties of English in the other countries in eastern and southern Africa also have many features of form in common because of the common Bantu substratum (except in the extreme north), and a tradition of movement for work within the regions. Although we do not have space to discuss them in detail, the sociolinguistic situations vary widely. In Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, Swahili has a strong position, but history has meant that each country has a different policy towards it – the language is dominant in Tanzania and least used in Uganda (Wolf 2010).

In Zambia and Zimbabwe English is very dominant and local languages have little or no public role, though they are of course very widely used. The situation is similar in Malawi although the government there has also supported Nyanja (also called Chichewa), a language understood by 50 per cent of the population, as a medium for primary education and a national lingua franca – in broadcasting for example. This policy was resented by speakers of other languages (as the choice of Hindi was in India, cf. 5.1) (Bernsten 1998) but there seem to have been educational benefits (5.4.2.3 below).

In South Africa the government has launched an extremely ambitious language-rights policy (see below), but English remains in wide use and seems to be used in more and more domains. Similarly, Namibia chose English as the official language, although a majority of the small population speak the Bantu language Oshiwambo, and Afrikaans had been the previous language of administration and education.

There are three fairly monolingual states in southern Africa which represent continuations of precolonial entities (Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland — the last two actually retaining royal families and sovereigns), but even they continue to use English in education and much public life despite having clear majorities speaking the national language.

Since the 1950s, Africa has produced a large literature in English, honoured in the 1986 Nobel Prize for Wole Soyinka and in the international success of novels by Chinua Achebe and others. Kenyan literature in both Swahili and English flourishes, but literature in English by Africans is not uncontroversial. Kenya’s best-known writer, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o, who has written in English, Swahili and Gikuyu but lives in exile, believes that African writing must be in African languages if it is to reach a valid audience, and for a time gave up using English for his creative work. Chinua Achebe’s response to such arguments is one of our mottoes above.

The media in anglophone Africa use a mixture of English and local languages, and in terms of music and radio particularly the local languages may be the more popular and more listened to. English is the predominant written language in most of anglophone Africa and the main language even of conversational writing. Marković (2010) shows that Facebook sites from Kenya and Uganda reflect the different sociolinguistic mixes of those countries in that the Kenyan ones have more Swahili than the Ugandan. She says:

Depending on the topic and the identity that the users wish to enact at the given moment, they may use different registers of English (some of which do not have a standard written counterpart, such as baselctal English in Uganda), vernacular languages and the lingua francas of the region (Swahili in Kenya and Luganda in Uganda). English sometimes appears even in the purely intra-group setting, showing how important the topic is for the selection of the language.
Since 1992, a large film industry has developed in Nigeria and later in Ghana, Liberia and Kenya. These industries, inevitably known as Nollywood, Ghollyood and so on, produce very low-cost digital films both in the local languages Yoruba Igbo and Hausa and in Nigerian English, with the whole of anglophone Africa as a market (Oluyinka 2008, Ezejideaku and Nkiru Ugwu 2009). To make the films attractive to this extended audience, Nigerian producers use actors from Kenya or South Africa alongside locals. So the films spread outer-circle varieties over a wide area, eliciting familiar complaints that other cultures are being corrupted by imported trash.

To sum up, English seems to retain a public position in all these states, and in most cases is acquiring native speakers and expanding, even when it is not particularly functional. This can be illustrated by surveys of ‘who speaks what language to whom about what’, carried out in successive decades in different countries, so they exemplify different and changing conditions.

Adekunle (1995) surveyed language use in Jos, a linguistically mixed town in the Plateau region of Nigeria, where Hausa is a lingua franca. He interviewed and observed people there about their language use in different situations. The results show that both domain and interlocutor affected language choice. With intimates personal affairs were discussed almost exclusively in the mother tongue, but official matters might also be discussed in English. A Hausa-speaking official would use Hausa with those who could speak Hausa, English with others and pidgin only with those who could speak neither Hausa nor English. Written records were kept exclusively in English. Similarly a Yoruba in Jos – where Yoruba is not a local language – would use Yoruba with other Yorubas, and English, Hausa or pidgin, whichever was effective, with acquaintances on personal matters. Three or four languages interpenetrated in all daily interaction and the English that may dominate on paper is not or was not at the time of the survey, dominant in speech, because it signals social distance as well as impersonal subject matter.

Bitja’a Kody (2001, cited in Bobda (2010)) looked at language use in Yaoundé, Cameroon, and found the same multilingualism and interpenetration but more prominent roles for French and English. Up to a third of children had French as their first language and did not speak an African language well. For Anglophone children he found that they used an African language and English about equally at home, English most, and then French and an African language with friends on the street, only French (mainly) and English in the market, and predominantly English and French in offices.

South Africa is as multilingual as most African countries, but it has made unique efforts to validate local languages and have them all used in all domains, including administration and education. This is an attempt to overcome the history of linguistic oppression. South Africa was liberated in the early 1990s and reconstituted as a pluralistic society whose constitution establishes 11 official languages. The constitution asserts the right of citizens to be educated and deal with authorities in any of these languages. Serious efforts have been made to put the policy into practice, and government documents are translated into many of the languages. Nevertheless, market forces favour English as a high-status language likely to appear neutral in most
situations and institutions like the army and government seem to be adopting English as link language. There is no language like pidgin or Swahili which rivals English. This is illustrated by the quotations from speakers of Tshivenda and Afrikaans given by Barkhuizen and de Klerk (2000):

It would be difficult for me to go to the office or where to a certain place and try to talk Venda... there must be top language.

What do you think that should be?

That should be English. That is the only language that is the communication language.

Okay, I’m growing up Afrikaans. I don’t expect it from anybody else to speak to me in Afrikaans, but can’t we now just communicate in English and we’ve got a middle medium. Everybody can be happy.

In South Africa, as elsewhere, English has a specially favoured position. But the mother tongues have a place in the mosaic of a multilingual environment as well, and it is shown in this quotation from the interviews of Barkhuizen and de Klerk with a soldier whose mother tongue is neither TshiVenda (a Bantu language) nor English.

For myself, there is some period when maybe I want cigarette and a Venda has got a cigarette then I get a problem how am I going to get a cigarette from the Venda guy. Then I introduce myself to other Venda guy and ask him, then they told me how to ask for a cigarette in Venda.

But then why didn’t you ask him in English?

You see I want to soften him up.

English is useful, that is, but in many circumstances other languages are a possibility and appropriate choice of language is a vital skill of multilingual Africans (Bisong, 1995), as Allie Conteh shows in recording 18.

5.4.2.3 English in education

The debate between Westernisers and orientalists (5.3.2) about the correct medium for education in a colonial environment responds to an insoluble problem created by colonisation. If education is offered in the language of the colonisers it alienates the local educated from their own community and creates an elite. But if education is offered in the vernacular, the colonised people suspect an attempt to keep knowledge from them and provide second class service.

Educationalists basically agree that it is better to acquire literacy in a language one is familiar with, rather than struggle to learn literacy and a new language at the same time (Cummins 1981, 1986), and there is a good deal of evidence that children learn content ineffectively in languages that they and their teachers have not fully mastered.

A useful comparison can be made between Zambia and Malawi. In Zambia, English is the only potential link language and is the medium of education even at primary school, so that Zambian children normally do not learn to read their mother tongue. In Malawi Nyanja/Chichewa was made an official language and primary education was
carried out in it, with English as a subject. But this language is also spoken in Zambia, so it is possible to compare the policies. Williams (1996) showed that while Zambian children could only read English, Malawian ones not only read as well in English as Zambian ones, but also were literate in Nyanja/Chichewa, which was their mother tongue.

Parents on the other hand remember colonialist policies aimed at excluding blacks and can generally see that knowledge of English is a key to success in their society. So they tend to be anxious for their children to get as much of the language as they can in the few years of schooling they can afford (Arthur 1997). Furthermore there are practical difficulties in the way of vernacular education. Zambia has many mother tongues, and large urban areas where people of different ethnic backgrounds mix. It would not be politically possible to choose just one or two vernaculars. But in a country with 30 mother tongues and limited resources, it would be very expensive to provide even primary textbooks in every mother tongue, or even five or six. Foreign aid money might be used in theory, but in practice it has normally been directed to English-language materials, cheaper to produce because of economies of scale, and frequently written by the aid-giver’s own experts and published by their own publishers (Banda 1996).

Even in multilingual and supportive South Africa there are practical problems in providing education in all 11 languages, and very many parents prefer English-medium schools to those in their own language. The result is that middle-class children come to school knowing its medium and poorer ones do not, and that the books they read, even if not published in the West, say by their choice of medium that the West is best. These circumstances give a good deal of support to arguments (7.1) that the language policies – and still more so practices – which have been adopted in Africa benefit Britain, the USA and the local elite much more than local people, but they also show how difficult it would be to supply Africans with the primary education in the mother tongue (or at least majority local language) that Europeans and most Asians take for granted.

5.4.3 African Englishes – a descriptive account

5.4.3.1 A preliminary sketch

- some common features, partly because they often have a substratum in Bantu languages
- a smaller vowel set than inner-circle varieties, compensated for by spelling pronunciations and nonreduction of vowels. Spelling pronunciations are normal and predominant. As an example of how different the vowel patterns of African English can be, and yet how distinctiveness and redundancy are retained, Ebot (1999) cites Cameroon English purpose //pap̩s/, perpetrate //pεp̩t̩ʁ/ compared with GA //parrə/, /pəp̩t̩/ or RP //pəpə/, /pəpət̩/ where every vowel is different both in realisation and systematically and yet both varieties have three different vowel phonemes in these two words
- some vowel pronunciations used as identity markers. In discussing NURSE, first realised as [nas] [fast], Schmied (1991) quotes Kenyans saying ‘I don’t want to
strain myself so much to say [faɪst] only to sound British ... This would seem snobbish to my colleagues'

- word stress sometimes assigned according to local rules (Peng and Ann 2000, Bobda 1994), as in West African *indicate* vs RP/GA *indicate* perhaps because stress is 
attracted to certain types of strong syllable.

- figurative expressions based on the substrate languages. Chisanga and Kamwanga-mulla (1997) cite 'I have killed many moons in that hut from Zimbabwe'

- in casual speech, long words which sound formal to inner-circle ears but do not necessarily have that value, since casual styles have had to be 'reconstituted' from language learnt at school.

5.4.3.2 Phonology
The accents of individual African speakers depend on their mother tongue, the area they grew up in, and how acrolectally they are speaking. However, there are similarities among the varieties of English that have a Bantu, or at least Niger–Congo substrate, and those with Afro-Asiatic or Nilotic (or Krio) substrate seem to have similar phonological characteristics. The exceptions to this overall very rough similarity are varieties in South Africa with Afrikaans (Germanic) and Indian substrata.

Schmied (1991) and Bobda (2000a,b) have attempted overall summaries of the vowel systems of speakers with African-language substrata, and the result, describing a mesolectal accent, is something like this (Table 5.4), with interesting mergers and splits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.4 African lexical sets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT = FLEECE = happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS = FACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP = BATH = PALM = START</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT = STRUT = CLOTH = THOUGHT = NORTH = FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT = GOOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter = comma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRESS is [ɛ] in West Africa and FACE is [ε] (Wells 1982, Schmied 1991, Ebot 1999), but this distinction is lost in eastern and southern Africa. Similarly LOT/
THOUGHT / CLOTH / NORTH are distinct from GOAT in the West (as [ɔ] and
[o]) but merged in the East and South. Marković (2010) notes that spelling in
conversational writing – computer-mediated communication – often reflects these
vowel mergers, with spellings like chart for chat (TRAP = START) and spot for sport
(LOT = NORTH).

Bobda (2000a, b, 2001) has an elegant analysis of the regional differences in
NURSE. He says that the vowel is normally [ɛ] in the south of eastern-southern
Africa (Zimbabwe and south) and in the north (Kenya, Uganda), with zones where
both forms occur, sometimes with lexical differentiation, in between. In West Africa, he
says, pronunciation depends on an interaction of spelling and region/mother tongue.

People who pronounce first, bird, third as /fɔst, bɔd, tɔd/ are from southern Nigeria,
Sierra Leone or Gambia, people who pronounce work, journey, church as /wek, dʒene,
tʃɛʃ/ are from Ghana, and people who pronounce bird, murder, world as /bad, mada, wald/
are Hausa speakers from northern Nigeria.

Finally, because African English is less stress-timed than inner-circle varieties, commA
and lettER have split (Bobda 1994), so that a vowel like that implied by the
spelling is produced. This reflects the general tendency in school-learnt English to
spelling pronunciation mentioned above.

As for consonants, many varieties of African English realise /θð/ as [tʃ] as one
would expect (Ebot 1999). Given their origins in school British English and pidgin,
it is not surprising that the varieties are nonrhotic, although rhoticity has been noted
in Kenya, ascribed to the influence of American tourists, and in Malawi, ascribed to
Scottish missionaries.

Final voiced fricatives (which are somewhat unusual in the world’s languages)
may be unvoiced: [laf] love. Consonant clusters may be broken up with epenthetic
vowels, especially in East Africa: [kʌmʃifdn] confidence, or simplified, especially in the
West: pos’ office. Final /l/ is often vocalised. Otherwise, consonant variation seems
to depend on the substrate language. For example, many individual languages have a
single phoneme covering [l] and [ɛ] and so confusion of English /l/ and /ɛ/ occurs
sporadically, for example among Asante speakers in Ghana and speakers of the central
Bantu languages in Kenya (Kanyoro 1991). This can be illustrated by the spelling
Ordinally Level ‘Ordinary Level’ from a web page written by pupils of an elite school in
Uganda. Some languages, like Hausa in Nigeria, have no /p/, or like Luyia in Kenya, no
/b/. Some have no distinction between /b/ and /v/. According to Ebot the ‘ethnically
characterized features’ of English pronunciation that may arise ‘are hardly accepted by
educated Cameroonians as good usage’.

Most African English is syllable-timed with stress marked mainly by high pitch
(Wells 1982). When one of the authors was so naïve as to suggest that Nigerians
should teach stress-timed speech with marked sentence stress he had the response
‘The students would just laugh at me if I tried to speak like you people’, a striking
illustration of endonormativity. This means that syntactic devices rather than con-
trastive stress have to be used to indicate focus: For Peter, he won’t come may be used to
emphasise Peter rather than stress on Peter.

Words are very often stressed differently in African English (partly because stress
Bobda (1994) says that stress is generally further forward in the word than in British English. He is able to give some rules predicting Nigerian/Cameroonian stress placement from the form and word-class of the item, analogous to, but different from, those which operate in RP/GA. Here we just give some examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W.Af</th>
<th>RP/GA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indicate</td>
<td>'indicate'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancestor</td>
<td>'ancestor'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plantation</td>
<td>'plantation'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chatechist</td>
<td>'chatechist'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idomitable</td>
<td>indomitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>photographer</td>
<td>photographer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.3.3 Syntax

The syntax of written standard African English is close to that of other Standard varieties. In a text from the Accra Mail, 8 August 2001 we noted three local features of syntax:

... This places enormous responsibilities on the party, because it will be partisan affair but also a nonpartisan flavour would be expected. It is not too early for us to sound our concern. The congress should be so organized that it would give the whole country a sense of purpose and direction.

It will not do for the congress to for example downplay the importance of the NPP's allies in Election 2000, nor would it serve any purpose for the congress to degenerate into squabbles that would be seized upon by detractors to distract...

- because it will be partisan affair, where one might expect a partisan affair, reflects a local, or unsystematic, use of articles
- a nonpartisan flavour would be expected and so organized that it would give contain a characteristic outer-circle use of would as a tentative or polite version of will rather than something required by the sequence of tenses
- its seized upon by detractors to distract the verb distract is intransitive, where inner-circle varieties might use an object such as attention.

In more mesolectal varieties more local characteristics might appear, most of them typical of New (or simply unedited?) English: nonstandard patterns of verb concord, avoidance of complex tenses, extension of progressive forms to stative verbs, different patterns of preposition use and complementation with verbs, nonmarking of noun number, conflation of count and noncount, and of definiteness categories, invariant tags, pronoun copying (Mr Chongwe said his client he did not want) and simplified word order conventions (Schmied 1991:64–76).

Mesthrie (1996) gives three syntactic characteristics of South African Indian English: consistent plural marking in the second-person pronouns you singular and y'all plural; inversion in indirect questions (I don't know who's the plane going to land); and extended use of of in constructions like She put too much of nuts in the cake. All three seem logical regularisations, but only the second is widely reported from other African Englishes.
Afrikaans English differs in syntax from 'Anglo' South African English mainly in features like concord and article use that affect all second-language speakers, though Watermeyer (1996) mentions a tendency to use a as an invariant indefinite article even where other varieties use an (also reported from New Zealand and Tristan da Cunha).

5.4.3.4 Lexis

We saw that South Asian English was characterised by frequent code mixing, in the sense that words from Hindi and Urdu can be quite freely used in English, because the writer or speaker can rely on the reader or listener being bilingual. The situation for African speakers varies from country to country. In Kenya and Tanzania speakers can assume that the interlocutor knows Swahili, and according to Hancock and Agongo (1982) ‘Practically any local word can turn up in East African English’. Similarly in the monolingual states of Southern Africa (Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana) one can assume some knowledge of the national language. But in Ghana, Nigeria or Zambia, English is genuinely a link language, and any borrowed word must be genuinely ‘local English’ rather than code mixing.

Lexical examples are quoted here from our own observations and from Chisanga and Kamwangamullu (1997), Branford and Branford 1991, Adegbija (1989), Schmied (1991) and Fisher (2000). Borrowed foreignisms (BONFIRE NIGHT words) are common, like people who khonta-ed (‘apply for land from royal family’) from Siswati in Swaziland. From South African English one could cite bredie ‘type of stew’ (from Afrikaans), and maas ‘dairy product’ (from a Nguni language). In Nigeria there are foreignisms which are also borrowings from local languages — often the names of foods such as dodo ‘fried plantains/bananas’, foofoo ‘yam porridge’, or garments like agbada ‘male gown’. Others are loan-translations like waist beads for a form of decoration. Many are extensions within English: social wake-keeping ‘part of the funeral ritual’, chewing stick used for cleaning the teeth, introduction ‘type of ceremony to formalise engagement to marry’, junior wife in a polygamous marriage (see Southern African right-hand wife, principal wife), black soap ‘locally made cheap soap’, pounded yam food.

Among local lexicalisations, CRORE words, one could cite borrowings like will be bulawa-ed (‘promoted, impliedly to an unrefusable but difficult post’) from Swaziland and local developments like biopsy ‘shooting competition’ from South Africa. Here too belong the loan-translations from Siswati young father, young mother ‘father’s younger brother, mother’s younger sister’.

Among tautonymy — ROBIN words which have a different or extended meaning in one variety compared to another — Nigerian English has event ‘show/ accompany someone out of the house’, travel ‘be away’ and go-slow ‘traffic jam’, fatal accident ‘serious accident, not necessarily leading to death’ and teller ‘bank paying-in slip’. Kinship terms have extended reference in many African cultures and languages: brother ‘member of same tribe/friend’ in Nigeria which could be compared with a quotation from Zambia ‘I went to see my sister, same father same mother’ where specification is necessary since it could otherwise be a cousin, half-sister or more distant relation. In Uganda there are usages like balance ‘change in a shop’ (also reported by Nihalani et al. 2006 from India), which is perhaps just an example of the use of what in other varieties is
The outer circle is a rather formal term, *eat money* ‘embezzle’, a local figurative expression, *avail* ‘provide’ (us with documents, for example) and changes of complementation such as *rob* ‘steal’.

Many varieties, including Afrikaans English, conflate *lend* and *borrow*, and Afrikaners also conflate *leaf* and *bread*, *ride* and *drive*, when and *if under mother-tongue influence.*

Among heteronyms (THUMB TACK words – items or activities which have different names in different varieties), a distinction can again be made between borrowings, loan-translations and new coinages. There are borrowings from local languages and pidgin like *chop* ‘food’ from pidgin, *lobola* ‘bride-price’ from Siswati in Swaziland. Others are loan translations like Nigerian *long legs* ‘undue influence/ string-pulling’, *hear a smell* ‘smell something’, *not on seat* ‘out of the office’. Many of these are idioms like *the girl is ripe* (for marriage), *the woman has jumped him* (betrayed with another man) from Southern Africa.

Most common seem to be extensions or new collocations: Nigerian *off the light* ‘turn off the light’. (compare *forwarded* ‘put forward’ in a newspaper from Sierra Leone), *kola* ‘bribe’, *tight friend* ‘close friend’. Some well-known East African borrowings are: *jumbo* ‘hello’ and *safari* ‘journey of any kind’ (confusingly tautonymous with General English *safari* ‘tropical wilderness journey’).

Tautonyms combine with heteronyms in the many French-influenced usages in Cameroon lexis: *formation* for ‘training’, *licence* ‘university degree’ and so on. Other local developments have the same effect; South African *stroller* ‘street child’ is tautonymous with a US English term for a child’s pushchair.

Skandera (1999) warns us to be sceptical of lists of the kind above. They usually derive from anecdotal observation or intuition and may include very ephemeral items. It is therefore interesting to note that Adegbija asked his students what *trouble shooter* (5.2.4 above) meant and virtually all gave only the Nigerian (and Indian) meaning: this tautonym at least has been tested.

5.4.3.5 Pragmatics and style

Behaviour and discourse patterns are transferred direct from one’s own culture and therefore will be very different across Africa.

One common stylistic feature of African English is the use of idiomatic expressions in different forms from their inner-circle originals, often merging two expressions. Thus in the *Accra Mail* text quoted above we have to *pool our resources together* (= UK, US put our resources together mixed with *pool our resources*), *sound our concern in the above* (= UK/US voice our concern mixed with *sound a warning*). Another shows the effect of independent development of formality and tone: formal (even biblical) phrases that have become old-fashioned or clichéd in the inner circle occur alongside others that seem slangy and colloquial. Thus in the *Accra Mail* article we see *chipped in their widow’s mite*. Corresponding to this is the use of unexpected and fresh figurative phrases from the substratum languages or cultures: Adegbija quotes the novelist Achebe’s *Proverbs are the palm oil with which words are eaten*.

Apart from the characteristic use in Nigeria (5.2.5) of *Sorry!* (at all levels) and *Well done* (only mesolectal and below, according to Banjo) there are many other pragmatic
features. Some are culturally determined, like the reluctance to refer to seniors by name mentioned by Adegbija (My senior brother rather than his name), or loan translations like the greeting sequence How? Not bad.

Similar developments sometimes happen in widely separated areas. Adegbija (2001) gives examples of characteristic Nigerian uses of OK to mean things like I have made up my mind and what did you expect? Writing about a country in Southern Africa in about 1990 the Zimbabwe-born British novelist Doris Lessing highlights similar extensions:

‘What’s wrong, Rebecca?’
‘Okay’ said Rebecca, meaning, I shall tell you.

...‘Okay’ said Sylvia, in her turn using this new or newish idiom which now seemed to begin every sentence. She meant that she had absorbed the information and shared Rebecca’s fears.

(Doris Lessing, The Sweetest Dream 2001:348–9)

5.4.4 Further reading


Cameroon and Sierra Leone pidgin are described on the Language Varieties website at http://www.hawaii.edu/satocenter/langnet/ [accessed 4 February 2011].

Review questions

1. What similarities and differences do you see between the roles of English in education in Africa and in South Asia?
2. Why do you think Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o once decided not to write in English? How does the spread of Nollywood cinema relate to this kind of decision?
3. Where would someone come from who had the same vowel in fed and fade and an [a] in NURSE?
4. Can you explain the word balance ‘change in a shop’ from the way English came to or is learnt in Uganda? What process would produce the verb off as in off the light? Why is bulewa-ed classified as a CRE word?
5. Search online for not on seat. Or he filled a teller. Which countries do your hits come from?
6. What do the Facebook extracts in the chapter motto say about the stage Uganda has reached in Schneider’s model?
5.5 South-East Asia

When one is abroad, in a bus or train or airplane and when one overhears someone speaking, one can immediately say this is someone from Malaysia or Singapore. And I should hope that when I’m speaking abroad, my countrymen will have no problem recognising that I am a Singaporean. (Professor Tommy Koh, quoted by Tongue (1974))

Focus questions:
- What differences would you expect between the Englishes of Hong Kong and the Philippines in view of their colonial history and language substrates?
- Listen to samples on IDEA (http://web.ku.edu/~idea/) and see if you hear what you expect.
- In which of the South-East Asian countries discussed below is English needed as an internal lingua franca?
- Listen to online recordings 19–20.

5.5.1 The countries

Table 5.5 South-East Asian countries and their population area listed roughly north-south.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Area (000 sq.km)</th>
<th>Population (2010) in millions</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong, China</td>
<td>0.1062</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>332,965</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>Manila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference figures

Barbados | 0.430 | 0.265
Ireland   | 69    | 3.8
UK        | 245   | 62.3
USA       | 9,363 | 310.2


5.5.2 Background

In moving from Africa and India to South-East Asia we move to a different economic environment. Singapore is a developed country with levels of education which are among the highest in the world (and with infrastructure, computer use, health, welfare...
The Hong Kong region of China is a fully developed world financial and business centre with a high standard of living. Malaysia is a rapidly developing ‘Asian tiger’ economy. The Philippines are poorer, but better off in terms of average income than the African or South Asian countries. Consequently the resources available for education and implementing language policy in these countries are incomparably greater than in sub-Saharan Africa or even (per head) in South Asia.

The precolonial languages of the Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore were in the Austronesian group. These are usually not tonal (unlike Bantu languages and Chinese), have polysyllabic words which may have inflections, and a phonology with few consonant clusters and relatively fewer consonants than English. In Malaysia (and Singapore) the precolonial language was Malay, which in its modern standardised form has many loanwords from Sanskrit, Arabic and English, and often coins words from Sanskrit roots as English does from Latin or Greek. It can be written in characters derived from the Arabic script, but is now more commonly written in Roman letters. The various precolonial languages of the Philippines had less influence from other languages.

The local language of Hong Kong is Cantonese, a ‘dialect’ of Chinese. (‘Dialect’ is in quotation marks because ‘dialects’ like Cantonese or Hokkien are as different from one another as Spanish and French); Cantonese and the other ‘dialects’ are tonal, typically have words of one or two syllables with few or no inflections, and have few consonant clusters and few possible final consonants. Most people in modern Singapore, and many in Malaysia, are of Chinese descent and speak Cantonese or Hokkien or another ‘dialect’ of Chinese as their ancestral language. In Singapore most younger people have, however, adopted Mandarin, alongside English, as their preferred language. In both countries there are substantial numbers of people of Indian descent, mostly with Dravidian language backgrounds.

5.5.2.1 History

The earliest civilisations in Malaysia and Indonesia arose as a result of Indian expansion starting 2,000 years ago. From the eleventh century onwards Islamic missionaries and traders appeared in the area and gradually Malaysia and most of Indonesia became Muslim, often with a striking mixture of Indian and Islamic traditions and styles. However, neither Hindu nor Islamic culture affected most people in the Philippines. In 1565 they became a Spanish possession (under the viceroy of Mexico) and consequently it was Spanish Catholic missionaries rather than Hindu/Buddhists or Muslims who brought ‘higher religion’ to the islands. Most of the population became Catholics (though some were reached first by Islamic missionaries and became Muslims) and Spanish was used for education for the small upper class.

The fishing settlement on Singapore was converted to a strategic British trading and military centre at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The spices, the main goal of Europeans in South-East Asia, grew further east, and it was not until the later nineteenth century that the peninsula itself became valuable to Europeans. Brit-
ish interests then started to exploit the tin deposits and tropical products including palm oil and rubber. The ten or so small Malay sultanates were gradually taken over by Britain, and Chinese and Indian labourers and business people came to operate the mines and plantations.

During the twentieth century the Malay peninsula was a multilingual society. The Malays spoke different local varieties of Malay, and used a standard written form; the Chinese used their ‘dialects’, the Indians Tamil and other Indian languages, and the colonial authorities used English. Arabic and Sanskrit were known as languages of religion. A lingua-franca variety of Malay, ‘Bazaar Malay’, and types of English functioned as link languages. English was spread by the education system and educated people became very fluent because they used the language for everyday communication across communal boundaries. Less educated people in towns also used English for this purpose. The result was that lingua-franca English existed in a range of varieties from an ‘acrolect’ (3.4.1.4) which was a Standard English with local phonology to a ‘basilect’ which had many of the characteristics of an extended pidgin or creole (even if it was not one’s mother tongue and hence is called a ‘creoloid’). Because more basilectal varieties were used in the school playground, they began to connote intimacy for many people who also mastered the acrolect, and the lectal range from standard to markedly local began to imply a stylistic range from formal to informal.

Hong Kong came under British control as a result of the Opium Wars with China and developed as a trading centre. Throughout the colonial period a minority of British administrators and traders coexisted with a large majority of Chinese traders and labourers. Since most Chinese could speak Cantonese, there was no need for a lingua franca, only for a language to use with powerful foreigners. Knowledge of English was spread almost entirely through the education system, which increasingly used English as a medium.

In 1898 ownership of the Philippines passed to the USA. The Americans launched a vigorous campaign of education through the medium of English, so that by independence in 1946 a rhotic variety of English with US vocabulary was widely known for administration and education, and used among Filipinos with different mother tongues. Virtually all Filipinos spoke one or more local languages alongside it, of course.

5.5.2.2 The current situation: Malaysia and Singapore

The former British possessions in the area are mostly now part of Malaysia, which finally emerged in 1964 as a federation combining the old sultanates on the peninsula with the parts of Borneo which had been British. Singapore ultimately became an independent city state. While the Englishes of the two states are fairly similar, the sociolinguistic situations are very different.

As noted above (5.1), at independence Malaysia adopted a policy favouring Bahasa Malaysia, a synthetic language close to written literary Malay, and not very distant from the Malay vernaculars. Education was to be entirely in Bahasa Malaysia and so was public and political life. In 2002 the government, eager to benefit from globalisation,
signalled a swing back to English-medium primary and secondary education, at least for science and mathematics, but in 2009 it recognised the problems that had arisen and went back to Bahasa Malaysia for these domains. English is now used for some tertiary education, and quite widely as the language of business, where many firms are still dominated by Chinese or Indian personnel. English is frequently used in workplaces, often with variation between standard and more localised forms and code-switching into Malay according to situation and conversational partner. Powell (2008) has attractive examples from courtroom interaction, the first showing style-shifting into a mesolect, the second the use of English for a lawyer and Malay for a witness:

1. Judge (to parties): I really must apologise for my late arrival.
   (to Clerk): So already fix that one, is it?
   (to Counsel): Oh don’t be so daft!

2. Judge (to Counsel). Then ask him. You see, it is as simple as that.
   (to W): Nombor enam telah ditulis menjadi nombor kosong? (‘Was number six rewritten as a zero?’)

Singapore, with a population speaking a variety of Chinese ‘dialects’, Indian languages and local Malay, emphasised English as the main official language. It has subsequently moved towards a policy which aims at the Chinese community dropping the ‘dialects’ and becoming bilingual in Mandarin Chinese (the official language of mainland China and Taiwan) and English, Indians in an Indian language and English, and Malays in Bahasa Malaysia and English. In Singapore an increasing proportion of speakers have English as a mother tongue – but the local variety rather than Standard English. As in pre-independence Malaya, Singaporeans can move up and down a continuum from acrolect to basilect according to the formality and intimacy of the situation, though only the most educated have full access to the acrolect and only the least educated use the deepest basilect. Government policy, which has been very successful in propagating Mandarin, aims at Standard English.

5.5.2.3 The current situation: Hong Kong

Hong Kong was returned to Chinese sovereignty in 1997. Today, English is very widely used in the education and legal systems and to deal with international business, and is becoming ‘localised’, and used to some extent for everyday interaction among locals who all speak Cantonese (Bolton 2002). Mandarin Chinese (putonghua) is becoming more and more important in administration and for interaction with people from the rest of China.

5.5.2.4 The current situation: the Philippines

The Philippines became independent of the USA in 1948. There were indigenous lingua francas, and one of these, Tagalog, the language of the Manila area, was chosen as the national language (and, after some negotiation, renamed Filipino). The local languages are all related to Tagalog, so Filipino is easier than English for local people to learn. Since 1984 the principle has been that the first years of education may be in
The vernacular – the local language – but after that the humanities and social sciences must be taught in FIlipino and the natural sciences in English. Tertiary education is largely in English. Thus successful school leavers are proficient in English and Filipino.

In fact nearly all adults understand Filipino and a high proportion can speak it. Knowledge of English is also widespread (56 per cent of adults can use it, according to Gonzalez (1998)); but the upper classes have the highest proficiency in English and the advantages that go with it. Filipino is the language of many publications and much entertainment, the thriving film industry for example. Television is said to be 60 per cent Filipino (including Mexican soap operas dubbed into Filipino) and 40 per cent (imported) English, and it is said that Filipinos prefer the programming in the national language (Clampitt-Dunlap 1995), as in India and Ghana.

Nevertheless the choice of a local lingua franca as national language sets up a language pyramid of a type we recognise from parts of Africa and India (and Malaysia), with the national language intended to take over functions from English, but not automatically accepted by those who do not have it as their mother tongue. In fact full implementation of the bilingual education policy is hindered both by English-medium universities unwilling to use Filipino as a medium, and by speakers of Cebuano, another lingua franca, who have used the courts to prevent school exams being held in Filipino rather than English, on the grounds that this would give native Tagalog speakers the advantage of exams in their own language (cf. Chichewa/Nyanja in Malawi in 5.4.2).

5.5.3 Malaysian/Singaporean English – a descriptive account

5.5.3.1 A shortlist of particularly salient features

This is a variety which varies much within itself in terms of styles and speaker proficiency. While Singapore English seems to vary on a one-dimensional scale from a formal, educated acrolect to an informal, uneducated basilect, with education a key variable determining a speaker’s lectal range, modern Malaysian English seems to vary according to ethnicity as well as education. For some, many of them Malays, English is almost a foreign language used with varying proficiency in work-related situations. For others, many of them educated non-Malays, it is a local lingua franca or even mother tongue, used in a variety of situations with appropriate lectal variation. For others still, less educated non-Malays perhaps, it is a lingua franca to be used in basic communication, generally at mesolectal or lower level. In what follows we can only give examples of features which, while local, occur across a range of varieties and lects.

‘Singlish’ – basilectal/mesolectal Singapore English – is well described (for example on Anthea Gupta’s web page (currently http://www.leeds.ac.uk/english/staff/afg/singh2 [accessed 4 February 2011]) and, in terms of salient features, at least, close to basilectal/mesolectal Malaysian English. Our description is based on Deterding (2007), which is an account of a speaker of a Singaporean variety of Standard English, not ‘Singlish’. 
● a reduced set of final consonants and consonant sequences as compared with other varieties and consequently words which end with glottal stops, voiceless fricatives, or nasals (\([\text{i}:\hat{\text{a}}]\) 'eat', \([\text{b}æ\hat{\text{n}}]\) 'bank')
● stereotyped Singapore vocabulary items: borrowings from Malay like \(ulu\) 'old-fashioned, provincial', and from Chinese like \(kiasu\) 'selfish' (see below), and local coinages like \(hu\) 'confused'
● the particle \(lah\) (borrowed from Chinese) which is used to emphasise confidently made statements or shared knowledge
● omission of sentence subjects (and objects) that can be inferred from the context.

5.5.3.2 Phonology
The vowel inventory is quite reduced. KIT and FLEECE, FOOT and GOOSE, LOT/CLOTH, THOUGHT, CURE, and NORTH/FORCE and START/PALM/BATH and STRUT are all merged, though probably as speakers move up the lectal scale they make more distinctions. FACE and GOAT are monophthongs, as in many other varieties, and Deterding notes that a diphthongal pronunciation of the FACE vowel sounds ‘affected’ to Singaporeans. He also observes that lexical distribution is not always as expected. In particular \(æ\) and \(ɒ\) have the FACE vowel, not that of DRESS, so that they do not rhyme with \(ı\) and \(ıd\). The distinction reflects independent oral transmission of the variety, in that it comes neither from the spelling nor from inner-circle or other varieties.

Dental fricatives are often realised as stops. Final consonant clusters are often simplified, so that \(\text{thin}k\) is \([\text{θınk}]\) or \([\text{ʃınk}]\) and \(\text{effeckt}\) is \([\text{ʃɛfɛkt}]\) or \([\text{ʃɛfɛkt}]\). Word-finally, most plosives/stops are omitted or reduced to glottal stops, especially if voiceless – that may be \([\text{dɛʔ}]\) and \(\text{word}\) may be \([\text{wɜd}]\) or \([\text{wɒd}]\). Final fricatives – especially /s/ and /z/ – may be all voiceless, so that \(\text{cæs}\) and \(\text{sæz}\) are homophones, and \(\text{ɛkspɛnsif}\) is \([\text{ɛk'spɛnsif}]\). Relatively few vowels are reduced to \([\text{ə}]\), as in other syllable-timed varieties, so that vowel pronunciation may be close to the spelling. A number of words have local stress patterns, some of which, like \(\text{pur'chæs}\), look like regularisations based on the spelling (cf. \(\text{pərsənt}, \text{chæs}\)).

Having an accent that is too Chinese is a mark of not being cool in youth culture. The Guide to Singlish (on a closed website) gave these utterances of uncool youths, which actually seem mainly to illustrate normal mesolectal pronunciation with the addition of loss of \(\text{θ} \) and \(\text{r} \) in \(\text{withdraw}\), and the South Chinese conflation of \(\text{l/r/n}\) in \(\text{nine}, \text{number}, \text{and road}\).

\(\text{I one too wee door some money.} \) 'I want to withdraw some money'
\(\text{Blok li-te-fi, lumbər tree-too-ıg, āng Susa hıd, } \) 'Block 95, No. 328, āng Susa Road'

By contrast, an American accent may be becoming more fashionable: originally US pronunciation of individual words like \(\text{skedul}\) are said to be becoming more common, and so is rhoticity.
5.5.3.3 Syntax

Basilectal and mesolectal Singapore-Malaysian English differs rather dramatically from the standard in terms of syntax. We just give some examples of common features which can be encountered. Subjects and objects can be omitted where they are clear from the context, as in Chinese and Malay. For example as an answer to the question *Do you get overtime pay, or can you take time off in lieu?* Richards (1977:79) recorded *You want to overtime also can, take off also can*. 'If you want (to take) overtime, you can, but if you want to take time off, you can do that too'.

Correspondingly, as in Chinese, Malay, and many creoles, *be* as copula (and auxiliary) can be omitted. Richards asked *It's pretty quiet running this car park at night, isn't it?* and received the answer *This one Ø near the shopping centre, night club, there the good business Ø, that Ø why the government operate the parking here*. 'No, it is near the shopping centre and night clubs, there's good business there, that's why the government has a parking lot here.'

Gupta (1994) says that the syntax of questions in Singapore Colloquial English – what we are calling the basilect and mesolect – is simpler than that in Standard English and also than that in Malay and Chinese. Question words other than *why* and *how* are not usually fronted, and inversion is only usual when the verb has the **BE** or **CAN** auxiliaries, so that the following question forms are normal:

*Why you take so many?*

*Go where?*

*She eat what?*

Given the possibility of omitting the subject and not inverting, questions of the form *What to do? Where to go?* ('What can/should I/we/she do?', 'Where can/should I/we/she go?') are common and characteristic of Singapore/Malaysian usage. In Chinese and South-East Asian languages questions often include the equivalent of *or (not)* as a question word, and correspondingly local English often has questions like *Want or not? You want tea or what? Can or not? Pain or not?* (Gupta 1994).

Singapore English is well described and its syntax is of great interest. Deterding 2007 is a good introduction to a fairly acrolectal variety.

5.5.3.4 Lexis

The various lects of Singapore/Malaysia English include a great deal of local vocabulary. Singlish has a rich supply of local lexicalisations (CRORE words) derived from Chinese dialects, of which we only discuss three:

- **chim/chem** 'excessively complex/difficult/serious'. The Guide to Singlish gave this example: 'Usually when confronted with something that appears to be more complex than 1 + 1, the S’porean would exclaim, "Why so CHIM one?" even before s/he begins to read or think about the "something..."'
- **chope** 'reserve a chair, etc. by putting a bag or garment on it'
- **kiasu** 'person with a fear of losing out to others'. The Guide to Singlish gave these typical traits of a kiasu:
1. Everything also must grab 'He/she has to grab everything'.
2. Must chop a seat when you go everywhere 'He/she has to chop a seat on all occasions'.
3. Anything that is free must get 'He/she must get some of anything that is going free'.
4. Must be number 1 in everything (self-explanatory).

Foreignisms formed from English lexical material include:
- *kuey, caves*, 'foods regarded in Chinese tradition as yang (male light positive) and yin (female dark negative) respectively'
- *red packet* 'envelope containing money given at a festival'.

Among tautonyms (ROBIN words) one could mention *send* with the meaning of 'take' as in *send him to the airport*, *peon* 'office boy, office porter', *blue* (adjective) 'out of touch', *that time, last time* 'in the past, formerly'. Among heteronyms (THUMB TACK words) one could mention borrowed words, which give local colour to universal concepts: *makan* 'food', *jaga* 'watchman'. Of course the General English terms are known and used alongside the local ones, with a different stylistic effect.

Probably more specifically Malaysian are the foreignisms *outstation* 'provincial office' and the official term, *bumi putra*, a foreignism borrowed from Malay meaning 'a person with the Malaysian legal ethnic status of a “native” (as opposed to a Chinese or Indian, for example)'. *Bungalow* is used in its widespread sense of 'tropical villa' rather than its British one of 'one-storey house', and *stay* is used in the Scottish, African and so on sense of ‘reside permanently’ as well as its English/US one ‘be based temporarily’.

5.5.3.5 Pragmatics

One of the most striking features of much Singapore/Malaysia English is its use of pragmatic particles, mainly borrowed from dialects of Chinese. Gupta (1992) identifies 11 particles used to mark tentativeness, definiteness or contradiction, to identify directives and to establish solidarity and so on; *la*(b) 'definiteness' is part of the stereotype, illustrated in the following dialogue from Platt et al. (1984). (A is an ethnically Indian, English-educated Malaysian, so the text also illustrates that this variety is an independent form, not English in the mouths of Chinese or Malay speakers. This could be called upper-mesolectal):

Do you use Tamil at all?
A. I’m afraid we know little. Don’t speak at home. To my maid, I have to speak to her. We have learned, lah, since she came.

Gupta’s example of *ma* ‘rejoinder’ is quite striking as it shows a child (EG) who is a native speaker of Singaporean English interacting with her mother (MG), reminding us that here at least the term ‘non-native variety’ is meaningless:

EG: Why Meiimei head like that one?
MG: Meiimei’s head is on the bed. (utterance is SI)
The example also shows that the mother moves from acrolect to mesolect (retaining pronoun gender for example even in the Singlish utterances), while the child speaks the basilect she has learnt from her peers, referring to her sister as *he* for example.

5.5.4 Hong Kong English

Although Hong Kong English is generally regarded as an outer-circle variety it has progressed less far down the Schneider stages (cf. 5.5) than, for example, Singapore English: stage 3 instead of stage 4 according to Deterding et al. (2008). It is mainly used in education and interactions with ‘outsiders’ and seems to be more susceptible to outside influence — less endonormative — than the Malaysian/Singapore variety. For example, Deterding et al. (2008) say that Hong Kong English shows more influence both from US varieties and from recent innovations in British English than the Singapore variety. On the other hand, as more and more young people in Hong Kong are English-educated and have friends and relations in Canada, the USA and Britain, English is more and more a natural means of expression (Bolton 2000). Literature has started to be written in English, and on the internet Cantonese and English have started to interpenetrate one another, as in these comments on a home page:

Comment: lo por jai: sorry ah... i know fault la... forgive me la... hmmm... your hp write duk ho ha ah... but y mo ngor gah??!! hope lo por jai ng ho angry la... la por dio yan ? la kong jai

Comment: Good homepage woor.... will be (haha... since u haven’t finished it ma). CutieGal really has a cutie homepage with cutie music woor. But... why don’t you put your cutie photos here ah?

The first comment simply mixes transcribed Cantonese with English; the second uses English clarified with the Chinese attitudinal particles *wor*, *ma*, and *ah* as in 5.5.3.5.

The phonology of this variety of English (or more precisely of one type of fairly ‘high’ mesolect) is shown by Deterding et al. (2008) to be similar to but not identical with other South East Asian Englishes. It is striking that although length/tenseness distinctions like RP/GA /i/ /ɪ/ are not present, the set of diphthongs is quite large, and FACE and GOAT do not appear as monophthongs as they do in so many other varieties. Voiced TH often appears as [d] as in many other varieties but the unvoiced equivalent is [t] (or [θ]) but rarely [k], as in Estuary English (4.1.4). Under the influence of Cantonese, initial /l/ and /n/ may be merged. According to Hung (2000) there is an interesting r-split. Morphemes with orthographic <v> at the beginning of a usually stressed syllable are pronounced with /w/, other orthographic <v> pronounced with /l/ (/`advertisement/ `advertisement, /`leave/ `leave/). But if the stress shifts the pronunciation of <v> does not change: `/`advertisement/. So /w/ and /l/ here are different phonemes, not realisations of /v./.
The syntax of Hong Kong English includes many typical ‘new English’ simplifications, particularly in the noun phrase: systems of countability and singular, definiteness and so on. There seem to be a number of ROBIN words where a familiar word has a local meaning: triad ‘Chinese gang’, localisation ‘replacing expatriate workers’ or karaoke bar ‘near-brothel’ (Benson 2000). Local Westerners may use borrowings from Chinese like dim sum (snacks served in local restaurants) and gwailo (‘Westerner’), but also, reflecting imperial connections, from South Asian languages including chit (for ‘bill’ or ‘receipt’), nullah (‘open drain or ‘water course’). The MOB word chop has two homonymous local meanings ‘stabbed/slashed’ and (borrowed from Chinese and frequent throughout South East Asia) ‘stamped/certified’. These are tautonomous not only with the General English lexeme, but also with Indian chop ‘cut hair’.

5.5.5 Philippine English – a descriptive account

5.5.5.1 A shortlist of particularly salient features of Philippine English

Unlike all the varieties discussed in this chapter so far, Philippine English derives from US English, normally uses US spelling conventions and vocabulary variants, and is rhotic. However in mesolectal and basilectal accents the /t/ is an alveolar flap, not a semivowel. The vowel inventory is reduced in ways typical of ‘New Englishes’. Philippine speakers are said to have a ‘sing-song intonation’ and definite syllable timing.

There is a range of typical Philippine vocabulary: borrowings from Spanish (merienda ‘afternoon tea’), Tagalog/Filipino (bandina ‘love song’), loan translations from local languages (since before ya ‘for a long time’) and local coinages (batchmate ‘person who studied, did military service, etc. with the speaker’). Since nearly all speakers of Philippine English also speak Filipino, ‘mix-mix’, code-switching is common in informal and intimate situations. Our account here is based on Tayao 2008.

5.5.5.2 Phonology

Acrolectal speakers of Philippine English distinguish most of the vowels Americans do. Mesolectal ones merge CLOTH, THOUGHT and GOAT as [∫], KIT and FLEECE, GOOSE and FOOT. Because Philippine English is largely syllable-timed, unstressed vowels are often given their full spelling pronunciation and indeed vowel reduction is a mark of formal speech and careful acrolectal style rather than the other way round.

Dental fricatives may be realised as stops, as may /s/ and /z/. Voicing distinctions are often lost between /s/ and /z/, /f/ and /v/. Under influence from the indigenous languages, Philippine English often has unaspirated voiceless stops at the beginnings of words and unreleased stops at the end of words. It also has dental /t d n l/. Consonant clusters are often simplified.

As with other ‘New English’ varieties word-stress patterns may differ from American norms. Tayao cites examples where US usage has stress on the first syllable but Philippine, even acrolectal, on the second: colleague, govern, pedestrian, hazardous.

5.5.5.3 Syntax

Written Standard Philippine English does not vary syntactically from other standard
versions, and because its domains of use are more limited than those of Singapore English it has not developed the lectal range and exotic syntax of colloquial Singapore English.

Typical features of informal writing and speech include omission of ‘redundant’ subjects, and optional marking of verb agreement and plurality. It is characteristic that these features coexist with sophisticated journalistic constructions — although not standard, they are not necessarily marks of unsophisticated writing. There are also individual constructions typical of South-East Asian English in general: Almost of the Tagalog speaking population (≈ ‘almost all of...’).

5.5.5.4 Lexis

Philippine English tends to be so full of code-switching and mixing that it is hard to tell what is simply Tagalog and what is borrowed into English. Nevertheless one can identify local lexicalisations (CRORE words), either coined in English like bedspacer ‘person who is sharing a flat’ or borrowed, like barkada ‘circle of friends’. Among foreignisms borrowed from Tagalog (BONFIRE NIGHT words) are bawang (‘shirt’) ‘traditional smart shirt made from embroidered cloth’, dalagang Filipina ‘traditional “good girl”’, and lechon ‘roast pig dish’ — as usual foreignisms cluster round food, costume and traditional values. From Spanish (apparently) comes maja blanca ‘coconut pudding’. The best known foreignism formed from English lexical material is jeepney ‘taxi on a jeep chassis’. An interesting tautonym (ROBIN word) is standby ‘idler, bystander’ (Platt et al. 1984). Among heteronyms (THUMB TACK words) one could mention the following borrowed words: carabao ‘water buffalo’, calamansi ‘lime’, yaya ‘nanny, nursemaid’ lumpia (ultimately from Chinese) ‘spring roll’ and sari-sari ‘corner shop/neighbourhood store’.

5.5.5.5 Pragmatics

Functional phrases differ between varieties, and in the Philippines one can say for a while when answering the telephone, where other varieties might use just a moment — a sort of pragmatic tautonym.

Like other varieties that do not occupy all the domains of their local culture (5.3.2.5), Philippine English can be stylistically underdifferentiated in the sense that language which other varieties would regard as rather formal can be mixed with apparently informal phrases. Thus the informative text on Adel Rey’s website (http://reyadel.tripod.com), about the lives of a bedspacer who shares a flat and room with other students and a homebody who studies from home, mixes phrases which would sound formal in American English with others which would sound informal.

Let us then trace their movements in one typical school day.

The homebody wakes up early if he is a commuter, then helps in household chores, eats breakfast, and he’s off to school. After the morning classes, he’s back home helping do the chores, then partakes of lunch. After his meals, he might wash the dishes or he is immediately back to school.
Code-mixing English and Tagalog is, as noted above, a characteristic way for educated people to vary style. The following extract gives No. 10 of ‘ten things I like about the US’ from an internet chat site:

Number 10 ko, camping. camping dito...akala ko, OK. Roughing it out dow. Tapos, when my gf and I got to the camp, maku RV ang mga hinayupak na Kano; may barbecue grill pa sa pickup trucks nile!

Walang hiking involved to get to the campsite...pupunta pa ako sa upstate New York para lang makapunta sa mga lugar na ganon, bear country pa!

Finally, nonverbal communication (paralanguage) is of course different in different cultures. Filipinos asked directions may simply point with their eyes and lips rather than either pointing with a hand or giving verbal directions.

5.5.6 Further reading

Singapore English is described on the Language Varieties website at http://www.hawaii.edu/satocenter/langnet/ [accessed 4 February 2011].

Review questions

1. What did the Malaysian judge mean by “So already fix that one. is it?” Why did he choose this mesolectal form? Why are his other utterances in Standard English? Why is Hong Kong in Schneider’s stage 3 if Singapore is in stage 4?
2. The Indian English word nullah is reported from Hong Kong and the originally Indian word bungalow seem to have a similar non-British meaning in many varieties. Can you suggest why?
3. While Indian English seems to vary very much in pronunciation according to the speaker’s mother tongue, Singaporean seems remarkably unaffected by the very different L1s of its speakers. Can you suggest the mechanism?
5.6 Others
British and American influence affected many parts of the world and led to the use of English for education and administration in many states other than those we have discussed above. Here we give brief descriptions of a few examples, which illustrate the interaction of several factors in determining the impact of English as a colonial language. First is the degree of development of the local language – the number of domains in which it has been used. Where the local language is already used for religion, in a school system, for a written literature, for university study, for newspapers, for modern entertainment and so on, there will be less tendency to use English in these domains, and the local language will have greater vitality, and also normally higher status. Second is the degree of multilinguism of the community, which leads to the use of English at the popular level as a link language. The inverse of this is the extent to which English is used in contact with native speakers (normally from the colonial power). Finally, although there may be some effect from attitudes to the former colonial power, it is much less than the global attractiveness of English.

5.6.1 The Mediterranean
Three territories in the Mediterranean were occupied by Britain long enough for the English language to have retained some official or at least public functions there: Gibraltar at the southern tip of the Iberian peninsula, the island of Malta between Italy and Libya and the island of Cyprus. All three territories are at least bilingual. Gibraltarians speak Spanish at home and English on official occasions, and use both languages at school. The Maltese use Maltese for most purposes but have English as an official language and operate a bilingual education system. The broadcast media, on the other hand are largely in Maltese or Italian, and films are often dubbed into Italian. Similarly, the media in Cyprus are mainly in Greek (foreign films subtitled into Greek), but Cyprus combines bidialectism with bilingualism. It is said that although (standard) Greek is the sole official language in the Greek sector, Cypriots may write a letter applying for a job in English, but would expect to be interviewed in Standard (Athens) Greek, and then chat with their colleagues in Cypriot Greek, which is characterised among other things by a large number of loanwords from English.

A contrast between Cyprus and Gibraltar shows that the survival of English is not particularly closely related to attitudes to the British. Gibraltarians are generally in favour of links with Britain, and so it is not surprising that English is official, well known and widely used. By contrast, there is much resentment in Cyprus against the British presence and the treatment Cyprus has received from Britain. English is not an official language, but it is still widely used in business and education; the utilitarian value of the language in the globalised world outweighs attitudes.

5.6.2 The Caribbean
The island of Puerto Rico was captured by the USA during the Spanish–American war of 1898 and has remained a US possession (a self-governing ‘commonwealth’) until now, with its inhabitants fairly evenly divided among advocates of statehood,
independence and the status quo. Puerto Rico had a rich literature and an intellectual elite educated in Spanish when the Americans arrived and, despite early attempts to impose English as the medium of education, the position of Spanish has never been seriously threatened on the island.

Spanish is used for virtually all internal purposes, and although (US) English is widely known, it is only spoken fluently by educated people. Thus in 1992 only 11 per cent of respondents to a survey claimed to use English frequently at work, and only 24 per cent of the population said in the 1990 census that they could speak English easily (Clampitt-Dunlap 1995). The media are mainly in Spanish, although US television and so on is also widely available.

5.6.3 The Indian Ocean

On the Indian Ocean islands of the Seychelles and Mauritius, English is again in contact with a pre-existing well-developed European language. They were first colonised by France in the eighteenth century and developed for the production of cotton and sugar using slave labour. At the beginning of the nineteenth century they became British with no significant change of population. When slavery was abolished the Seychelles went over to less intensive agriculture, while on Mauritius slaves were replaced by indentured Indian workers. In both territories the majority language remained creole French, with the upper classes speaking French and the Indians their own languages.

However, just as Indians in South Africa are going over to English, and those in Guyana and Trinidad have largely adopted creole or English, the Indians on Mauritius are going over to French creole or French. The Times of India for 7 February 2000 gave these interesting quotations:

Yashdev Sharma, an engineering student said: ‘Some youngsters consider it degrading to use either Bhojpuri or Hindi at home and would rather speak French, which is more fashionable than English.’

A government official said: ‘I may use Bhojpuri to communicate with the elders in the family but with my children — it’s French or Creole. The youngsters don’t like Bhojpuri at all.’

The situation in the current independent states is that French creole remains the dominant everyday language. French is widely known and spoken (and a compulsory subject from the beginning of primary school), and English is an official language, and a main medium of education, but less ‘popular’ than French, (or the French–creole continuum). The result seems comparable with that in Puerto Rico.

5.6.4 Papua New Guinea and the Pacific

New Guinea was one of the eight or ten areas in the world in which agriculture developed independently and the farmers of inland New Guinea continued to pursue their intensive agriculture unaffected by outside influence until the twentieth century. The island is extremely rich in relatively unrelated languages, although many are now dying as a result of increased communication. Other islands of Melanesia like the Solomons
and Vanuatu have similarly been settled for a long time and have a rich variety of (Austronesian or New Guinean) local languages. Western traders, administrators and missionaries introduced pidgin Englishes in the nineteenth century and these have developed as lingua francas. Several have become official languages and are used for some education and administration, like Tok Pisin in New Guinea and Bislama in Vanuatu.

In New Guinea, English and Tok Pisin (the local pidgin) are official languages and Tok Pisin is the medium of primary education, with transfer to English later. Tok Pisin is the best developed pidgin in the world, with standardised grammar and vocabulary and a very un-English appearance.

Unlike Puerto Rico and the Indian Ocean islands, New Guinea had very many local languages and none of them was used in ‘modern’ domains before colonisation, so that the local languages are much ‘weaker’ than French or Spanish. Unlike in the Mediterranean islands, where English is used only with outsiders, in New Guinea English is used mainly with other local speakers for internal purposes, and consequently can become very nonstandard. Because of these factors the island is rather rapidly undergoing language shift. Smaller languages are dying. Tok Pisin is becoming creolised – acquiring native speakers – and as Tok Pisin borrows more and more ‘modern’ vocabulary and spellings from English, something like an English–Tok Pisin continuum is developing.

Mühlhäusler (1991:637) gives these examples of city boys calling out to girls (with unashamed sexism) in a mixture of English (roman), Tok Pisin (italics) and fixed phrases from Hiri Motu, an earlier lingua franca (underlined italics):

Yu, mipele givim long yu. ‘You, we give it to you.’
laik ok one eh edeseni o lao? ‘I like the OK one. Hey, friend, where are you going?’
luk fresh one. ‘I like the unattached one. Friend, where are you going?’
O laik gut wan. Olsem, olsem. ‘I like a good one just like her, like her.’
... Ai, nogat mani ya, yu stupit. ‘You have no money, you stupid.’

The situation in the much smaller islands of Vanuatu is in a way more complicated, since the islands were colonised jointly by the British and French, and both English and French are official alongside Bislama, which has developed as a link language among the 105 small languages of the island. Bislama is an English-lexified pidgin, but the Vanuatu government’s website Wëkim long Tōkbaot Vānautu ([http://www.chez.com/webyumi/](http://www.chez.com/webyumi/) [accessed 4 February 2011]) provides examples of how different the two languages are: Sapos yu wantem talem tingting, kess o glat blong yu is glossed ‘For any feedback, complaints, comments, corrections ...’ and Plis jusum one samting blong luk luk en is ‘Make your choice’.

Early (1999) reports that 80 per cent of spoken interaction among the ‘educated’ staff of the national broadcasting organisation is in Bislama. Unlike New Guinea, however, Vanuatu does not use the pidgin as a medium of education, but has two streams, one English-medium, one French-medium. We saw that in the Seychelles and Mauritius the existence of French creole and French as a local international language
(Madagascar, the Comores, Réunion) meant that English was less ‘fashionable’ than French. In Vanuatu analogous factors – an English-based pidgin, English-using neighbours – mean that English is gaining ground over French. The survey of language use by broadcasting staff showed that only 20 per cent of writing (and much less speech) was in French, with most being in English or Bislama. Early (1999) argues that focus on the maintenance of the two colonial languages distracts attention and resources from the development of the language nearly everyone understands – Bislama – and the maintenance of the rich heritage of Melanesian languages.

In Fiji a situation reminiscent of Malaysia has arisen. Colonisation at the end of the nineteenth century left the traditional power structure of Fijian society in place. However, workers for plantations were imported from India, and to a smaller extent China, so that in modern Fiji a majority of the population is ethnically non-Fijian. The independence constitution gave privileges to native Fijians and one dialect of their Austronesian language is the official language. Nevertheless English is widely used and is the medium of education at most levels. The Chinese community is said to have gone over entirely to English as its daily language, and some Indians are moving in the same direction. Fijian English is definitely used for interactions among locals, at least in urban areas, and its lexis has therefore been localised. It includes local lexicalisations (CRORE words) of relationships, either loan-translated from Fijian or Hindi like big father ‘father’s elder brother’ or borrowed like tavele ‘cross-cousin’ (cf. §2.2), and foreignisms (BONFIRE NIGHT) like tyre ‘game played with a tyre and two sticks’, tanoa ‘traditional drinking bowl’ (Tent 2000). In Fiji, unlike in Malaysia, political support for an official ‘indigenous’ language seems to have been unable to overcome a degree of societal multilingualism. Perhaps the reason is the limited scope of Fijian compared to Malay – the lingua franca of its area for centuries – and the absence of previous or current use of Fijian in modern domains.

French, Spanish and, with political support, Fijian, seem to be holding their own against English, while the languages of New Guinea, the Solomons and Vanuatu seem to be severely threatened by pidgin and/or English.

The extreme case of language shift seems to be illustrated by the small island of Guam, which was acquired by the USA from Spain in 1898 along with the Philippines and Puerto Rico. It was a strategic military base and English was at once imposed as the language of education and government. Teachers were mostly native speakers of English from the USA, and Guamanians came to identify strongly with the USA after the Second World War. Influxes of immigrants and US military personnel increased the use of English. Consequently Guamanians today mainly use English. As described by Clampitt-Dunlap (1995), the situation seems like New Zealand or Ireland, with revived interest in the local language, Chamorro, coming almost too late to rescue it. Children are said now hardly to understand the mother tongue of their parents and grandparents, even though it is a school subject nowadays. On Guam, with a language spoken by few people and used in no modern domains, education entirely in English, immigration from other islands requiring English as a link language and a high proportion of prestigious inner-circle speakers in the community, there seem to have been all the conditions for rapid language shift without even a creole phase.
5.6.4.1 Further reading

Clampett-Dunlap’s dissertation is available online at http://ponce.inter.edu/vl/tesis/sharon/diss.html [accessed 4 February 2011].

Tok Pisin and Bislama are described on the Language Varieties website at http://www.hawaii.edu/satocenter/langnet/ [accessed 4 February 2011].

Review questions

1. What factors seem to be driving language shift among ethnic Indians in Mauritius?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of carrying out primary education in Tok Pisin or Bislama?
3. Where would you place Fiji, Guam and Cyprus on Schneider’s stages? How well do the scales work for these communities?
4. What are the roles of local-language status, local multilingualism and nationalism in the sociolinguistic outcomes in the cases discussed above? Note that Bhojpuri is essentially nonstandard Hindi.
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It’s a terrible idea... It’s a perfidious British plot in order to transform the EU into a sort of English speaking area.

Marc Roche of Le Monde newspaper, criticising Mr Kinnock’s plans [to translate fewer documents]

In Brussels, English is widely spoken especially by lobbyists, and it tends to be the common language when you get a group of people together from all corners of Europe either socially or in a work environment.

Nolan Quigley, Belgium (from UK).

BBC on-line Talking point 'Is the English language conquering Europe?'

6.1 The rise of English in the expanding circle

6.1.1 English becomes a world language

Focus question
● When did English become useful as a foreign language? When did it become useful as a lingua franca?

One consequence of the rise of British power outside Europe was increasing use of English (and English-based pidgin) as a lingua franca even outside territories under British or US control. Even in the mid-eighteenth century there is evidence of a shift from Dutch and Portuguese towards English (and French). For example, Denmark had a colony in the West Indies (since 1917 the American Virgin Islands). Its official language was never Danish, but until 1748 it was Dutch, and thereafter it was English (Liebst 1996). On the other hand, English did not have the self-evident status it occupies now. When Stamford Raffles, the British commander in South East Asia around 1800, wrote to local kings and princes he naturally did so in their languages: Javanese, Malay and so on. However, as world shipping came to be dominated by Britain in the nineteenth century, English became the lingua franca of traders and sailors all over the world outside Europe, and pidgin Englishes sprang from their interaction with local people. As the nineteenth century ran on, American traders and imperial expansion increased the presence of English in world trade. Scandinavian and German missionaries in Asia and Africa often used English as a lingua franca before they had learnt local languages.
Within Europe, French had replaced Latin as the natural international language by the eighteenth century. The Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 ending the Thirty Years’ War was the last major European peace treaty written in Latin. The next, the Treaty of Utrecht between Britain, France and Spain (1713), was written in French only, and so was the Treaty of Vienna a hundred years later (1815). Robert Walpole, who became effective Prime Minister of Britain in 1718, still spoke Latin to the German-born King George I because George did not speak English and Walpole did not speak French or German. However, when an English princess married the King of Denmark in 1765, they spoke French to one another. The prestige of French was so high that the upper classes in countries like the Netherlands and Prussia started to adopt it as their home language.

However, towards the end of the eighteenth century several factors combined to lead to more use of mother tongues and the learning of more foreign languages. There was a kind of ‘three-language system’ where educated people read English, French and German, as well as their mother tongue if it was another European language. Among these factors were increased nationalism, a Romantic turn towards the mother tongue, industrial and technical leadership in Britain, the superior German education system which made Germany the centre of science and scholarship, and the continuing status of French as the language of diplomacy and culture and the default in lingua-franca situations. In the nineteenth-century British novels of Charlotte Brontë the characters typically know French and are learning German, and in one, Villette (1855), the heroine works as a teacher of English as a foreign language (to French speakers) in Brussels; one of her colleagues is Fräulein Anna Braun, who teaches German to the same pupils. Correspondingly, in the German novelist Theodor Fontane’s Irrungen Wirrungen (1888) an educated working-class Berlin girl knows French, but admires her upper-class lover’s knowledge of both French and English.

In the second half of the nineteenth century the importance of English tended to increase as US industry, technology and, above all, research and scholarship, were added to British power.

The wars of the first half of the twentieth century destroyed the intellectual basis for German as an international language and weakened French. It is significant that the Treaty of Versailles (1919) was written in English as well as French; American power had been decisive in winning the war and the language of the USA achieved a new status as a result. Nonetheless, this quotation from Virginia Woolf’s To the Lighthouse (1927) shows that French was still conceived of as a more likely lingua franca than English (as well as neatly expressing the pros and cons of a lingua-franca situation):

So, when there is a strife of tongues, at some meeting, the chairman, to obtain unity, suggests that everyone shall speak in French. Perhaps it is bad French; French may not contain the words that express the speaker’s thoughts; nevertheless speaking French imposes some order, some uniformity.

Throughout the twentieth century English became more and more widely known as a consequence of US military power, the attractiveness of US popular culture and the
superiority of US technology, science and scholarship. Another factor was the spread of knowledge of English within territories once colonised by Britain and the USA, which continued, as we have seen, even after independence. In the second half of that century it replaced French in lingua-franca situations even in Europe.

6.1.2 Foreign language and lingua franca

Even outside states with English as a majority language (the inner circle) and those where English has many state-internal functions, the language is widely known and learnt. There are two types of situations in which it is used: foreign language and lingua franca (3.4.6). A foreign language situation is one where communication is mainly with people who speak the language as a majority or official state language. If one learns Spanish mainly to speak to people from Spain and Latin America, Japanese to speak to people from Japan, or English to speak to American, British, Australian or Caribbean people, one is learning it for foreign language situations. A lingua-franca situation is one where communication is mainly with people who speak some other language but have also learned the lingua franca. Russian is useful in central Asia, and Swahili in central and east Africa, because many speakers of other local languages have learnt Russian and Swahili respectively as lingua francas to communicate with others. In the last half of the twentieth century English became very widespread as a lingua franca throughout the world. Such situations are most common in the expanding circle, which is why the issue is raised here, but arise frequently in the outer circle and quite often in the inner circle. In fact the value of English as a language of wider communication is one of the reasons why postcolonial states have maintained it as a language of education (as opposed, for example, to the complete abandonment of Dutch in Indonesia).

The issue of 'culture' arises here. When learning a language with a view to foreign language use, it is useful to know something of the ideas and attitudes of the people to be interacted with, so that alongside Japanese one learns Japanese 'culture' and so on. The value attached to 'national culture' in foreign language teaching theory has varied as ideology and the international climate changes. Risager (2006) points out that in the seventeenth century languages were taught with identical materials for all, that is without any consideration of local culture, whereas towards the end of the twentieth century culture was emphasised as an important part. As English increasingly becomes useful as a lingua franca, its relationship to US or any other culture becomes less important and being too 'American' can even be a hindrance. What is required instead is awareness that the person whom one is interacting with (one's interlocutor) may have unexpected cultural or pragmatic norms, and sensitivity in adapting to them.

6.1.3 A note on terminology

Since we have used 'General English' for features common to all or most standard varieties we will call English that is not localised to any particular inner or outer circle country 'expanding-circle English'. It has become conventional to use the term 'English as a Lingua Franca' for the complex of linguistic features and communicative practices which make English, whether native or non-native, widely comprehensible in
lingua-franca situations. Thus expanding-circle English is defined by where it comes from, but English as a Lingua Franca is defined by its scope, as discussed in 6.3.

Review questions
1. When did English become the default lingua franca in Europe? Outside Europe?
2. How should English language teachers deal with ‘US culture’?

6.2 Domains for English

Focus questions
● Where might you see or hear English in an expanding-circle country?
● Listen to recordings 26 and 27.

6.2.1 Introduction

In the expanding circle, by definition, other languages than English are used for official purposes and as the normal spoken medium among the citizens of a country in all domains (Söderlund 2010, Lilja-Visén forthcoming). English may still be used as a lingua franca within groups who are not part of the local language community, like exchange students, some expatriates, some immigrants and so on. It will also be used by speakers of the local language in foreign-language situations (with American tourists, for example) and in lingua-franca ones (communication with or within international organisations, or on the street with foreigners). It may also be used in some domains within the country. For example, although English will not be used in primary education, religion, courts and the law, national politics, literature, national administration, or home and family life, it may be used (along with local languages) in research, education (especially university-level), publicity, business, popular culture and the mass media.

English comes to be used in these domains for a number of reasons. Some are functional: international diplomacy, international organisations, research publication, business negotiations and chats with foreigners often make use of English because it is widely known and the interaction is likely to succeed in this medium. In other cases English seems to be chosen largely for its associations: advertisements intended entirely for a public with some other mother tongue often make use of English, despite its clear inefficiency as a medium; at least 20 per cent of the audience (Preisler 1999b, INRA 2001) in any country and far more in most, will not understand at all), and song lyrics in English are often said merely to sound better. Neither factor is new. In the eighteenth century French was functional for international diplomacy because it was the language most diplomats knew. At the same time, Italian was the fashionable language of music, and operas in London and Paris were written in Italian, presumably because ‘it sounded better’ not for any functional reason (unless it is true that the high proportion of vowels makes singing easier).
Both function and fashion represent ‘market forces’ which tend to lead to the spread of a dominant language. The main force that can act effectively to manage language use (and perhaps limit the spread) is action by governments and other public bodies. In the expanding circle governments often have policies to secure the position of national languages by, for example, subsidising the local film industry or publishers, ensuring that democratic processes and legal actions are carried on in local languages, regulating the use of English in education, or even imposing codes for what languages can be used in particular media.

The school system – which is usually an instrument of national policy – is also affected by market forces. Once a language becomes widely known, schools tend to make its dominance self-perpetuating. If it is observed that English is a useful language on the world stage, then schools start to teach it. Once more people in more countries have learnt it at school, it becomes more useful, because there are more foreigners with whom it can be used. So, following the wishes of parents and pupils, schools teach the language even more, even more people learn it and it becomes even more useful. The evidence is that government policy cannot easily resist market forces at this level, however. The former Soviet satellite states in Europe taught Russian in the schools energetically without establishing the language as a self-perpetuating international medium.

At present the world’s schools are forces to strengthen the position of English. English is the main foreign language taught in China, in Japan, in Indonesia and in nearly all other Asian countries. Ninety per cent of pupils in the EU study English at some time or another in their education (EU Commission 2008). The age of beginning English study is gradually being lowered and it is not unusual to start before the age of 10 or even, as in Spain, at pre-school.

### 6.2.2 English in international organisations

Before briefly examining the use of English in various domains worldwide we can illustrate the mechanisms that lead to wider use of English by considering some international organisations and a subculture within popular culture.

Some international organisations choose a single working language because it is known to many people in all their member states. The Commonwealth of Nations, the former British Commonwealth, uses English, the Commonwealth of Independent States, the successor to the Soviet Union, uses Russian, and the Gulf Co-operation Council (which does not include Iran) and the Arab League use Arabic. Others have members with a few different official languages and use all of them. Mercosur in southern South America uses Spanish and Portuguese, NAFTA with Mexico, the US and Canada as members has Spanish, French and English. Where members have many different languages, three strategies are possible. One is to allow use of all of them, as in the European Union, which claims to have 23 working languages. The second is to select ‘major’ languages of some sort, as in the UN, which has Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. Its predecessor, the League of Nations, used English, French and Spanish. The African Union has Arabic, English, French and Portuguese. The third strategy is simply to nominate an international language as
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the working language. In the nineteenth century the obvious one was French and it remains the ‘official’ language of the Universal Postal Union (founded in 1874). Now English is the sole official and working language of APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation including China, the US, Japan and many other Pacific-rim countries including several with Spanish as official language), ASEAN (the Association of South East Asian Nations, 10 states from Burma/Myanmar to the Philippines and Indonesia), the Asia Cooperation Dialogue (the rather vague forum uniting the states of Asia as a whole) and OPEC (the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries).

It is striking that Asian countries seem much more willing to accept a pragmatic English-only policy than the countries of Europe, but it seems that the difference is increasingly formal rather than real. Kirkpatrick (2008) shows that interaction at ASEAN is indeed in English and mostly completely effective. But although Asian institutions have adopted English as a formal lingua franca and European ones have not, Seidlhofer (2010:355) argues that ‘English has become the de facto “extraterritorial” lingua franca throughout Europe’, resulting in a mismatch between policy and practice.

The European Union has in theory a strong institutional policy commitment to multilingualism and this makes it an interesting case study for the spread of English. The Treaty of Rome (1956) among the original six member countries (France, Italy, (west) Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg) and later treaties are formulated in all the languages of the community at that stage. The EU has no official working language and its official languages are those of the member states; by 2010 there were 23 national languages among 27 member states. Nine languages are spoken natively by more than 5 per cent of the population: German with nearly 20 per cent of the EU’s 450 million citizens, French, English and Italian with 12–14 per cent each, Polish with 8 per cent, Spanish with 6 per cent, Romanian and Dutch around 4–5 per cent and Greek with about 3 per cent. The languages of Europe have a long association with their respective nations. In particular, each of them has been the focus of a struggle to ‘gain domains’ like higher education, religion and science from Latin or to gain these and the political and school domains from the language of a politically dominant group. Public use of Finnish became a symbol of the Finnish nation’s struggle for independence from Russia, that of Czech for the Czechs’ independence from Austria–Hungary and aspirations for the use of Irish for Ireland’s liberation from Britain. To ask nations to give up the hard-won status of their languages was seen as undesirable, but probably also politically impracticable. This is the conflict between the ideological nationalist and utilitarian nationalist (3.4.4) language functions operating at an international level.

In EU institutions anyone has the right to use any language and interpreting or translation will be provided, at least in theory. Knowledge of English is becoming a presupposed skill in educated people (Graddol 2006) and the language increasingly has lingua-franca functions in academic, business and everyday interactions in Europe. Consequently, the EU is faced with strong market forces leading to increased use of English. Generally speaking the more public fora, mainly the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers, are multilingual with simultaneous interpretation into
all languages. However, at more informal meetings of ministers or representatives, in
the corridors and cafes, and in most of the work of the Commission (the EU civil
service), market forces take over and only ‘major languages’, in fact usually English,
are used. The Parliament is the most multilingual institution but even here Swedish
members of the EU parliament often only use Swedish in plenary sessions and official
committee meetings, and go over to English in study groups and in informal interac-
tion (Melander 2001). Although all documents with legal force are produced in all
languages, in practice many MEPs consult documents in English rather than wait for
versions in their own language.

Most of the day-to-day work of the Union goes on in English or, to a decreasing
extent, French, and Schlossmacher (1994) gives a vivid illustration of why this is
so. More Europeans have learnt English at school than other languages. Hence, if a
German representative or official addresses an unknown person in German, the inter-
action normally fails and the two have to resort to English or possibly French. Next
time the German will probably not bother to try in his own language but start off in
English. Increasingly no one will hear German spoken, and the position of English will
be strengthened, irritatingly for the German, who speaks the language which is the
mother tongue of the highest proportion of Europeans.

As more countries join the Union, more languages become official. But ‘the more
languages, the more English’. Ninety per cent of young people in Europe today have
taken English at school (EU Commission 2008) so English is increasingly likely to
be the most effective language for informal interaction at EU level. The process that
limited the use of German has eroded the position of French, and market forces are
pushing the Union towards a single de facto working language.

The Union’s policy to manage multilingualism is basically to provide translation
and interpretation as often as possible. Its interpreting services used to follow the
principle that all interpreting should be into the interpreter’s mother tongue. But this
system has broken down in a 23-language Union. Now there is much relay interpret-
ing, in which a speaker’s words are translated into a pivot language, usually English,
and then from the pivot into other languages and some biaactive or ‘retour’ interpret-
ing in which the interpreter works out of his or her own language into the pivot
(Gebhard 2001). Thus Estonian might be handled by native speakers of Estonian
interpreting out of their first language into English, with the other languages being
served by their own native speakers interpreting out of English.

Three interesting and symptomatic points arise from these changes in interpret-
ing practice. One is that since the pivot is often English, the position of English is
strengthened – all information will have ‘passed through’ the language. The second
is that combining relay and biaactive interpreting means that no native speakers of
English will be involved; an expansion of English appears to result in a reduction of
the significance of native speakers. Consequently, the third observation is that the
English that occupies such an important position will be an ‘off-shore’ variety not
controlled by native speakers. It might come closer to the types of form and prac-
tice often recorded from lingua-franca situations. This combination of increased
use with a decreased role for native speakers and a variety defined by non-natives
The expanding circle is a common one in considering English in the expanding circle, as it was in the outer circle.

Of course, one reason why English is acceptable in organisations like OPEC and ASEAN is that it is not the nationalist language of any of the members. As Seidlhofer (2010) points out, the choice of one working language in the EU, obviously English, would have to entail a type of denationalisation of the language, its conceptualisation as English as a Lingua Franca rather than British English. We discuss these issues further in section 6.4.3 below.

6.2.3 Subcultures: English from the bottom up

A rather different set of functional factors leads to English being necessary and acquiring a high status in many subcultures, some of which would see themselves in violent opposition to the bureaucrats of the EU. Preisler (1999) studied members of four youth subcultures in Denmark: hip-hop, computer nerds, rock music and death metal music.

The subcultures turned out to be rather hierarchically organised, with highly-skilled and knowledgeable individuals enjoying high status. Because the subcultures are international, one aspect of being skilled and knowledgeable is that one is part of an international network with links to other countries in Europe and back to the USA where the subcultures originate. This network operates in English, and the technical terms for different types of dance, etc. are English. Preisler gives these examples of the international vocabulary of hip-hop:

*Breakdance*: boogie, electric boogie, windmills, back spin, head spin, turtle, footwork, shop, crocke (Danish verbal suffix), poppin’, bobbins’, back slide, etc.

*Hip/Dr*: ragamuffin, scratch, scratcher, mixer, cut-blocks.

*Graffiti*: tagge (Danish verbal suffix), tagging, bomb, bombing, jams, cypher, burn-off, wild-style, straight-letters, window-down-wholecar, etc.

Consequently the high-status members of the subcultures are characterised by a reasonable knowledge of English, among other things of course, and knowledge of English acquires status within the subculture. Consequently English expressions and respect for English filter 'down' to lower-status subculture members and out into the general population because of the covert prestige of the subcultures. Knowing English is necessary for being a good hip-hopper, and is not just a mark of success within bourgeois society.

Four interesting points emerge here. First, English enters European society not only institutionally or top-down via European institutions, education and so on but also individually or bottom-up via the subcultures. Second, the latter is a very different English from that of the European Parliament or world business — it is a version of US street slang, strongly influenced by AAVE (4.5.4.1). Thirdly, although the technical terms in its vocabulary are strongly oriented to native-speaker models (the originators of the subcultures), grammar is probably less important and very varied, given the international role of the language as in the subculture. Fourth, this is also a variety
that is often used in lingua-franca situations: Preisler describes how hip-hoppers from Poland visit Danish groups and communicate in English.

6.2.4 Domains of English in the expanding circle

Having mentioned schools, song lyrics and international organisations, we can briefly describe other domains occupied by English in the expanding circle as follows:

6.2.4.1 Advertisements, posters, trademarks, shop names, magazine headings etc.

Many television and print advertisements use (usually American, if spoken) English for its fashion value. SAS, the Scandinavian airline company, for example, produces TV commercials for the home market which show long sequences of Scandinavian scenery and customs ending with the slogan ‘It’s Scandinavian’. Both in Bulgaria (Bogdanova 2010) and Laos (Khathaphone Somvorachit, personal communication), magazines in the local language and script have section headings, and sometimes article titles, in English and Roman script. The same phenomenon in Chinese magazines involves Chinese characters that only make sense read aloud as English words (Shi Hui, personal communication).

In this context it is difficult to resist quoting an example of ‘T-shirt English’, the variety used in slogans on East Asian T-shirts, pencil-cases and so on, which is evocative rather than communicative:

STANDARD
ONESELF WHO IS ACTUAL
IS CERTAINLY
FOUND

6.2.4.2 Business

English is increasingly used as a corporate or company language in multinational corporations, including corporations headquartered outside the inner and outer circles. What exactly is meant by ‘English as a corporate language’ differs widely between companies, however. In some cases English is used mostly for external communication, for example with international clients or subsidiaries. In other cases, English is also used to a large degree within the individual company units due to the presence of international experts. In both cases English is the default lingua franca, that is, the language used to communicate with speakers with a different first language, and local languages are used alongside English. While English is often introduced to eliminate the difficulties that occur due to the linguistic diversity of multilingual companies, research indicates that the introduction of English as a corporate language may in itself lead to language-related problems, such as the emergence of a shadow structure based on language competence, the disappearance of informal knowledge-sharing because non-native speakers withdraw from gossip and small talk, and social exclusion.
The expanding circle of international employees due to a lack of competence in the local or parent company language which in many cases retains a significant role. (Thanks to Dorte Lønsmann, cf Lønsmann (forthcoming); Tange and Lauring (2009).)

6.2.4.3 Internet communication

Internet communication can be in any language, but the borderless nature of the net means that sites can be visited by users from anywhere, and many providers will want to make use of this by providing material in English. Blogs, online games and chatrooms may attract participants from all over the world and thus become typical lingua-franca situations. Internet surfing of any kind is likely to lead users to material in English and thus increase exposure ‘at home’. But perhaps a wider point is that electronic communication makes geographical location, and therefore the local status of languages, less important overall. English is important in the global language mix and therefore appears on screens everywhere.

Glass (2009) shows that Thais write to other Thais in English for several reasons: to allow correspondence to be read by non-Thai superiors; because it is easier (less threatening) to give this message in English (one respondent only); and to practise English. But the most common reason was their use of the computer for writing: the software they are using does not allow the Thai alphabet, or they type faster in English as a result of computer use. So the technology itself leads to use of English in preference to a language with a very different writing system.

6.2.4.4 Creative writing

In the borderless world introduced by the internet one can choose to write amateur (fan fiction, genre fiction) or even professional fiction for a wider market than one’s home language. Kirkpatrick (2007) discusses fiction in Chinese-flavoured English aimed at an audience including Chinese speakers. In many European countries young writers normally choose English as the medium for song lyrics and this leads to them occasionally choosing (a nonlocalised variety of) English as the medium for other types of creative writing.

6.2.4.5 Films, TV

In some countries (Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Syria and Portugal, for example) American and other imported films are subtitled, so that the original soundtrack is audible, and TV becomes a channel bringing English into the home. In others, films are ‘dubbed’ by a variety of techniques (some, in Latvia and Poland for example, quite cheaply because they involve a single narrator) and films and TV bring in US culture without the language. The extent to which subtitled films and TV create a presence of English in the country depends of course on the volume of imports. DVDs often offer the choice of dubbing or subtitling, and increasing online access to films and TV makes it much easier to skip the national process and watch in the original language, often English.
6.2.4.6 Interaction with outsiders

Increasingly English is the default language to address foreigners or tourists in. Tourists who speak Asian languages assume that everyone in Europe knows English, and Europeans assume that people of Asian appearance will understand English if they don’t appear to understand the local language. One should not, however, overestimate this – in most countries most people on the street will not be able to give fluent directions in English at a moment’s notice.

6.2.4.7 Medium of education

It is characteristic of expanding-circle countries that the national language is used as the medium of education throughout primary, secondary and tertiary education. Market forces of various kinds are starting to erode this. At the highest level, PhD theses in many subjects are routinely written in English in many countries, so that they become part of the international ‘conversation of the discipline’. Even at the undergraduate level, university textbooks in many subjects are too expensive to produce in small languages. Even in large languages, translations may be out of date by the time they are available. So increasingly university departments, particularly in the natural sciences and technology, prescribe set texts in English. At the same time universities are under pressure to attract students from overseas, either to earn money or as part of exchange programmes. University staff are also mobile, and universities employ the best researchers they can get wherever they come from. Students or their parents may like to see courses in, for example, business studies, taught in English so that they learn the language along with the subject. All these factors encourage the universities to offer courses taught in English, and in the last few years these have become quite common all over Europe under the name of CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning (Dalton-Puffer 2005), and also in Japan, for example. Similar pressures have led to ‘immersion’ secondary education through English in some secondary schools.

6.2.4.8 Printed press

Newspapers and magazines in most countries are in the local language, but there is often an English-language local newspaper like Thailand’s Bangkok Post and Saudi Arabia’s Saudi Express which is read by locals and is quite influential. American ‘international’ publications like Time and Newsweek (and many others, British or American) are read throughout the world.

Of course the key feature of the expanding circle is that most domains are unaffected by English other than in the form of occasional loanwords: religion, courts and the law, national politics, literature, national administration, home and family life, to name a few.

Review questions

1. Give some functional and some ‘association’ cases of using English as a foreign language or lingua franca.
2. Why does ASEAN use English as the official and working language? Why doesn’t the EU? Why does neither use Esperanto? Why does neither use Chinese?

3. How does top-down English (at universities, in diplomacy) differ from bottom-up English (in song lyrics, on social media)?

4. How does globalisation affect the use of English in the domains mentioned?

6.3 English in lingua-franca situations

Focus questions

- How should participants in a lingua-franca situation speak to make sure they are effective?
- Listen to the online recordings 23–25

6.3.1 Research on English as a Lingua Franca

Since the mid 1990s there has been a good deal of research on the use of English in lingua-franca situations, or ‘English as a Lingua Franca’ (ELF). A key element of this has been the development of large corpora of spoken ELF interactions like the quite general VOICE corpus in Vienna (Studtorfer 2003), the ELFA corpus of academic English from ELF situations (Mauranen and Ranta 2008) and Kirkpatrick’s Corpus of Asian English (Kirkpatrick 2008). Situations of use and speaker proficiencies vary very much and so it is also useful to have data from smaller corpora from specialised situations like Björkman’s, specifically from lectures and student group work (2010) and Smits’ longitudinal study of multilingual students taking a course in English (2009).

Some investigators of ELF make a distinction between proficient and nonproficient ELF users, basically suggesting that the proficient users are competent users of ELF viewed as a variety, while the others have not yet learnt to use the language competently. The proficient users are not defined as those who have native-like usage, but those whose usage conforms to principles of explicitness and economy discussed below. This enables them to distinguish learner language from fully functional English as a lingua franca. Not all investigators would make this type of distinction.

Thus Allan James (1999) gives this example of ‘Austrian/Italian/Slovenian conversation’:

A: I don wanna drink alcohol
B: Me too
C: I also not

which is undoubtedly interaction in a lingua-franca situation but not the type of proficient language use that some writers focus on. In this situation, communication among L1 speakers of different languages is perfect but the code is nonstandard and the participants probably could not express all they would wish to.
Guido (2004) gives an example of a tragic lingua-franca situation which does not provide an opportunity to discuss the features of successful usage. All the participants seem reasonably fluent in English, but the varieties they use and the purposes they perceive in the interaction are so different that there is no communication. Exhausted would-be immigrants to Europe are being interviewed by tired Italian immigration officials, in English:

A: Who helped you to escape from Nigeria?

B: Di car kom pick as and I bin drive for Niger thhh di awa yansh dem bin break thhh for di uranium mine dem thhh for won year

A: Did they did they make you to work in the mines who

B: Yeah hh di mine dem bin give di money for go awa away for Agadez …. He won truck kom drive for di desert… After two days di sand bin make >wakawak< for di sun, mek Libya border no see as

A: The border, eh? Hhh You had no documents, eh?

The Nigerians speak fluent but fairly basilectal Nigerian English; the Italians speak fairly accurate Standard English with Italian accents. They understand some of each others’ words, but no more. This is a one-off meeting in which participants have no time to learn each others’ varieties or pragmatic strategies.

By contrast to the effective but basic communication of the Austrian/Italian/Slovenian non-drinkers, what is described in the literature is mainly proficient use of English in successful lingua-franca interactions, often academic or business, where the participants have shared aims and frames of reference. The point is made that most such interactions are successful not only despite some non-native features, but probably also because of some such features.

By contrast to the one-off encounter at the frontier of Fortress Europe, lingua-franca interactions seem often to go on in quite long-lasting ‘communities of practice’ like university programmes, business project cooperations or repeated meetings of international committees. These communities consist of people who know one another and have developed ways of working and understanding one another. Smit (2008) found that as a multilingual group of students worked together longer they started to use more and more direct control acts (not would you be prepared to … but could you), apparently because the more direct acts were more effective (and familiarity with one another had increased). Shaw et al. (2009) observed that although close-knit groups of exchange students did not adapt their pronunciation or syntax appreciably to one another, over a few months they learnt to understand each other and communicate effectively (as Smit (2009) says, unintelligibility is a temporary phenomenon in ELF situations).

6.3.2 Spelling

The focus in studies of ELF has been on speech. While informal conversational writing in ELF shows the variety of spellings typical of other environments, many of
which are rational simplifications, there is no sign that the eccentric spelling system of
Standard English is being adapted. Formal documents described as written in and for
lingua-franca situations typically follow the standard American (or British, or both) norms provided by word-processing programs.

6.3.3 Phonetics and phonology

Proficient expanding-circle users are those whose competence is internationally valid
and hence effective in ELF situations, so that their pronunciation is comprehensible to people from a wide range of backgrounds. Apart from that, they have the accent of their own language background. To see what the accents of proficient expanding-circle users must be like, we can consider interaction between speakers of different varieties in general. We can see that inner- or outer-circle speakers of English with different accents, but internationally valid competence, can understand one another. The accents differ in features like the realisation of /θ/ (clear or dark) and /t/ (approximant or tap), the extent of rhoticity, the realisations of the vowels and lexical distribution of words among vowel phonemes. Thus we could come up with a specification of internationally comprehensible English requiring that most of the phoneme contrasts found in ‘educated’ or ‘standard’ inner and outer-circle speech be maintained, but details of realisation might be quite varied.

Jenkins (2000) approached a characterisation of an internationally valid accent in another way and reached similar but more precise conclusions. She observed speakers doing communicative tasks in lingua-franca conditions, and noticed what sort of features caused breakdown. Most of the features were to do with pronunciation, rather than syntax or vocabulary. She concluded that there is no particular need for learners who expect to be using the language mainly or often in lingua-franca situations to learn native-like features that do not contribute to comprehensibility, while it is very important to learn features, native-like or not, that do contribute. Her lingua-franca core is derived from empirical work on what causes breakdown in lingua-franca situations. The list proposes a target pronunciation that is quite unlike British or American patterns. Stress-timing is not on the list, for example, because it is difficult to learn and is in any case not a feature of major Asian and African varieties. The reduced vowels characteristic of inner-circle pronunciation are actually avoided because they make words less distinctive. Imperfectly realised vowel-length distinctions, word-stress placement and aspiration of unvoiced stops, on the other hand, are frequent causes of misunderstanding and thus prerequisites for adequate pronunciation in lingua-franca environments. But the aim is a common core, not uniformity. Whatever the model, teachers would only focus on some features for practice, imitation and correction.

6.3.4 Lexis and phraseology

Most discussion of lexis in effective ELF concerns innovative but regular word-formation, resulting in transparent neologisms. Björkman (2010) gives levelize, unlogical, boringdom as examples. Marked features of inner-circle English lexis are also eliminated as they are in many outer-circle varieties (5.2.4). Examples of features
eliminated might be the unpredictable alternation of the suffixes -ic and -ical which leads to forms like ethnical 'ethnic' and the unpredictable semantics of words like funny which may be reinterpreted as 'fun'.

The status of idioms in lingua-franca situations has been discussed in some detail. It has been argued that opaque idiomatic language is a characteristic of native-speaker language which may be problematic for ELF users, in that expressions which are clear to natives may be obscure to people who have learnt the language formally (Prodromou 2007). This phenomenon is known as 'unilateral idiomaticity' (Seidlhofer 2002:220). But examination of the corpora has suggested that many idioms are actually metaphors which may be 'dead' to the natives who have automatized them, but are comprehensible as live metaphors for lingua-franca users who can play with them creatively. Pitzl (2009) gives the example of an Austrian talking to Koreans who says of a problem that no one seems to have noticed: In that case we should not wake up any dogs by going now. He seems to be using the metaphor underlying the inner-circle phrase let sleeping dogs lie but by not using the inner-circle form reawakens the otherwise rather clichéd idiom.

Jenkins (2000) found that the second most common cause of misunderstanding in lingua-franca situations was the use of words which the interlocutor did not understand. Consequently, one recommendation from considerations of lingua-franca usage is that learners should probably prioritise vocabulary higher and grammatical accuracy lower, a widespread opinion in second-language teaching circles today (Schmitt 2000). Another is that in lingua-franca situations speakers must be careful to select lexis their interlocutor is likely to know, and have strategies to explain it if they don't. Lexis needs to be unambiguous and of as wide a currency as possible, so English as a lingua franca makes use of general English lexis and avoids local lexicalisations and foreignisms. Faced with a choice of source ('should I say sweets or candy?') speakers will choose the item their interlocutor is likely to understand, and this will often be the US one. Exceptions might be where the US variant is ambiguous, as in the case of gas/gasoline, petrol.

If local words for local phenomena presuppose knowledge that may not be available to interlocutors from other backgrounds (BONFIRE NIGHT words) they need to be used with caution, but if they have become internationally known (KANGAROO words) they are presumably appropriate. Clearly the speaker has to judge how appropriate local English words or straightforward code-switching into L1 are in the situation, and this kind of judgement is a key feature of ELF competence. Klimpfinger (2009) showed that occasional uses of words or phrases from other languages in lingua-franca interactions were functional and accepted.

6.3.5 Syntax

The best researched feature of proficient English in lingua-franca situations, and also the one which seems to be most similar across first languages, is the syntax of spoken interaction among proficient and highly-educated users. Generally this resembles the syntax of corresponding inner- and outer-circle English users, with a
moderate proportion of deviances that do not impair and may enhance communicative efficiency. Writers generally emphasize that the effect of the deviations from inner-circle syntax in proficient lingua-franca usage is either to reduce redundancy or to increase explicitness. Kirkpatrick (2008) argues that proficient lingua-franca usage can be distinguished from nonproficient by the functional nature of its innovations, as opposed to the nonfunctional nature of errors in less proficient usage.

Several lists have been presented of typical features. There are many similarities with features of the New Englishes which can also be regarded as simplifications of L1 usage. Björkman (2010) gives the following list from her corpus of university interactions.

**Noun phrase level**
- Not marking the plural on the noun: *Here there are two type of equations.*
- Article usage: *So the definition of the renewability is basically for us …*
- Double comparatives and superlatives: *much more cheaper*
- Countability/plural: *One unit has very much disadvantages.*

**Verb phrase level**
- Subject-verb agreement: *I call this A, which is a function of past history, what a catalyst have seen in its life.*
- Non-native-like uses of the progressive: *And this is showing a Kaplan turbine.*
- Passive voice: *But we affect by the flow …*

**Clause level**
- Nonstandard question formulation: *Why this quotation only on one side?*
- Word order (particularly in indirect questions): *It doesn’t matter which one do you talk about*
- Unraised negation: *I think it is not right to plot these in the same diagram (vs raised: I don’t think …).*

Apart from nonstandard question formulation these features never gave rise to miscommunication. The interactants whom Björkman observed seem to have been skilled users of English in their lingua-franca situation, so that the nonstandard features in their speech were those which either did not interfere with or actually enhanced its transparency.

### 6.3.6 Pragmatics

Proficient communication in English in lingua-franca situations is characterized by a wide range of pragmatic strategies to ensure effective communication. These naturally vary across situations. Thus Meterkoed (1998) found that in casual conversations topic abandonment was a common response to difficulties, but Björkman (2010) found this very rare in highly purposeful student task groups. Björkman lists the following as quite frequent pragmatic strategies among multilingual groups of students solving problems: comment on discourse structure, comment on discourse content, signalling of importance, comment on intent, comment on common ground, back-channeling. She heard no instances of other-correction (no one corrected anyone else's grammar or pronunciation). The point is that interaction in the lingua-franca environment is skilled and well adapted to its purpose.
Review questions
1. What is necessary in the situation and the participants' backgrounds and proficiency for lingua-franca communication to be effective?
2. What phonetic/phonological features should English teachers focus on to ensure effective communication in ELF situations?
3. What sort of nonstandardness in syntax and lexis is acceptable in ELF situations?
4. What advice should be given on pragmatics (turn-taking, pauses and so on) in ELF situations?

6.4 The possibility of expanding-circle Englishes and two examples

Focus questions
- Why might it be useful to say that an expanding-circle country had its own variety of English?
- Listen to the online recordings 21 and 22.

6.4.1 Why expanding-circle Englishes?
The English of nonproficient non-natives is strongly influenced by their first language and culture. This has given rise to a series of jokey labels for ineffective expanding-circle Englishes: Chinglish, Italglish, Japlish/Janglish and so on. Because these varieties are not (fully) comprehensible internationally and thus tend to be ineffective in lingua-franca and foreign-language situations, they are best thought of as stages in the learning process, rather than varieties of English. Parallel names exist for outer-circle varieties – Hindlish/Hinglish, Punglish (Punjabi), Singlish and even inner-circle ones: Wenglish (Wales) and, significantly Britlish, and these again signal lack of international comprehensibility.

However, as noted above, even the English spoken by proficient non-natives is likely to be influenced by L1 and their home culture and pragmatics. The current situation is one where English speakers use a range of different pronunciations, forms and pragmatics, and attitudes are moving (slowly) towards granting equal status to any internationally effective way of speaking. Given this increasing egalitarianism, it does not seem rational for expanding-circle speakers to strive to imitate one particular way of speaking, British or American, and they might do best to set up their own targets for internationally effective proficiency. Those features shared with other users with the same language background, which do not interfere with communication with internationally effective speakers with other backgrounds, could be treated as variety characteristics. It would be possible to observe speakers of English with L1 Spanish who were efficient communicators in lingua-franca or foreign-language situations, make notes of features that were widespread among them, and describe this as Spanish English.
The advantage of doing this would be that the target of education could be proficiency in the local variety of English. The demands of the education system could be set at a fully-functional and achievable level, rather than at one — native-like production — which nearly all learners would fail to achieve. This would be a change from an exonormative standard expanding-circle English to a set of endonormative Englishes. It would have two aspects: a process of change in language and language attitudes, and a series of decisions by education and especially examination authorities. It might have two stages, one in which features of different varieties are mixed to create a norm, and the second in which regional expanding-circle Englishes develop which have unique features due to their own substrates, like the outer-circle varieties.

There is a great deal of evidence for the first: English learnt in countries where British Standard English has been the school norm and TV offers undubbed US films and series is often in practice ‘mid-Atlantic’ in the sense that features of British and American usage are mixed, because learners are exposed to both varieties. The vocabulary of cars and leisure seems to be acquired from the media and learners say US/General trunk rather than British boot and candy rather than sweets, but Scandinavian mid-Atlantic at any rate has British autumn for US fall and cinema for movie theatre. Where university and school authorities used to demand just one inner-circle variety as standard, and then went over to allowing any ‘standard’ variety but requiring consistency, they are now increasingly allowing mixed varieties and focusing on communicative value rather than approximation to any particular native usage.

The second stage, in which learners regard themselves as learning a local English, and examiners reward the acquisition of a local English, seems as yet to be more the programme of experts (Takeshita 2009) than a reality on the ground. There is to some extent a contradiction between the demand that varieties of English used in lingua-franca situations should avoid strong local characteristics and the development of highly idiosyncratic ‘national’ varieties, since the whole point of expanding-circle English is to speak to people outside one’s country. A programme for local expanding-circle varieties of English as educational norms would have to make clear to the public that such norms were to be fully comprehensible internationally.

In this section we examine an expanding-circle variety that seems to be on its way to codification and full functionality — China English — and another which is probably more like English in lingua-franca situations and seems rather far from codification — so-called Euro-English.

6.4.2 China English
A number of Chinese scholars have argued that there is a recognisable variety of English called China English and that it should be recognised in a similar way to American English, Indian English and so on. The first part of this claim is that proficient Chinese users of English actually do speak or write in a certain way, the second is a proposal for Chinese educational policy and a change in the world’s attitudes. The two parts probably need to be examined separately, as they are in accounts like that of He and Li (2009).
He and Li define China English as 'a performance variety of English which has the standard Englishes as its core but is colored with characteristic features of Chinese phonology, lexicon, syntax and discourse pragmatics, and which is particularly suited for expressing content ideas specific to Chinese culture through such means as transliteration and loan translation'.

We note in passing that China English, like the other adaptations to new circumstances of Standard English, accepts English spelling conventions, weird as they are. He and Li notice the following features of China English in use.

### 6.4.2 Phonology

The various Chinese languages or dialects, like the many languages of India, have different phonologies but a number of shared features, and consequently while the Chinese ‘colour’ will vary among speakers, China English has distinctive features just as Indian English does. He and Li list ‘replacement of /θ/ with [s] and /ð/ with [z]’, insertion of final [ə] to make final consonants and consonant clusters pronounceable, ‘general lack of voiced fricatives’, ‘certain types of diphthong simplification’, ‘avoidance of weak forms for function words, and a tendency to pronounce multisyllabic words or word groups with syllable-timing’. If some of these features sound familiar it is because English phonological features such as dental fricatives, and the Germanic pattern of stress-timing and the resulting diphthongisation of stressed and weakening of unstressed syllables, are all rare in the world’s languages and targets for elimination in many varieties with a non-Germanic substrate.

### 6.4.2.1 Lexis

As we have repeatedly noticed, the register of talking about a country is likely to include a large number of words referring to ‘content ideas specific to [local] culture’ in the BONFIRE NIGHT (known mainly to local people) and KANGAROO (widely known but referring to local phenomena) categories. The register of talking about China, and hence China English, includes phrases formed in two ways, listed as follows by He and Li (p. 73):

(a) Transliteration: For example, Putonghua, Renminbi (RMB), yamen (‘the office of officials in imperial China’), dazibao (‘big-character poster, commonly used during the Cultural Revolution’), fengshui (geomancy), lama, maotai, etc.


It may be that at least paper tiger and lama have been borrowed from China English into General English by now. One could argue that all the phrases which He and Li have to gloss are BONFIRE NIGHT words and many of the ones they assume we recognise
are KANGAROO words. Phrases like *dragon well tea* are probably re-metaphorised idioms like the ELF equivalents in Pitzl (2009) (c.f. 6.3).

The question arises who speakers of China English are speaking to when they use these terms. They must be people who are to some extent familiar with the cultural reality of China, but do not speak (good) Chinese; foreign residents or well-informed visitors, for example. These people will probably understand a word like *guanxi* ‘contacts one can exploit’ (Kirkpatrick 2007:147) which may be a local lexicalisation, a CRORE word. As noted above, there are also written texts like novels written in English for an audience at least partly of Chinese people, and these can make use of loan translations for a poetic effect. Such local lexis would have to be used with care in a lingua-franca situation, since the essence of lingua-franca usage is mutual comprehensibility.

6.4.2.3 Syntax

He and Li identify two stylistic transfers: greater frequency than in other varieties of four word sayings (based on Chinese four-character expressions), like *effort halved, result doubled*, and of ‘parallel structures like ”a fall into the pit, a gain in your wit”. They also identify two syntactic features based on structural transfer: greater frequency of topicalisation of adverbials than in other varieties, so that, they imply, *This morning I bought a book* might be used more frequently relative to *I bought a book this morning in China English* than in other varieties; and subject-deletion, so that subjectless expressions like *Very glad to write to you again* which are informal and not particularly frequent in other varieties, might occur more in China English.

6.4.2.4 Pragmatics, text structure

It has often been argued that written texts in expanding-circle (and other) Englishes have their own text structures (Kaplan 1966) but the issue is quite controversial. Nevertheless there seems to be evidence that China English texts are more often structured inductively, stating the main point towards the end, than corresponding texts by Americans, and correspondingly that General-Particular patterns are more common in American than China English writing. In conversation there may be transferred features at various levels. China English speakers seem likely to respond to compliments with nonacceptance (’It’s just so-so’) while Americans usually accept and, for example, return ‘Yours was as good as mine’ (Yu 2004), and they may use questions like *Where are you going?* and *Have you eaten?* as phatic interaction, where Americans would perceive these as an intrusive personal question and an invitation respectively.

China English thus seems to meet many of the formal requirements for variety status, and there seem to be expert voices recommending that it be adopted as a model. China English and comparable constructs like Japanese and Korean English have not, however, yet received the sort of grass-roots support that learning English in general has. He and Li (2009) found that a large majority of university-educated informants thought that a native-speaker variety was the most desirable target and rejected the idea of expressing their identity through Hong Kong or China English. Evidence
that universities and language schools in China actually hire unqualified teachers of English who are native speakers rather than qualified non-natives points in the same direction.

6.4.3 Euro-English

Other expanding-circle Englishes with the same types of transferred features and the same aim of recognition by education authorities have been proposed (Takeshita 2009). They seem unproblematic, given that L2 speakers will inevitably carry over L1 features into their second languages, so that defining an internationally comprehensible variety of English and making it the expected end point of the learning process is merely realistic. The aim is that generally applicable ELF skills and practices will be combined with a local variety so that when the learning process is complete people will be able to use a locally ‘coloured’ variety confidently and effectively in lingua-franca (and, of course, foreign-language) situations.

However, in the case of one proposed expanding-circle variety of this sort the relation between universal ELF features and local ones is distinctly problematic. This is ‘Euro-English’. How such a variety, or at least a regional version of it, could develop is suggested by this quotation from a Spanish student in Sweden describing a colleague:

… though here in Sweden he practices English every day, he practices it mainly with Erasmus students. People who are in his same linguistic situation. These students could speak better or worse, but they are not the better sample to follow. But since they speak different languages from him, they are not making gross Spanish mistakes. He will develop a kind of Euro-English.

But what this person is describing is actually the process by which someone who speaks a type of Spanish English which is not internationally effective adapts through interaction to speak without errors that interfere with communication, that is develops a type of Spanish English that is effective in a lingua-franca situation. If we call what he develops Euro-English then Euro-English is effective L1-coloured English and lingua-franca skills.

But could Euro-English be more than this? Could it be an expanding-circle variety like China English? Approaching the question through the categories used elsewhere in this book and starting with phonology shows that the relative similarity of many European languages to English is part of the problem. The Chinese languages (‘dialects’) may be very different from one another, but they are also collectively very different from English and thus the Englishes of China collectively share characteristics which allow us to speak of China English (in pronunciation: tone, simple syllable structure, syllable timing, for example). Similarly the Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages of India are very different from one another but also very different from English in distinctive ways which result (along with other factors) in a characteristic Indian English marked by shared features of difference from inner-circle varieties. By contrast the other Germanic languages and the Romance ones (which still predominate even in the expanded EU) are different from one another but basically very similar to English.
They do not share many prominent features that distinguish them as a group from inner-circle English or other expanding-circle varieties. The prominent distinguishing features of French-coloured English – syllable-timing, h dropping, stress pattern, merger of FLEECE and KIT – are quite different from the prominent distinguishing features of German-coloured English – syllable-final devoicing, merger of DRESS and TRAP intonation. Consequently, Euro-English as a variety seems unlikely to have shared phonological features that it does not share with most other outer-circle and expanding-circle varieties.

At the level of syntax Euro-English seems to be confounded with English in any lingua-franca setting. The term came to prominence in 2001 (Jenkins et al. 2001) in an article which at least at the level of syntax seemed really to be about ELF in any situation, rather than a specifically European one. This led Molin (2006), in a widely-discussed dissertation, to search a corpus of European informal and formal writing for the type of ELF features illustrated in 6.3.5 above, and fail to find them. We would argue that, for Euro-English to be a variety like China English, French-coloured, Spanish-coloured and German-coloured English would have to be characterised by shared syntactic ‘innovations’ not found in other varieties. As far as we know there are few such features.

At the level of lexis, there are two kinds of shared feature of European- (or European-language)-coloured English which do distinguish it from other varieties. One is a set of so-called false friends, where a word which is shared by many languages has had a peculiar sense-development in English. In most European languages there are words that look like genial (inner/outer circle = ‘friendly and cheerful’), actual and eventual but mean ‘very clever, like a genius’, ‘current’ and ‘possible’ respectively, so that European English can contain expressions like a genial photographer meaning ‘a photographic genius’ or This is not actual meaning ‘This is not an issue at present’. These are distinctively Euro-English in the sense that they make perfect sense to other speakers of European languages but not much to speakers of other varieties of English. If a Euro-English that was more than English in lingua-franca situations were to develop, these usages would be badges of membership. It was words of this kind that Molin found most likely candidates for Euro-English status in her corpus.

The other lexical items that might characterise Euro-English (in this case including the English of the UK and Ireland, but excluding the other inner-circle countries) are a set of words in the BONFIRE NIGHT (known mainly to local people) and KANGAROO (widely known but referring to local phenomena) categories. The register of talking about Europe, and hence a potential Euro-English (for example Modiano 2009), includes loanwords from French like acquis communautaire and specialised terms like subsidiarity or Schengen land. Readers of EU publications could probably find hundreds of such specialised terms.

It is hard to see that European Englishes are likely to have shared common pragmatic characteristics that can be transferred into Euro-English; once again, shared features will be those characteristic of effective English in lingua-franca situations.

The EU faces a dilemma. Its current plurilingual policies do not seem to work and are being subverted by bottom-up use of English as a lingua franca. Seidlhofer (2010)
WORLD ENGLISHES recommends adopting English as an official lingua franca, but making it clear that this is neither British nor American English but English as a Lingua Franca, with some kind of central direction to ensure that this is indeed a neutral and 'denationalised' medium. This may well be the most practical way forward, though it would meet with enormous resistance from those who prefer a policy which recognises the nationalist role of the 23 languages, even if this becomes merely symbolic. But it is once again an attempt to impose a top-down politically-motivated policy against the perceptions of the majority of Europeans. Molin (2006) showed that, as in the case of China English, few Europeans showed much enthusiasm for the idea of a European variety of English, and most aimed at an inner-circle variety. Even if a lingua-franca-adapted English becomes the de facto European norm, it is not clear that a policy advocating it would be any more effective de jure than the current plurilingualism. And maybe that does not matter much. Maybe symbolic policies and pragmatic practices will be as effective in the EU as in outer-circle countries like India and Kenya.

Review questions
1. Where do the phonetic features of China English come from?
2. What problems might arise from China English lexis borrowed from or based on Chinese?
3. What common lexical features might European Englishes share?
4. Why is the concept of shared Euro-English phonetic features problematic?

6.5 How English might be affecting other languages

Focus questions
- What effect can a widely-used language have on others?
- What effect did French have on English in the Middle Ages?
- How was English affected by the use of Latin in education and religion?
- Why did Cornish and Manx die?

Many books have been written on the influence of English on other languages and we can only outline a few points here. Melander (2001) suggests three possibilities. First, English affects the code of other languages, above all their vocabulary. Second, whole populations might give up their own language and go over to English, as they have done in Wales, Scotland and Ireland (4.2.3.4). Third, languages might 'lose domains' – cease to be used for particular topic areas.

6.5.1 Effects on the code of other languages
The most obvious effect of English on other languages is borrowed lexis. The borrowing may be functional – in that terminology for new inventions or genres (like hip-hop) is borrowed along with the invention, for example – or merely fashionable, in that an English word is borrowed for a concept which is already adequately lexicalised in the borrowing language. Thus Melnyk (2002) observes that Russian and Ukrainian
have borrowed some computing words from English unchanged: upgrade, browser, email, while others are constructed from English roots and Russian affixes, like smailik from smile as a sign in e-mail, and others again appear to be Russian words with a new meaning, so that mylo ‘soup’, has acquired the meaning ‘email’. Capitalism has brought bizniz, coupon, voucher, broker and so on. Other borrowings into Russian/Ukrainian seem, however, to be due to fashion rather than function: cool, dance, or free love.

Since loanwords are often adapted to the phonology of the borrowing language, they can appear very unEnglish. This is striking in Japanese. Millet (1999) gives Wa puro ‘Word processor’, Apanō Apartment’, Choco ‘Chocolate’ and Pano kon ‘Personal computer’ as examples.

In some languages there are many ‘pseudo-loan’ – words that look English but do not correspond to any actual English item. The German for ‘mobile phone/cell phone’ is handy, there is a German word pullunder ‘undershirt’ based on English pullover and many languages have smoking ‘dinner-jacket/tuxedo’. Pseudo-loans seem particularly popular in Japanese, perhaps because the language has traditionally been open to borrowing, English has a high status and the language is not very well known, so that native-speaker norms have little currency. Examples are (see Millet 1999, Ishiwata 1986):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baacodo oyaji</td>
<td>A bald man who combs the few strands of hair that he does have to cover the maximum amount of head as possible looks like an old man (oyaji) with a ‘barcode’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sumaato</td>
<td>A ‘sumaato’ woman has a good figure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chenji-rebaa</td>
<td>To change gear, use the ‘change lever’, or gearshift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goo-shappu</td>
<td>traffic light</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting that sumaato and baacodo reflect a nonrhotic source and that sumaato must derive from Br (etc) E smart ‘well-dressed’ rather than US ‘clever’, showing that, even in Japan, influence has not only been from US varieties.

The borrowings above are at the level of content words or short phrases, but some borrowings show deeper influence from English. An unusual example of a borrowed infixing process is this utterance from a review on the most ‘serious’ Swedish radio channel: on my rd, utan Carmina fucking Burana. This would be best translated ‘a new era, without Carmina bloody Burana’ because foreign-language swearwords usually have an attenuated force. More typical ‘deep’ effects arise from words and constructions in the local language being influenced by English usage (grammatical calquing). People start to say in deutsch ‘in German’ instead of auf deutsch, il est une disgrâce on the model of it’s a disgrace and Fue por eso que lo hizo instead of Fue por eso por lo que hizo! It was for this reason that I did it’ (Touchot 1990:211). Practices in the EU can encourage this tendency because it is a requirement that legal documents in all languages have the same sentences in the same order. Since the original documents are nearly always written in English or French, the requirement forces speakers of other languages to adopt the
sentence-lengths and rhetorical ordering typical of the English or French traditions (Trobsborg 1997).

Words in the mother tongue that are formally similar to English ones can be influenced in their meaning – an effect called 'loan shift'. Truchot (1990:209) cites *régulier* representing AmE *regular* (French *normal*) in fast-food shops, unidiomatic uses of general terms like *système* and *nécessiter* in the IT domain and uses of the passive that are new to French.

Loanwords, foreign terms in advertising and, to a lesser extent, syntactic and semantic influence, are common in many languages, but code-switching of the type seen in many outer-circle countries is much less so. Occasional English functional phrases – *okay*, *bye-bye*, *so what* and so on have often been borrowed, but switching from language to language in mid-sentence is rather uncommon. This is true even in communities where English proficiency is high (Sharp 2001).

**6.5.2 Language switch**

Languages are dying out all over the world as, domain by domain, their speakers go over to languages perceived as more powerful or useful. In the inner and outer circles it is often English or pidgin they go over to. Welsh and Gaelic speakers, Native Americans, Australian Aborigines and Maoris have switched to English. Speakers of 'small' languages in South-east Nigeria and New Guinea are certainly going over to Pidgin, and there must be many other cases. It is not obvious, however, that a language shift to English is happening or is likely to happen in the expanding circle, where the local official language is usually essential for work and education, and English merely a desirable extra. Fears that people will give up speaking Thai or German, or even Danish or Slovenian, seem unrealistic (Melander 2001).

**6.5.3 Domain loss**

Domain loss, on the other hand, is quite likely, and seems to have happened in certain cases. The modern official languages of Europe and Asia have struggled to gain domains from classical languages like Latin, Arabic, Sanskrit and Chinese, and by the twentieth century many of them were usable in virtually all domains. But the pressures described earlier mean that there are many domains in which English competes with the official languages, and some (like medical research reporting) in which some official languages are no longer used. If official languages came to be used less and less in domains like education, law, business and politics, a process would have started which might actually lead to parents ceasing to speak their own language to their children because it seems useless, and thus to language switch. Governments which want to maintain their own language therefore have to be vigilant in limiting domain loss as far as possible.

**Review questions**

1. What are the three types of effect that English could have on other languages?
2. Which is the most obvious at present?
6.6 Implications for the choice of school variety

Focus question
- What variety of English should be taught in schools in the expanding circle?

In the context of globalisation, one could ask what kind of English should be taught by schools in the expanding circle. This is actually three questions: what exposure should we give the learners, what production model should we choose and what production target should we aim for? We need first to distinguish these three concepts. Exposure is what the English learners listen to or read. The model is above all the teacher’s usage, but also the tapes or written material they are supposed to imitate. (Whatever the school gives, pupils in many countries will be exposed to predominantly US English through the media.) The target is what we aim for pupils to learn and produce themselves. We might well want to expose learners to Shakespeare, but we will hardly set his language as a model for them to learn, still less expect them to actually produce Shakespearean English.

To answer the question we also have to consider the purpose of the English education. Is it for national use? (language education) – Are we teaching Vermonters to use English well in the US or Nigerians to use it well in Nigeria? Or for foreign language learning which has the aim of introducing children to a different culture and means of expression? Or for international language learning which has the aim of allowing the learners to communicate across cultures and language boundaries, perhaps especially in lingua franca situations? Or some combination of these?

In the expanding circle, it is increasingly considered that learners will need English to communicate with almost anyone in the global community, rather than merely learning it as a foreign language studied for personal development and cultural awareness. In this context one might aim at English as an International Language (Smith 1983) or English as a Lingua Franca (Seidlhofer 2003). Here the aim would be for students to have the maximum scope of proficiency (3.4.5). They should be able to understand as many accents and varieties as possible, so there would be wide exposure. The general model would be the effective international communicator, so it would be important to learn cross-cultural communication strategies. Learners would have to avoid culturally specific references and behaviours in their own speech and pragmatic behaviours.

The code taught for production would be whatever is most likely to be comprehensible to speakers of different varieties – probably the syntax of Standard English with the lexis of its American variety, omitting items like condominium and left field which are culturally specific (Modiano 1999a). For reception we would probably want to make learners aware of the major alternatives to American lexis. Above all we would seek to make them aware that there may be unexpected lexis and indeed usage on all levels, and give training in strategies to deal with it. The target for the accent would be merely that the key distinctions made in most varieties were maintained, as in the list produced by Jenkins (2000).
It is clear that, except with reference to accent, these recommendations apply to speakers of inner- and outer-circle varieties as well as to expanding circle learners, and we can expect that some training in International English or ELF would be part of the education of American, British, Nigerian and Indian young people as well as German, French and Japanese.

**Review questions**

1. Who would benefit from having Scottish Standard English as the target variety?
2. Who would benefit from having Spanish Standard English as the target variety?
since we malaysians r so into american english, we forgot whr actually our english came from. d language i mean. we were invaded by d brit-
ish b4 n until then we speak english d british way. well, we supposed 2. instead, we r influenced by d. american english bcoz of d movies, songs n all those mass media thingy. well, let me define snoggin. snogging is actually a british word 4 make out. seems familiar? well, american n us, we call it make out but in england they call it SNOG.

7.1 Cross-currents in attitudes to English in the world

Focus questions

● Is it a good thing that English has spread?
● Who is it good for?
● What attitudes need to be adopted to make it a good (or less bad) thing?

Inner-circle nonstandard varieties, outer-circle varieties, English in lingua-franca situ-
ations and the other phenomena discussed in this book are not merely neutral fields of study. Research interest in a particular area has often meant commitment to a par-
ticular view of desirable language policies, especially within education. At least World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca have been movements as well as fields of study, and there is a good deal of controversy between supporters of contrasting posi-
tions. Simplifying, one could think of these controversies in terms of six discourses or ideologies which we are calling standard-language ideology, World Englishes, Real English, Second Language Acquisition, Linguistic Imperialism and English as a Lin-
gua Franca.

The first (standard-language ideology) is not widely represented in the literature but extremely common in real life. It envisages languages as having a correct or best form typically spoken by the educated upper class of native speakers in the home of the language: the French of Paris, the German of Hanover, the Italian of Florence. English is essentially a language like any other, so that the ‘best’ is spoken by educated natives at Harvard or Oxford or perhaps Los Angeles. Associated with this may be the idea that the spread of English is basically a good thing because the world would be
simpler if everyone spoke the same language. Clearly nonstandard native varieties and still more non-native varieties are inferior because they deviate from the ‘best’ form of the language. This naïve discourse is often heard from native speakers in the inner circle, but it is widespread everywhere, for example in Japan and Korea (Takeshita 2009) where native speakers of English with or without appropriate qualifications are imported to provide young people with models and interlocutors, and where it has been suggested that English should be made official to replace the national languages.

Some native nonstandard varieties have long been given attention and some respect, but up to the 1960s this was mainly from a dialectology aimed primarily at making a record of traditional rural dialects, many of which were dying out in the course of the twentieth century.

The standard-language ideology has been under attack for some time. Two discourses were active in the 1960s in opposition to it. One was centred around the idea that what would later be called outer-circle varieties should be treated as valid and encouraged to be endonormative (Halliday et al. 1964). Through the work of Kachru and Smith in the 1980s this developed into the World Englishes position, arguing for teaching varieties independent of inner-circle culture and appropriate to the needs of local users. World Englishes focuses on and celebrates the differences between and individuality of varieties, as used on their home ground within a community of speakers.

The other development of the 1960s was what came to be called ‘Real English’ (Milroy and Milroy 1993, Milroy 1999), arguing that widely-used mainly urban non-standard varieties should be recognised in schools and other powerful institutions (alongside the teaching of Standard English norms). In the USA the emphasis was on respect for and school recognition of AAVE, which it was sometimes proposed should be called Ebonics (in recognition of its difference from Standard English). A branch of this line of thought later made use of improved recording and corpus analysis tools to provide better description of the spontaneous ‘real English’ (Carter and McCarthy 1997) of native-speaker conversation. Real English focuses on the actual spoken usage of inner-circle native speakers of all varieties and is critical of the status that is granted the minority of standard-language users and written grammar.

A critique of these positions that has had some support in the literature, but had little acceptance, might be regarded as a development of standard-language ideology. It argues that in fact in any country the standard language and the prestige accent are associated with power (Honey 1997) and worldwide it is Standard English with an American or RP accent that is ‘powerful’ in this way (Quirk 1990). To fail to teach these is to deprive learners of the power that might accrue to them from having the standard. Such an argument serves to maintain established power relations, although this does not mean that it outlines a bad strategy for an individual.

Another discourse – in fact a whole field of study – that developed in the 1970s was Second Language Acquisition. This is the scientific study of individuals’ language development in the course of learning a language. Since it did not focus on English, but on acquisition of any language, and was oriented to the learning individual, not a community, it had no reason not to take native-speaker competence in the standard
language as the goal of the learning process. SLA is interested in learning processes whatever the target, and has led to detailed study of the types of error that learners make – or the interlanguages (Selinker 1972) that they construct – on their way to a competence comparable to native speakers. Many features that characterise New Eng-lishes (5.2) and usage in lingua-franca environments (6.3) have their origin in learner interlanguage, but the concern of SLA is with individuals whose aim is to move towards greater accuracy and fluency, rather than with communities using particular varieties.

Nineteenth-century nationalism saw use of the vernacular as a national language as a natural situation and it has long been known to educationists that at least primary education is likely to be most effective if carried out in the mother tongue (Cummins 1981, 1986). In the 1990s these positions developed into a critique of the spread of English called Linguistic Imperialism (Phillipson 1992), arguing that the continued use of English in postcolonial situations was a result of deliberate policies by the imperial powers and that it maintained power in their hands and those of the English-speaking elites in the outer circle. English was an instrument to exclude and marginalise the weak and poor majority. A key notion here was the human right to speak, be educated and take part in the political process in one’s own language (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). As English became the lingua franca of the EU and of science, Philipson and his group extended their critique to the inequalities among languages and individuals created by this hegemony.

But the growth of English use in lingua-franca situations in the early years of the present century led to a discourse (Jenkins 2000, Seidlhofer 2001, Mauranen 2006) arguing that in such situations English would not be an instrument of hegemonic power if the actual communicative demands of lingua-franca situations were recognised and targeted by education systems. The problem is not English but ‘native-speakerism’, the association of English with inner-circle users. Inner-circle users should adapt to the lingua-franca situation rather than expecting other participants to adapt to them.

All the last five discourses agree in rejecting standard-language ideology, but their different emphases can lead to conflicts in values and socio-political or educational recommendations. Real English emphasises the value and importance of varieties that may not be internationally comprehensible and thus may come in conflict with English as a Lingua Franca which expects all participants in the situations it focuses on to meet a criterion of such comprehensibility. The same conflict may arise with World Eng-lishes, which focuses on difference and localisation while English as a Lingua Franca focuses on shared skills and forms (see Singapore and Cameroon in 5.1.4). Linguistic Imperialism often regards the varieties studied by World Englishes as impositions by (post) colonial powers and might denounce their speakers as members of a fairly small exploitative class without the interests of the majority at heart. World Englishes, and in particular English as a Lingua Franca, attach positive value to features which SLA describes negatively as errors because of its aim to study progress towards a linguistic norm. It is unfortunate if, for example, those interested in ELF suggest that it is not worth studying learner-language development or if researchers in second-language ac-
quisition mistake functional varieties for stages of acquisition. It is, therefore, in our
opinion, rather important to be aware of the difference in emphasis among writers. Students and researchers should not quote research with a different emphasis from their own as though there is only one possible emphasis in variety studies.

Review questions
1. Why might efforts to raise the status of nonstandard native varieties of English conflict with the ideals of the English as a Lingua Franca movement?
2. What criticism would Language Rights/Linguistic Imperialism proponents make of attempts to institutionalise Nigerian English as target in Nigerian schools?

7.2 What’s next?
No sweetie im gonna b a good girl n stay in! lol! well 1 got no feckin money spent it al in Liverpool 2day i realy shold of gone clubbin! lol!:)

n 2) got work in mornin need 2 get in2 shower! ;) l8a huni luv ya luv Suz xxxxx (There are two reasons why she is not going out: (1) she has no money, and (2) she has to work tomorrow.)

(message in British chatroom)

Focus questions
● How will English develop in the future?
● What factors will affect its development?

The varieties of English around the world are changing in form, in their environments of use, in their mutual relations and in their relations to other languages. In this section we try to summarise some of the processes we have seen at work in this book, and to speculate about the future.

We can identify three interrelated root causes of many of the developments we describe: US power, globalisation and information technology. US power in the domains of economics, politics, the military, science and academe generally and culture, especially entertainment, has been maintained at a very high level over the last 60 or more years, ensuring that English has become more and more widely known. Globalisation means that more and more activities which used to be carried on at a national or local level (business, academic publishing, politics, military cooperation and many others) are now carried on at an international level and require the use of link languages. The accompanying movement of people means that there are multilingual communities everywhere, often using English as a lingua franca. Information technology, email, chatrooms, social networking and so forth, increase international contact and these media make informal and unedited language publicly available (Crystal 2008). It has
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also meant that contact within communities is less restricted by geography – it is easy nowadays to be in better contact with people 5,000 kilometres away than those in the next street.

The overall changes in the environments in which English is used mean that the language is used more and more for practical purposes, often in situations where native speakers are absent or in a minority, so that native norms are less important. Lingua-franca situations include people with very varied norms and scopes of proficiency and so many interactions in English are between participants who use expanding-circle varieties with more or less proficiency. We could describe this as a process of internationalisation (or what Seidlhofer 2010 calls ‘denationalisation’) and destandardisation. Nonstandard, unedited English is becoming more and more visible.

In fact a number of new technologies, such as mobile phone text messages and online chat, make renewal and adaptation of the language code almost inevitable, although specific forms may be a teenage fad, of which only a few become established. Text and chatroom messages are full of abbreviations, some international like l8 ‘late’ and 2 ‘two, to, too’, some probably local or individual like British moz, sqz ‘tomorrow’, ‘sorry’.

In this chapter’s motto l8a ‘later’ seems to represent a local nonrhotic pronunciation and feckin ‘fucking’ may represent a northern English pronunciation of STRUT with [ə] (4.1.5.1). In other environments l8r and fuckin are more common.

Correspondingly, the hierarchy of the standard varieties is tending to break down – if no one cares whether they are writing or speaking Standard English they are not likely to care much if they are using a British or Indian variety. Of course people still see and hear more edited and standardised US English than other kinds, and they still in general attach prestige to it, but the trend is towards more variety, less standardisation, and more lingua-franca English, and so to some actual reduction of the authority of the inner-circle native speaker, along the lines often called for by writers quoted in this book. Real English on a national level and International English/World Englishes on an international one have been so influential that the power to be derived from using standard Centre varieties has probably declined somewhat. BBC World Service radio, once the preserve of RP speakers, now makes use of speakers with a wide variety of international accents, and the markedly ‘Centre’-oriented international TV news channels BBC and CNN do something similar. How far this is a cosmetic surface on surviving linguistic power relations is unclear. But we noted EU interpreters predominantly listening to non-native English, ASEAN politicians communicating in South-East Asian-coloured English, Africans watching films in Igbo-influenced Nigerian English, and it is hard not to think that there is a genuine shift.

If this trend continues, it could affect the code and lead to simplification and elimination of what Trudgill (2002:92) calls ‘afunctional grammatical categories’. at least in lingua-franca usage. On the other hand, as Graddol (1997) points out, the main agency for spreading English is the school and until now this has usually supported Standard English and resisted simplification and variety. The school might have a different effect if proposals for a codified ‘lingua franca’ English become influential.

The success of Real English and World Englishes mean that the various local and ethnic norms are more free to develop independently of one another. However, the
continuing power of the USA (and media availability of US English) means that US varieties have more prestige than others and exercise an influence on all other varieties. The amount of that influence depends on many factors, but it is clearly related to the extent to which the variety sets its own norm. US influence seems to be greater on expanding-circle English, which can simply switch standards from Britain to the USA, than on outer-circle and inner-circle varieties. However, since in general speakers of outer-circle varieties are ambiguous about the status of the local norm, they are more likely to adopt high-prestige outside variables than speakers of inner-circle varieties. All through Chapter 5 we noted comments from outer-circle countries with British-type varieties that American pronunciation and vocabulary were being heard more, though not yet predominantly.

The process of Americanisation is least obvious in the inner circle. Trudgill (2002:149) points out that inner-circle accents are actually diverging from one another rather than converging (4.1.5.1): the /æ/ phoneme in TRAP words is being lowered in southern England at the same time as it is being raised in the USA and the southern hemisphere; the /e/ phoneme in DRESS words is being raised and tensed in New Zealand, but it is being centred in the northern USA; and /æ/ in STRUT is being fronted in the south of England while it is being backed in the northern USA. As we noted in Chapter 4, such divergent tendencies appear in the pronunciation of English not only among but also within the larger inner-circle countries. Nevertheless, at the level of lexis Americanisation is proceeding quite steadily: In New Zealand, for example, US forms like hood, pants, movie, truck are rapidly replacing their British equivalents (Meyerhoff and Niedzelski 2003). A similar process can sometimes be observed in syntax. Studies of the ‘new quotatives’ seen in ‘She was like ‘OK’ ‘She said OK’ show that they have spread very widely and rapidly from the US (Tagliamonte and Hudson 1999), and, crucially, that they are not perceived as particularly American, just new (Buchstaller 2006).

The three factors – US power, internationalisation and information technology – will also have effects on the relationships between English and other languages. Continuing American predominance is likely to mean continuing borrowing of lexical items and other types of influence on the codes of other languages. Internationalisation is likely to encourage the use of link languages, which will not always be English. Graddol (1997) suggests that Chinese, Malay/Indonesian, Hindi/Urdu, Arabic, Russian and Spanish have the potential to be local link languages supplementing rather than replacing English. But English is likely to continue to displace French and German in this type of role. Computing and the internet will have complex effects on the ‘ecology of languages’. In so far as chatrooms and email are sites of international and intercontinental interaction they are likely to use English and to contribute to the extension of its domains. But the system is increasingly language-neutral and provides cheap opportunities for publication and communication in any language. The proportion of pages which are in English has declined steadily since the internet was initiated. Many chatrooms are bilingual and full of code-switching, like those quoted in 5.5.3 and 5.5.4. So electronic communication is not in itself an agency that supports the spread of English, and it may even be supportive of minority
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languages. But the other two factors support the spread of English (and other link
languages).

Wide use of English is a natural consequence of the way the world is now. At
present it benefits inner-circle countries in many ways. It helps them spread their
conscious or unconscious ideologies, and offers opportunities for their education
systems, publishers, entertainment industries, newspapers and magazines to exploit
wider markets. This process may well be damaging to the survival and scope of other
languages, as we noted in Chapter 6, but it is probably not realistic to expect the USA,
Britain and Australia to act to hinder something which is so advantageous to them.

Graddol (2006) suggests that this advantage to inner-circle countries is tem-
porary. Soon, he thinks, everyone will learn English at primary school along with
arithmetic and basic literacy. Then everyone who is educated will know English and
native speakers will have no advantage any more. Inner-circle speakers will in fact be at
a disadvantage because they will be the ones who only know English, while others will
be bilingual or multilingual and have more to offer.

In our view this may expect too much expertise of teachers and underestimate
the advantages that come from very early and very extensive exposure to a language
in all functions. Native speakers of a language are more accurate than others only
by definition, because accuracy is being native-like. Resetting the definition of ac-
curacy, as English as a Lingua Franca seeks to do, can mitigate this advantage. But
native speakers, that is those with extensive early experience, also have more au-
tomatised language and are therefore faster in such tasks as reading (McMillion and
Shaw 2009), prepared speech (Hincks 2010) and composition. The comparisons in
Hincks (2010) and McMillion and Shaw (2009) make use of Swedes, who already
live in the kind of bilingual environment Graddol envisages, so native-speaker advan-
tage may be slower to evaporate than Graddol anticipates, though many outer-circle
multilingual speakers may already have the type of exposure that entitles them to be
called native speakers.

Many people think that governments have to strive to manage language use in their
own countries so as to maintain linguistic diversity and the vitality of their own lan-
guages. This is certainly a strong tenet of what we have called Linguistic Imperialism
but might also be called Language Rights. Some countries, even small ones like Ice-
land, are remarkably successful in this type of policy, but English is so popular and so
much in demand worldwide, that many democratic systems do not seem to be able to
do more than tinker at the margins. One effect of globalisation is to weaken national
governments and make it more difficult for them to carry out language policies that
resist its trends. Furthermore, we have seen that in many outer-circle environments use
of English actually favours the groups who constitute the government.

Others think that government action is required to make sure that as English spreads
it is an open resource and not one associated with the US and Britain. This requires
educational policies that change attitudes, and requires politicians who understand the
arguments of language specialists like those in the World Englishes and English as a
Lingua Franca camps. It is not clear that this kind of shift will happen as long as the
US retains its political and military dominance.
Review questions
1. Which three factors are claimed as crucial for the way English will change?
2. Which aspect of American English seems least likely to spread?
Glossary of linguistic terms

The terms listed below are marked in bold print in the actual text when they first occur. The number following the term refers to the section/chapter of the first occurrence.

AAVE, Afro-American Vernacular English (3.4.1.4) Formerly 'Black Vernacular English', cf. further 4.5.4.1.

accent (3.1.2) The pronunciation of a language variety.

accommodation (3.1.1) The process by which a speaker comes to use pronunciation, grammar, or lexicon more like those of his/her interlocutor.

acrolect (3.4.1) The variety of a language which, of a series of varieties spoken predominantly at different social levels, has the highest prestige or is closest to a standard form (especially with reference to creoles).

agglutinative (5.4.1.1) Languages have words composed of many bound morphemes whose form and meaning are relatively fixed and independent of the stem they are attached to.

agreement (3.4.1.1) The syntactic relation between words and phrases which are compatible, in a given construction, by virtue of inflections carried by at least one of them, e.g. these examples, they are.

Aitken's Law (4.3.3.2, where it is defined, explained and exemplified; also known as SVLR).

allophone (3.2.2) One of two or more alternative realisations of a phoneme, e.g. clear and dark l in RP.

apico-alveolar (3.2.2) Sounds are formed by the tip of the tongue and the alveoli, e.g. types of [s] and [r].

approximants (3.2.2) A speech sound with the function of a consonant but with vowel-like articulation, e.g. English [w], [j].

articulatory setting (3.2.2) A permanent property of a speaker's articulation, typical of the individual speaker or of a speech community, e.g. nasalisation.

aspirated (5.3.1.1) Refers to stops, whose release is followed audibly by a short period in which the vocal cords are not vibrating.

attrition (4.1.2.1), see lexical attrition.

autonomous (3.1.2) Language varieties are independent with respect to other varieties (cf. heteronomous).

BACKBENCHER (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, partial tautonyms where the local meaning could be used anywhere but also has a special sense in a variety, not lexicalised in others.

BAR (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, partial tautonyms where one meaning of a form is shared among varieties while another is exclusively local.

basilect (3.4.1) The opposite of acrolect, i.e. the variety of a language which has the lowest prestige and is most distant from a standard form.

BONFIRE NIGHT (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, foreignisms, i.e. the names of institutions, artefacts, etc., which are unique to a region.
borrowing  (1) The adoption of a linguistic form or construction from another language or dialect.

calque  (3.2.4.1) A word or expression which has been formed by translation of a corresponding word or expression in another language (cf. loan-translation).

Canadian raising  (4.6.4), where it is defined and exemplified.

centring  (3.2.2) Refers to a diphthong moving in the direction of [ə].

chain shift  (4.6.3) A series of two or more sound changes, by which sound a > sound b, sound b > sound c, and so on.

checked  (4.2.3) Vowels that do not occur in a stressed syllable with no final consonants, e.g. the short vowels in RP and most other accents of English.

CHIPS  (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, words which are both heteronyms and tautonyms.

clefting  (4.2.3.2) A syntactic construction of the type It is a good night’s sleep that you need, cf. pseudo-clefting.

clipping  (4.7.3.3) Process of word-formation in which an existing form is abbreviated.

close  (4.1.5.1) Vowel produced with the body of the tongue close to the roof of the mouth.

closing diphthong  (4.8.2) One which changes from relatively open to relatively close, as in bow.

cluster  (3.2.2) A sequence of adjacent consonants.

Cockney  (3.2.2) The traditional, influential accent/dialect connected with London’s East End, as spoken, for example, by Eliza Doolittle in G.B. Shaw’s Pygmalion.

code-mixing  (5.5.5.4) A form of code-switching, usually referring to speakers switching at frequent intervals from one language/dialect to another, for no discoverable external reason.

code-switching  (5.5.5.4) Switching in speech between different languages or dialects, e.g. depending on situation or topic.

codified, codification  (1) In linguistics, codified (codification) refers to the process of standardising and developing a norm for a language, e.g. by setting up official rules for grammar, orthography, pronunciation, syntax and vocabulary as well as publishing grammar books and dictionaries.

coining  (3.2.4.1) The formation or creation of a new word or phrase.

complex tenses  (5.4.3.3) Consist of at least two verb forms and are formed with auxiliary verbs, e.g. the perfect as in I have seen.

compounding  (3.2.4.1) Word-formation process using free morphemes as building elements, as in textbook.

concord  (5.4.3.3) Agreement of a verb with its subject as in I am, you are or I eat, do eat.

continuum  (4.1.2.2) Two or more varieties of language in the same regional area without a definable boundary.

conversion  (3.2.4.1) Word-formation type which changes/extends the word-class membership of a word without any formal marking, e.g. to mushroom.

copula deletion  (4.6.6.2) A form of the verb to be is absent.

count  (5.1.2.3) These nouns can be singular or plural and used with numerals, like one house, two houses (cf. noncount).
creole (3.2.1.1) A pidgin which has acquired native speakers and has expanded in structure and vocabulary to express the range of meanings and serve the range of functions required of a first language.

crore (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, a unique local word representing a concept which could exist in any variety but has not been lexicalised in all.
decreolisation (5.2) The process by which a creole language becomes more like its lexifier in pronunciation, syntax and lexis.
derivation (3.2.4.1) The formation of a new word from another word or stem. It typically occurs by the addition of an affix.
dispersities (3.2.2) In phonetic transcription: small added marks that can be used to distinguish different values of a symbol (cf. the IPA chart).
dialect (3.1.2, where definitions are provided)
diffusion (3.4.1.1) The gradual spread of words, sound changes, etc. from one person or community to another.
diglossia (diglossic) (4.3.2.1) The case in which a community uses two distinct forms of the same language in different contexts.
discourse marker (4.6.3) Any of a variety of units whose function is within a larger discourse rather than an individual sentence or clause, such as in Well, why don't you do something about it?
ditransitive (5.1.2.1) These verbs have both a direct and an indirect object, as in give the boy a present.
domain (3.1.2) A definable context of life in a society.
double or multiple negation (4.1.5.2) Nonstandard (in English) construction in which a single negation is marked by two elements, each of which can indicate it independently, e.g. I don’t know nothing.
dynamic (5.3.2.3) These verbs can have simple or progressive aspect like they work, they are working (cf. stative).
Ebonics (4.5.4.1 where it is clarified in connection with AAVE).
EFL (English as a Foreign Language) (2) English learnt in one’s native environment (e.g. France) for a context where most of the interlocutors (q.v.) will be members of a particular inner- (or outer-) circle speech community (e.g. Britain).
ELF (English as a Lingua Franca) (2) English used in or learnt for a context where most of the interlocutors (q.v.) will be non-native users with a range of cultural backgrounds.
domestic (3.1.1) ‘Originating inside’, of change whose origin lies within the community whose speech is changing (cf. exogenous).
dematiorative (3.1.3) Refers to a situation in a speech community where local norms are accepted (stage 4 in Schneider’s ‘dynamic model’; cf. exonormative).
epenthetic vowel (3.2.2) Is a term for the insertion of a vowel between two consonants, e.g. ‘thin’ in Irish English.
ESL (English as a Second Language) (2) (a) English used in or learnt for an outer-circle context. (b) English learnt in a foreign environment (e.g. by immigrants) for a context where most of the interlocutors (q.v.) will be members of a particular inner- (or outer-) circle speech community (e.g. Britain).
Estuary English (4.1.4) A somewhat vaguely defined, popular term for a variety typical of the lower Thames valley, with phonetic features intermediate between RP and Cockney.

exogenous (3.1.1) 'Originating outside', of change whose origin lies outside a community under investigation (cf. endogenous).

exonormative (3.3) Refers to a situation in a speech community when the linguistic norms are set from outside, e.g. by the 'mother country' (stage 2 in Schneider's 'dynamic model'; cf. endonormative).

expanding (4.7.3.3) In word-formation: the opposite of clipping.

expletive (4.2.3.2) Refers to 'padding', i.e. dummies or prop words which add nothing to the sense.

extra-linguistic (3.1.2) 'Not part of the language system'.

first language (L1) (2) The language someone acquires first, usually ≡ 'native language', 'mother tongue'.

folk etymology (4.6.3.4) Popular etymology, not based on factual knowledge and research.

dialectal etymology (4.1.1) Refers to popular beliefs about language, e.g. 'home-made' etymologies.

foreign language learning (6.6)

dialects (1.2.4.2) Names of institutions, natural organisms, artefacts, etc., which are unique to the region in question.

fricative (1) Speech sound articulated in such a way that the air-flow is led through a narrow passage where the air gives rise to audible friction.

fronting (4.2.3) (syntax) A syntactic process by which elements are moved to a marked position at the beginning of a sentence, e.g. That term I don't understand.

fudged (4.6.1.2) A term for a vowel that has an intermediate quality, for example [ŋ], between two distinctive 'norms', such as FOOT-STRUT.

GA (General American) (1.2.2) An American accent without marked regional characteristics.

General English (3.2.4.1) Refers to nonlocal vocabulary shared by virtually all varieties of English.

glottal (3.2.2, defined and exemplified)

habitual (4.4.3.2) Verb forms indicating that something is done or happens consistently.

H dropping (4.1.5.1) Absence of initial /h/, e.g. 'ney for 'Henry', stereotypically connected with traditional Cockney but also found in other social and regional accents in England and even in transported accents as in Newfoundland.

heteronomous (3.1.2) A language variety is heteronomous if it is perceived as a variety of another, 'superposed' on it, e.g. Yorkshire dialect in relation to Standard English English (cf. autonomous).

heteronyms (3.2.4.2) Local words for generally available concepts, i.e. words with the same meaning, used by different speakers or in different dialects.

homophones (4.2.1) Words have different meanings and spelling but identical pronunciation, e.g. we and aye.
HRT (high rise terminal) (3.2.2) A particular type of rising statement intonation used in what are traditionally falling-tone accents.

Hybrid (3.2.4.1) A hybrid word is formed from elements derived from different languages.

Hypercorrect (4.1.5.1) The use of an incorrect form by a speaker trying to avoid a stigmatized one, e.g. happle for ‘apple’ (related to H dropping).

Informant (4.1.5.2) Person acting as a source of linguistic data, e.g. in dialect studies.

Interlocutor (3.4.5.2) A partner in a conversation, or the person someone is speaking to.

Intovocalic (3.2.2) Appearing between vowels, e.g. [t] in litter.

Intralingual (3.2.4.1) Relating to a single language, ‘within a language’.

Intratational (3.4.1.4) Occurring or existing within a single nation.

Intrusive /r/ (4.1.5.1) In nonrhotic accents: the insertion of /r/ between two vowels when there is no <r> in the spelling (cf. linking r).

Invariant be (4.5.6.2) The generalized use of the form be in some varieties, notably AAVE, often expressing habitual action.

Invariant tags (3.2.1) Are characterised by a fixed form of the tag (e.g. is it?, are?), in contrast with variant tags.

Inversion (4.1.2.1) Reversal of the order of subjects and auxiliary to make a question as in She can go/Can she go?

Irrealis (4.11.6) This refers to an event that is just possible or imaginable.

Kangaroo (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, words with a General English name for a nonuniversal item or concept.

Keywords (3.2.2, referring to Wells’ lexical sets)

L vocalisation, (4.1.5.1) A characteristic feature whereby the ‘dark’ allophone of /l/ becomes a vowel of the [o] or [u] type.

Language (3.1.2, where it is contrasted with dialect)

Language education (6.6)

Lax (5.2.1.1) Vowels are shorter and more centralised than their tense counterparts. In English /æ/ and /ɑ:/ are lax.

Lectal (5.1) This is variation on the axis acrolect–basilect, that is usually also formal–casual.

Levelling (4.1.2) Dialect levelling is the process whereby local varieties of speech are losing their distinctive features.

Lexical attrition (4.1.5.2) Loss of vocabulary, with special reference to traditional dialects.

Lexical-distributional (3.1.2) Refers to the distribution of phonemes over the vocabulary which may differ between accents, e.g. /æ/ and /ɑ:/ in RP and GA.

Linguistic variable (3.2.6) Any variable investigated by sociolinguists in the tradition of Labov, e.g. [tʃ] – [ʃ] variation in words such as working.

Linking /r/ (4.5.6.1) In nonrhotic accents: the use of /r/ between two vowels, as in clear out (cf. intrusive /r/).

Loan-translation (3.2.4.1) Word created through direct translation of the morphemes in a word in another language, e.g. superman from German Übermensch (cf. esque).
**loanword** (1) Word taken over from another language or dialect.

**localisms** (3.2.4.2) Words whose form and meaning are both unique to a particular variety.

**mandative** (4.8.1.1) This indicates that something is required or requested.

**marked** (5.2.2.1) Features of a language are less frequent and more noticeable or characteristic than unmarked ones. *He thought* is marked for past, *he thinks* is unmarked.

**merger** (3.2.2) An instance of two speech sounds becoming identical as the result of a sound change, e.g. the recent lack of distinction between words such as spear and spare in NZE.

**mesolect** (3.4.1) Variety of a language intermediate between an acrolect and a basilect.

**minimal pair** (3.2.2) A pair of words differing only in one phoneme, e.g. *bed* and *bad*.

**mixing** (5.5.5.4) cf. code-mixing.

**MOB** (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, partial tautonyms which are also heteronyms, e.g. New Zealand mob which refers both (as in General English) to a mob of people and (uniquely in New Zealand) to a flock of sheep.

**monophthongal** (4.1.5.1) These vowels are 'pure', i.e. there is no tongue movement as in diphthongs.

**monotransitive** (5.3.2.3) These verbs have only a direct or indirect object, as in *make a cake*.

**narrow (allophonic) phonetic transcription** (3.2.2) A representation in phonetic symbols which is detailed down to the level at which features can be distinguished. Transcriptions in dictionaries, for example, are usually phonemic or 'broad' rather than phonetic.

**nationalist** (3.4.4) A function (as a symbol of national identity).

**nationist** (3.4.4) A function (as a practical means of communication in administration, for example).

**New Englishes** (2) A somewhat controversial term referring to outer-circle varieties.

**noncount** (5.3.2.3) These nouns are normally singular and cannot be used with numerals, like *furniture, two pieces of furniture*.

**nonprevocalic /r/** (3.2.2) This refers to */r/* in final position or before a consonant as in *four, work*.

**nonsyllabic** (3.2.2) These accents are characterised by the absence of nonprevocalic */r/*.

**orthography** (3.2.1.1) The standard writing system, i.e. ‘ordinary spelling’, of a language.

**overt and covert prestige** (3.4.1.4) (Labov 1972) ‘Overt’ or ‘open’ prestige is basically that of the standard variety in a community, as propagated in teaching, for example, whereas ‘covert’ or ‘hidden’ prestige tends to be not publicly recognised but related to positive attitudes to nonstandard speech varieties.

**paralanguage** (5.2.6) Actions which accompany or complement language such as head movements, or gestures.
patwa (3.2.1.1) From French patois 'dialect, nonstandard language' usually refers to Jamaican creole, but is also used about other Caribbean varieties.

p-Celtic (4.2) A branch of Celtic languages (Welsh, Breton, Cornish) so called from a sound change by which Indo-European *kʷ* became p.

phoneme (3.2.2) The smallest unit of a language that can be used to contrast utterances with different meanings.

phonemic inventory (3.2.2) The set-up of distinctive units in a variety.

phonotactic (3.2.2) These rules specify the phoneme combinations that a language permits.

pidgin (3.2.1.1) A simplified form of speech developed as a medium of trade, or through other extended but limited contact, between groups of people who have no other language in common.

prescriptive, prescription (3.4.1.3) Rules which aim to 'prescribe' what is judged to be correct rather than to 'describe' actual usage.

prosody (3.2.2) A cover term for suprasegmental features such as stress, pitch, and intonation.

proxemics (5.2.6) Culturally determined habits of standing close to or further away from interlocutors and their meanings.

pseudo-clfing (4.2.1.2) A syntactic construction of the type What you need is a good night's sleep, which can be used to mark the part of a clause that expresses new information.

q-Celtic (4.2) A branch of Celtic languages (Irish, Scottish Gaelic) that did not undergo the change described for p-Celtic (cf. above).

duplication (4.7.1.4) A morphological process by which all or part of a form is repeated.

reference accents (3.2.2) Well-known and well-described accents which are instructive in the comparison of accents worldwide. In this book, the reference accents are RP and GA.

register (4.11.4) A set of features of speech and writing characteristic of a particular type of linguistic activity or a particular group when engaging in it.

retroflex (3.2.2) Sounds that are pronounced with the tip of the tongue turned back and in contact with the roof of the mouth.

rhetic, rhoticity (3.2.2) Rhotic accents, such as CanE, Scots and traditional West Country dialects, retain 'historical /r/' (as seen in the spelling), including non-prevocalic /r/ as in bar, work.

ROBIN (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, tautonyms which unambiguously refer to different (local) things in different varieties. These are not particularly common, and the examples seem to be mostly transfers of species names.

RP (Received Pronunciation) (3.2.2) A nonregional accent regarded as the EngE standard accent, updated and documented in the Longman Pronunciation Dictionary (Wells 2008).

schwa (3.2.2) The unstressed mid central vowel. The last vowel in COMMA is often a schwa.

segment (3.2.2, where it is defined)

SLA (second language acquisition) (2). The individual process (or the study of the process) of learning a new language.
slit fricative (4.4.3.1) A fricative sound in which air flows through a wide slit rather than a narrow channel.
sociolinguistics (3.1.1) The study of language use in society.
speech communities (4.1.1) Groups of people who, in contact with one another, speak in similar ways, and agree on what is a normal way to express things.
spelling pronunciation (5.4.1.1) Pronunciation based on the spelling, as in yacht pronounced /jækt/.
split (4.1.5.1) A historical process whereby one phoneme becomes two.
standard lexical sets (3.2.2) (Wells 1982) Sets of words which typically all have the same vowel in different varieties, however it is pronounced.
stative (5.3.2.3) These verbs can only have simple aspect like they contain, * they are containing, cf. dynamic.
stigmatised (4.1.5.1) These usages are those which are regarded as 'bad' or 'uneducated'. Children are typically taught not to use stigmatised forms.
stress-timed (3.2.2) Languages assign roughly equal time from one stress to the next, irrespective of the number of syllables involved.
stylistic value (5.3.2.5) The way a word or expression signals formal or informal style. Get might have a less formal stylistic value than acquire.
substratal (4.2.2.2) See substratum.
substratum (1) A language spoken by some population which has influenced the way in which they speak the language of a group by which they were dominated.
suprasegmental (3.2.2) These features are pronunciation features like stress and intonation that cover more than one segment.
SVLR, see Aitken’s Law.
syllable-timed (3.2.2) These languages assign roughly equal time to each syllable.
tag questions (3.2.3) Short additions to declarative sentences, often repeating the auxiliary (you didn’t do it, did you?).
tapped (3.2.2, defined and exemplified)
tautonyms (3.2.4.2) According to Görlach (1995a), are words which occur with the same form in different varieties but have different meanings.
tense (5.2.2.1) These vowels are longer and less centralised than their lax counterparts. In English /i:/ and /u:/ are tense.
tensing (4.1.5.1) The process by which a vowel becomes more tense /t/ becomes /s/.
Th stopping (4.11.5, where it is defined and exemplified)
THUMB TACK (3.2.4.2) Our term for, and exemplifies, words specific to a particular variety with exact equivalents in other varieties because they refer to a widespread item or concept (British drawing pin in this case).
tone languages (5.4.1.1, where it is defined and exemplified)
topicalisation (5.3.2.1) The process by which a sentence constituent is made the topic of a sentence, that is moved towards the beginning. *Beef I like it* shows topicalisation of *beef* relative to *I like beef*.

transliteration (6.4.2) Writing words in a different system, as in Greek or Chinese written in roman letters.

twirled (3.2.2, defined and exemplified)

twang (4.7.3.2) A popular, non-linguistic word for nasal voice quality.

typological (4.1.1) These differences are differences of syntax, morphology or pronunciation, as opposed to lexical differences. A typological classification is opposed to a historical one.

unmarked (5.2.2.1) Features of a language are more frequent and less noticeable or characteristic than marked ones. Progressive aspect is marked relative to simple aspect.

uvular (3.2.2) Stops, fricatives or approximants are made by bringing the back of the tongue close to the uvula.

variant tags (3.2.3) Characterised by different forms in the tags and the preceding clause as in *You didn’t see him, did you?* (cf. invariant tags).

variety (3.1.2) Speech communities which have distinctly different patterns of pronunciation and lexis but broadly similar syntax are said in English studies to speak varieties of the same dialect.

vernacular (4.1.5.2) A language variety regularly used in the community but not standardised.

vocative (4.4.3.1) A form used in calling someone or getting their attention, found, for example in Latin and Celtic languages.

voice quality (3.2.2) The general quality of speech (individually and culturally determined) rather than the characteristics of individual phonemes, characterised by features like the tenseness of the speech organs, the amount of breath that escapes through 'closed' vocal cords, the normal setting of pitch, etc.

wide (3.2.2) These diphthongs are those which involve a relatively large movement of the tongue. /aː/ is wider than /e/.

Yod dropping (4.1.5.1) The pronunciation of words that originally had /ju/ without /j/, as in *news* or *beauty* without /j/.
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