In his important new study, Rajend Mesthrie examines the rise of a new variety of English among Indian migrant workers indentured on the plantations of Natal in South Africa, and among their descendants. Considering the historical background to, and linguistic consequences of, language shift in an immigrant context, he draws significant parallels between second-language acquisition and the processes of pidginisation and creolisation. In particular, he analyses universals of second-language acquisition and the role of transfer from the Indic and Dravidian substrate languages.

*English in language shift* observes the acquisition of language in its social setting, often outside the classroom. Its linguistic focus is on the distinctive syntax of South African Indian English, with respect to word order and clause structures; and it contains descriptions of lexis, phonetics and morphology in terms of social variation. South African Indian English is compared with other dialects within South Africa, with English in India and with Englishes generally.
English in language shift
English in language shift

The history, structure and sociolinguistics of South African Indian English

RAJEND MESTHRIE
Department of Linguistics, University of Cape Town

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521415149

© Cambridge University Press 1992

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1992
This digitally printed first paperback version 2006

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Mesthrie, Rajend.
English in language shift: the history, structure and
sociolinguistics of South African Indian English / Rajend Mesthrie.
   p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. East Indians — South Africa — Language (New words, slang, etc.)
2. English language — Social aspects — South Africa. 3. English
language — South Africa — History. 4. Languages in contact — Africa,
South. I. Title.
PE3451.M47 1992
420'.89'91411068 — dc20 91-39742 CIP

ISBN-10 0-521-41514-4 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-02649-0 paperback
For the family at 25 Jane Avenue: Panini, Platini, Billu, Ravi, and not forgetting Rekha and my wife, Uma
## Contents

*List of figures and maps*  
*List of tables*  
*Preface*  
*Acknowledgements*  
*List of abbreviations*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Historical background: the shaping of a New English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>'New’ Englishes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Indian immigration and indenture</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>English in the period of indenture (1860–1911)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>English in the post-indenture period</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Variation in SAIE: a first glimpse</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The gathering of data</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>The polylectal continuum</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Characteristics of the basilect</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Style-shifting between lects</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Pre-basilectal speakers</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Syntactic variation: the relative clause</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Relative clauses in English dialects</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Types of relative clauses in SAIE</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Proportions of relative-clause types</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>The social profile for relative clauses in SAIE</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Relative clauses by functional patterns</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Some acquisitional perspectives</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Comparison between lectal groups and R-groups</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Contents

3.9 Phylogenetic parallels 97
3.10 Conclusion 100

### 4 Word-order principles 101
4.1 Introduction 101
4.2 Parataxis 101
4.3 OV influences in a VO dialect 105
4.4 Topicalisation 110
4.5 Conclusion 127

### 5 Non-syntactic variation 128
5.1 Introduction 128
5.2 Morphology 128
5.3 Phonetic variation 136
5.4 Socio-lexical variation 141
5.5 SAIE and other varieties of South African English 149

### 6 Perspectives from second-language acquisition 152
6.1 Introduction 152
6.2 The view from language acquisition 152
6.3 Transfer in SAIE 154
6.4 Universals of SLA: negation 160
6.5 Parameter setting in SLA 167
6.6 Strategies of second-language learning 174

### 7 Perspectives from pidgin and creole studies 183
7.1 Pidginisation, creolisation, second-language acquisition 183
7.2 Pidginisation in the pre-basilect 186
7.3 The basilect as creoloid 191
7.4 A comparison with creole grammars 205
7.5 Analogies with decreolisation 210
7.6 Undeveloped themes, conclusions, prognoses 218

Appendix A  Comparison between SAIE sample and census data for Indians in Natal 222

Appendix B  Types of relative clauses used by individual speakers 224

Appendix C  Rank orders for relative clauses, topics and morphology 229
Contents

Notes  xi
Sources and references  233
Index  237

Index  248
Figures and maps

Figures
2.1 Present be + -ing by lectal group  
2.2 Past be + -ing by lectal group  
3.1 Types of relative clauses favoured by R-groups  
5.1 Twelve morphological variables in SAIE

Maps
1 Present-day India  
2 The languages of India  
3 Distribution of Indians in South Africa – 1936  
4 Distribution of Indians by magisterial districts of Natal – 1936
# Tables

1.1 A comparison of some background factors in three language-shift Englishes  
1.2 Indian languages in South Africa (1936)  
1.3 Asiatics in Natal with a command of spoken English, by age (1936)  
1.4 Asiatics in Natal with a command of spoken English, by age and gender (1936)  
1.5 Asiatics in Natal with a command of spoken English, by age and rural–urban domicile (1936)  
2.1 The SAIE sample, by region  
2.2 Size of the lectal groups in SAIE  
2.3 Absence of auxiliary inversion among twenty-four speakers in three types of questions  
2.4 Non-use of *do*-support in *wh*- and *yes–no* questions by twenty-four speakers  
2.5 Use of rhetorical questions by twenty-four speakers  
2.6 Non-phonological copula deletion by twelve speakers  
2.7 The functions of *be* + *-ing* in SAIE  
2.8 Use of *be* + *-ing* by twenty-four speakers  
2.9 Reduplication and phrasal repetition by twenty-four speakers  
2.10 Use of *only* as a focus marker by twenty-four speakers  
2.11 Use of modal *'d* by twenty-four speakers  
2.12 The use of four rephonologised items by twenty-four speakers  
2.13 Summary of the use of twelve features in SAIE  
2.14 Absence of auxiliary inversion in *yes – no* questions in the speech of interviewer and twenty-four interviewees  
2.15 Absence of auxiliary inversion in *wh*-questions in the speech of interviewer and twenty-four interviewees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Absence of do-support in yes–no questions in the speech of interviewer and</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>twenty-four interviewees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Absence of do-support in wh-questions in the speech of interviewer and</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>twenty-four interviewees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>A comparison between semi-speakers and pre-basilectal speakers in Natal</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Use of -ing in the pre-basilect</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>A comparison of deletions in the pre-basilect and basilect</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Frequency table for relative clauses in SAIE, by broad type</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Frequency table for standard and non-standard relative clauses in SAIE</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Percentages of speakers using standard and non-standard relative clauses</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Percentages of speakers per R-group for relative clauses</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and education</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and first and</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and social class</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and urban–rural</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and age in years</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Classification of relative clauses by speakers’ language background and</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language family associated with each type of relative clause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and home language</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Focussing and embedding in SAIE relative clauses</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Focussing and embedding in SAIE and by Scots children</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>The Keenan–Comrie hierarchy for SAIE relative clauses</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>The revised Keenan–Comrie hierarchy for SAIE relative-clauses</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Relative-clause types exhibited by four speakers</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Cross-classification of relative clauses by R-group source and broad</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relative-clause type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Cross-classification of speakers by impressionistic lectal group and</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>topicalisation strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Cross-classification between relative-clause usage and impression-based</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lectal groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Proportion of non-standard to standard relative clauses by embedding type</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Occurrence of <em>be/get/have</em> in relative clauses</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Relative frequencies of topic types in SAIE</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Syntactic and pragmatic mode</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Correlation between use of topics and relative clauses</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Comparison of topic range with relative-clause usage</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Twelve variable morphological features of SAIE</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Use of twelve non-standard forms</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Use of <em>should</em> and <em>childrens</em> by individual speakers</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>The social profile for the <em>should</em> and <em>childrens</em> variable</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>The social profile for SAIE morphology</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Correlations between rankings for three broad areas of variation</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Spearman rank correlations for three broad areas of variation</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Comparison of four morpho-syntactic groupings of speakers</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Retroflex <em>t</em> and <em>d</em> used by six SAIE speakers</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>Front short-vowel reflexes in SAIE, South African English and RP</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Initial <em>/h/</em> in SAIE, according to lectal groups</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>Use of <em>/h/</em> in SAIE, according to ancestral language</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Copula deletion in the present tense by ten speakers, according to ancestral language</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Use of focus <em>only</em> and <em>too</em> by ten speakers, according to ancestral language</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Comparison of five features of SAIE and substrate morphology</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Presence of subject pronouns and pleonastic subjects in SAIE, by lectal group</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Complementation patterns in the basilect</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>A comparison of SAIE usage with twelve features of creole grammars</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>A comparison of basilectal, standard and intermediate mesolectal forms</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the first study of the syntax of South African Indian English, as spoken in its natural home and neighbourhood surroundings. It is my belief that language study of this sort cannot be divorced from a historical and social context. Earlier studies of the dialect and prescriptive judgements by educators suffer in this regard. Unlike most earlier commentators, I do not believe that the dialect is deficient in any way. It is as systematic and logical as any other. If it has evolved many rules of its own, we must seek to understand the nature of these rules and establish the reason for their existence, rather than condemning them by some simplistic comparisons with the formal norms of upper-middle-class speech and writing. This work is both an attempt at understanding and a celebration of those rules, many of which turn out to co-exist in (new and old) English dialects all over the world.
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1

Historical background: the shaping of a New English

1.1 Introduction

South African Indian English (henceforth SAIE) spoken by about three-quarters of a million people, chiefly in the province of Natal, offers the linguist and sociologist an opportunity of examining the dynamics of language shift. This study will first focus on the means by which English has become established as the first language of this speech community, ousting in the process several ‘ancestral’ Indian languages. It is my chief aim, however, to examine the kind of variation that arises in such a situation, and the type of language acquisition involved. At the same time I will describe the more interesting features of the dialect and compare them with second-language varieties of English and (similar) former second languages turned first language.

1.2 ‘New’ Englishes

English as a dominant world language assumes a variety of forms in various parts of the globe, so much so that it has been for some time now problematic to speak of the English language. Sociologically speaking, it might make greater sense to think in terms of an ‘English language family’ – a cover term for a number of varieties with very different histories, functions and structural characteristics. As Kachru (1988) has indicated, many of the ‘sacred cows’ of English are untenable in the latter half of the twentieth century. It is now the property of the world at large, with the number of interactions in English amongst non-native speakers probably exceeding that amongst mother-tongue speakers, and between mother-tongue speakers and non-mother-tongue speakers.

The English language family comprises the following members:

(a) Colonial standards: This refers to the speech forms of educated people and the type of English used for broadcasting in England, the United
States, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada, the Caribbean and other areas where English is the native language of a sizeable part of the population. A basic division can be made between the English of England (English English henceforth) and the 'extraterritorial' English of the colonies. It should be noted that although the former is the most important member of the family in terms of its origin and historical influence over the others, US English continues to be a significant rival in the twentieth century. Gimson (1970: 88) estimates that more first-language users of English follow US rather than British norms. The term standard English is accordingly problematic, since there are now several national standards, and different norms for formal as against informal standards. In this study standard English will be used to refer to an idealised variety that takes on a coherent form in international writing (corresponding to Trudgill and Hannah's (1985) term, International English). This standard English is useful as a yardstick for comparing actual varieties in existence around the world, but the temptation to regard this as the only viable form of English, superior to the actually attested varieties, and unchanging in time, should be resisted.

(b) Regional dialects: These are best exemplified by the speech forms characteristic of particular regions in England (Wakelin 1977) and the United States (McDavid 1979). There is no reason to disallow the existence of regional dialects in the newer colonies, though being in existence for a considerably shorter period than British English, the differences are not as sharp nor as well known.

(c) Social dialects: These typically refer to variations within a region according to social class or ethnicity: for example, Cockney in London (Barltrop and Wolveridge 1980), Black English in the United States (Dillard 1972).

(d) Pidgin Englishes: These are simplified contact varieties with the defining characteristic of being no-one's native language: for example, West African Pidgin English (Todd 1984), and – up till recently – Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea (Todd 1984).

(e) Creole Englishes: These are speech forms based on a pidgin language, which have become the first language of a community and have in the process undergone linguistic expansion: for example, Jamaican Creole English (Le Page and De Camp 1960), Australian Creole English (Sandefur 1983).

(f) Second-language English: These are forms characteristic of second-language speakers of English that have arisen by contact with a large body of native speakers of English or via the education system in a
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country in which there is, or had once been, a sizeable number of native speakers of English. (We will henceforth use the abbreviations \( L1 \) for 'first language' and \( L2 \) for 'second language'.) Although \( L2 \) Englishes are not mother tongues of their speakers, they often play a significant role in certain domains of daily life. The designation 'L2' need not be taken literally – English learnt as a third or later language in life may also fall under this category. Crystal (1985: 8) gives an estimate of 1.3 billion \( L2 \)-English speakers as against 300 million \( L1 \) users – for example, English in Singapore (Platt and Weber 1980), Southern African Black English (Magura 1984).

(g) **Foreign Englishes**: These are varieties used in countries in which there has not been a large community of English speakers. Introduced via the educational system, English plays an international rather than intranational role in such countries. That is, English is used for communication with tourists or with representatives of other countries, but rarely between people from the same country: for example, English in Japan (Stanlaw 1983), English in Germany (Berns 1988).

(h) **Immigrant Englishes**: These are \( L2 \) varieties which develop in the context of migration to an English-dominant country. Their \( L2 \) status often changes within a generation or two, though special conditions like the intention to return to the homeland may run counter to this tendency. An immigrant English may become an \( L1 \) and merge with the dominant dialect of the country if conditions promoting assimilation exist: for example, Chicano English in the United States (Penfield and Ornstein-Galicia 1985), Panjabi English in Britain (Romaine 1989: 262–79).

(i) **Language-shift Englishes**: These are varieties that develop when English replaces the language of a community as the main (and often sole) language of daily interaction – for example, Hiberno-English (Barry 1982), Amerindian English (Flanigan 1987).

Before placing SAIE within this system, some discussion of the terminology used by current writers in the field is necessary, as the emphasis they place on specific criteria and certain groupings is quite significant.

Kachru (1983a: 2–3) has pointed out that the characterisation of varieties such as Indian English (i.e. the English of India) as \( L2 \)s does not do justice to their 'nativised' status. By 'nativisation' Kachru refers to the process of adaptation of English to a new environment – in the Indian subcontinent, for example, in both cultural and formal terms, English has
become closer to the sociocultural context of the subcontinent over time (see further 1.4.1.1; 5.4.1).

Kachru (1983b: 38–9) also distinguishes between institutionalised and performance varieties of second language. The former involve extended use in a range of functions in a country, and have consequently undergone a process of nativisation. Such varieties give rise to a nativised body of English literature, showing traces of the formal and contextual characteristics of the new variety of English. Performance varieties, on the other hand, are used in a relatively restricted functional range within a country – for tourism, international trade, commerce and for study as a foreign language. The distinction between institutionalised and performance varieties is essentially the same as that between L2 and foreign English that I have indicated above.¹

A term that has gained popularity is ‘New English’, which Platt, Weber and Ho (1984) use to designate an English variety with the following characteristics:

(a) It has developed through the education system (possibly even as a medium of education at a certain level), rather than as a first language of the home.

(b) It has developed in an area where a native variety of English was not spoken by a majority of the population.

(c) It is used for a range of functions (for example, letter-writing, government communications, literature, as a lingua franca within a country and in formal contexts).

(d) It has become nativised, by developing a subset of rules which mark it as different from American or British English.

Excluded from their designation New English are the ‘Newer Englishes’ of the British Isles (i.e. Scots and Celtic-influenced varieties like Hiberno-English); immigrant English; foreign English; pidgin and creole Englishes. Williams (1987) favours the term non-native institutionalised varieties of English for the group that Platt, Weber and Ho designate New Englishes.

Like Todd (1985), I would argue that the designation New English ought to be broadened somewhat to include varieties like the following:

(a) Amerindian English, which has developed in an area where (and when) native speakers of English were numerically strong (Flanigan 1987; Leap 1984).

(b) Black English in Zimbabwe and South Africa, where first-language varieties of English are still present and strongly influential, despite being used by a minority (Magura 1984).
Table 1.1 A comparison of some background factors in three language-shift Englishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>SAIE</th>
<th>Amerindian English</th>
<th>Welsh English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) (Former) immigrant status</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Several ancestral languages</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Colonial English – majority</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in country (at time of shift)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Substrate similarities with</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Other varieties of English in South Africa – Cape ‘Coloured’ English (Wood 1987) – for the same reasons.
(d) British Black English (Sutcliffe 1982)
(e) Maori-influenced English in New Zealand, and other varieties in Australia (Eagleson 1982).
(f) The ‘newer’ Celtic-influenced varieties in the British Isles (Barry 1982 on Hiberno-English; Romaine 1982a on Scots; Russ 1982 on Welsh English).

In this study, accordingly, New English will designate nativised L2 varieties (Platt, Weber and Ho’s New Englishes), as well as language-shift Englishes (Amerindian English, Hiberno- and other Englishes of Britain), and those immigrant Englishes which retain their distinctiveness within anglophone countries (for example, Pakistani English in Britain – Romaine 1989), Yiddish English in New York (Gold 1981).

SAIE is today a ‘language-shift English’; yet it could also be characterised as formerly an immigrant English, and then a nativised, L2 variety. As a language-shift English it might be expected to share similarities with British Isles varieties (like Welsh English) and New World varieties (for example, Amerindian English). However, there are significant differences within the set of language-shift Englishes in respect of background factors. Table 1.1 shows some differences between three such varieties (where + denotes ‘yes’; – ‘no’; and ? ‘possibly’).

Several factors make SAIE a complex example of a language-shift English: its development from an immigrants’ speech form with several substrate languages involved, amid a multilingual setting in which English was not the majority language. The setting has, in fact, more than passing resemblance to the situations in which pidgins and creoles develop, a theme which will be explored in chapters 2 and 7. I will first examine the historical background to the language shift that gave rise to SAIE, and reconstruct aspects of its early history as an L2 in Natal.
1.3 Indian immigration and indenture

Although South Africans of Indian descent reside in three of the country's four provinces, having been (il)legally excluded from the Orange Free State on racial grounds, the focus in this study will fall chiefly in Natal, where the majority of Indian South Africans live. Further investigation needs to be undertaken to ascertain whether those living in the Transvaal and Cape Province speak a variety that is close enough to warrant the same linguistic label as for their Natal counterparts. My first impressions are that, apart from special lexis, the language of young people of Indian descent in Cape Town, for example, is part of a general 'Cape Flats' variety, unless their parents are recent arrivals from Natal. This would mean that the label SAIE is possibly misleading, that it is an ethnic label not necessarily coinciding with linguistic behaviour.

In Natal, at any rate, varieties of English tend to follow fairly rigid ethnic lines: first-language varieties spoken by Whites, 'Coloureds' and Indians clearly distinguishable at least in terms of accent, and a second-language variety characteristic of speakers of Zulu. The use of English in Natal dates back to the 1820s, when the first explorers and traders made their way there. A sizeable community of English speakers was only established in 1849, four years after the British annexation of the Boer Republic of Natalia. (The influence of Afrikaans has been slight in the history of Natal, since most Afrikaners trekked away from the province upon the imposition of British rule, after a stay of about six years. The language has not played a role in the history of the Natal variety of SAIE, and will not generally feature in our exposition.) 'Settlers' were recruited mainly from England, and to a lesser extent Ireland and Scotland. The total number of British immigrants arriving between January 1849 and June 1852 was nearly 5,000 (Brookes and Webb 1965: 65). A high proportion of the settlers originated from the Midlands, Yorkshire and Lancashire, with the middle and upper classes proportionately much larger than in the 1820 Cape settlement (Lanham and Macdonald 1979: 74). The upper- and middle-class affiliation would have tended to level out regionalisms, though there is evidence (Lanham 1982: 325) of the prominence of Yorkshire and Lancashire accents in nineteenth-century Natal. By the end of the 1850s planters in Natal, growing a variety of crops, faced a shortage of labour. The most obvious source – given the economics of colonisation – the indigenous, mainly Zulu-speaking population, had been earlier consigned to 'reserves' not readily accessible to the planters. Furthermore, agricultural work was at that time not the prerogative of males in Zulu economic organisation, and planters apparently did not think of employing
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women, who were the more accustomed to agricultural toil. Basuto workers and Amatonga from Mozambique were recruited on some farms, but there was still a shortage of labour during peak season (Bhana and Brain 1990: 24).

Many Natal planters looked to India for the supply of cheap and – what they presumed to be – transient labour. The emigration of thousands of labourers from the Indian subcontinent had already taken place under the British Assisted Emigration scheme to various colonies in the Atlantic and Caribbean. By 1859 there were thousands of indentured Indians working in the British colonies of Mauritius, British Guyana, Trinidad and Jamaica. Natal was to receive, enthusiastically at first, 152,184 indentured workers in the period 1860–1911. (There was no recruitment between 1866 and 1874, on account of the economic depression in Natal.) Recruitment was mainly from two areas: the south-east of India (present-day Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh) and the north-east (present-day Bihar and Uttar Pradesh). The main languages spoken by the migrants from South India were the Dravidian languages, Tamil and Telugu (with some Malayalam, which did not survive for more than a generation), as well as a southern form of Urdu known as Dakhini Urdu. From the north came mainly Bhojpuri, Awadhi and dialects of Hindi, which coalesced to form a South African form of Bhojpuri, usually simply called Hindi (or Kalkatyā bāt (‘Calcutta speech’), after the port of embarkation for North Indians – Calcutta). There was also Urdu, spoken by the small number of Muslim immigrants, and languages having only a few score speakers: Bengali, Panjabi, Oriya and Magahi. The ratio of South to North Indian migrants was roughly 3:2.

Conditions surrounding indenture were not far removed from slavery, as the term used by shippers in the nineteenth century, the coolie trade, suggests. In Britain the system was attacked by Buxton and Lord Brougham in the House of Commons in 1837 as a recrudescence of slavery, abolished only three years earlier (Palmer 1957: 5). Tinker’s book, A New System of Slavery (1974), explicitly shows the parallels between the indenture of Indian workers and slavery – in the methods of recruitment, the transportation by ship, and the social and economic conditions on the plantations. The impression should not be formed, however, that indenture was an entirely involuntary affair, since many migrants were motivated by the desire to escape from debt, failing crops, unemployment, problems with the law or family quarrels. Brookes and Webb (1965: 85), nevertheless, put it aptly: ‘The Indians, to paraphrase Booker T. Washington’s famous saying on the American Negroes, are the only part of the population of Natal which came by special and urgent invitation.’
In Natal harsh working and living conditions, including low pay, extended working hours, an imbalance of Indian males to females and overzealous sirdars (overseers), led to a very high suicide rate – the second highest in the British colonies (Bhana and Bhana: 1990). Treated for the most part as social lepers, indentured workers were unwanted as free citizens after they had completed one or more terms of indenture. The
Table 1.2 *Indian languages in South Africa* (1936)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>83,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi (= Bhojpuri)</td>
<td>60,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>25,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>25,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>13,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211,071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1936 Census Report

'sucked orange policy' (as it came to be sympathetically recognised by some British officials) of repatriating workers and their families was a major political issue in Natal in the first half of the twentieth century. Bhana (1986: 2) estimates that about 23 per cent of the workers brought from India were repatriated by 1911.

The role of the plantation system in forcing a restructuring of linguistic tradition is well known. Sankoff’s summation of the link between slavery, the plantation and linguistic upheaval in the New World context ought to make clear the potential importance of the social background to indenture in nineteenth-century Natal:

The plantation system is crucial because it was unique in creating a catastrophic break in linguistic tradition that is unparalleled. It is difficult to conceive of another situation where people arrived with such a variety of native languages; where they were so cut off from their native language groups; where the size of no one language group was enough to insure its survival; where no second language was shared by enough people to serve as a useful vehicle of intercommunication; and where the legitimate language was inaccessible to almost everyone.

(1979: 24)

If working conditions were initially unsatisfactory, other aspects of the colony were attractive enough to induce the majority of Indian migrants to stay on after fulfilling their contracts, in spite of controversy over their permanent status: a pleasant climate, rich soil, available land and a strong economy.

Another group of migrants from India arrived as traders from 1875 onwards, initially attracted by the prospect of doing business with the colony’s growing Indian population. Paying their own way from the port of Bombay, they became characterised as *passenger Indians*. Some of them had previously lived as traders in Mauritius. New languages from western India were now introduced to South Africa: chiefly Gujarati, Marathi, Konkani and the Meman dialect of Sindhi. The number of speakers of Indian languages in South Africa in 1936 is given in table 1.2.
The passenger Indians and indentured as well as ex-indentured (or 'free') Indians were united by common geographical origins, but sometimes divided by class, religion and language. The main divisions in religion were – in order of decreasing numbers – Hindu, Muslim and Christian. In terms of class, the main division was that between traders and indentured...
workers; and in terms of language – north (Bhojpuri and Urdu, which were mutually intelligible, and Gujarati) versus south (Tamil and Telugu). In the early years caste was important in the matter of choosing a marriage partner among indentured Indians, but the essence of caste (endogamy, commensality, occupation, hierarchy) had of necessity to be diluted on the plantations, and so eroded as to be today unrecognisable and of marginal significance. Adherence to caste is slightly stronger among people of trader origins (i.e. mainly Gujaratis) than other Hindu groups in South Africa (Kuper 1955).

Even though citizenship was unambiguously assured to Indians in South Africa as late as 1961, the majority of them had long thought of themselves as belonging to South Africa, albeit as South Africans with a distinct ethnic identity. This is significant in accounting for the fact that a process of language shift has taken place in Natal within 125 years of the first migration.

Bughwan (1970) administered a questionnaire eliciting responses from high-school students in Durban regarding their competence in an Indian language. Her findings were that of 547 pupils 91.2 per cent claimed to speak, read and write better in English than in an Indian language; 0.9 per cent claimed to be more proficient in the home language; while 7.8 per cent claimed equal proficiency in English and an Indian language. Of the same total, 62 per cent claimed English to be the only language used with siblings, 27.1 per cent claimed to use more English than ‘home’ language; 9.9 per cent used both equally; and 0.8 per cent more ‘home’ language than English. (There were ten non-respondents, involving children without siblings.)

These tendencies have continued today to the point where an ancestral language has died out in many homes, or lives on in the intercourse of older speakers only. The English that has replaced these languages as the vernacular is distinct from Indian English and other varieties of South African English. Why this should be so, and how English was learnt in the early period will be the subject of the rest of this chapter.

1.4 English in the period of indenture (1860–1911)

It is unlikely that SAIE as we know it today existed as a social entity in the nineteenth century, yet its roots undoubtedly lie in the interlanguage efforts of some of the early migrants.
1.4.1 English transported

A minority of the migrants, mostly converts to Christianity, had some prior acquaintance with English in India. We are in the fortunate position of knowing the number of indentured workers with a knowledge of English on the first ship, *Truro*, that arrived in Natal in 1860. This information is contained in a letter written by the French-speaking Father Jean-Baptiste Sabon of the Roman Catholic Church addressed to his bishop (quoted in Brain 1983: 195):

> Among the Indians who are lately arrived from the Indies to be workers in Natal, there are about 50 Catholics. In coming from Maritzburg, I went there immediately to visit them... They are encamped two miles from D'Urban. Having assembled them around my person, I spoke either by myself or through an interpreter, for few knew how to speak French. Eight or nine speak Portuguese and about twelve can speak English. I had a long conversation with them; they appear very intelligent and they are much respectful towards a priest.

Father Sabon's own knowledge of Portuguese gave him an advantage over other missionaries in communicating with those migrants from Madras who had prior experience of the language (or, more likely, of Creole Portuguese). He deemed it necessary, however, to set about learning Tamil (Brain 1983: 195).

Christian Indians were generally far fewer in number per ship than the eighty-nine who arrived on the *Truro*.³ Whereas the percentage of Christian Indians on this ship was approximately 26 per cent, the overall percentage for the period of indentureship is given by Brain (1983: 247) as 1.4 per cent. Assuming that most indentured workers with a knowledge of English belonged to the Christian faith, the percentage of English-speaking indentured immigrants must therefore have been around 2 per cent. Most of the Christian Indians originated from South India. An influential exception in the early period was Henry Nundoo, a Hindi-speaking teacher of the Christian faith from Benaras, who arrived in 1864. Nundoo was employed as a schoolteacher under Reverend Ralph Stott in 1867 but quit after a few months ‘finding teaching too irksome’ (Brain 1983: 204). He was to resume his career as teacher a few years later and produce a primer, *Light of Knowledge*, which appeared in 1886, aiming to teach pupils English via the medium of Hindi. (This effort must have been of limited value, given the high rate of illiteracy in Indian languages among indentured immigrants.) Other migrants who knew English were the handful of clerks, interpreters and teachers who came on indentured contracts.
Since this is one of many sources which served as input to what was to become SAIE, we must attempt to ascertain what type of English was transported from India. It is not possible to describe in sufficient detail the state of English in nineteenth-century India in this work. The variation according to proficiency, home language and region in a vast country does not admit of easy condensation. We can note here that Indian English is for most of its speakers an L2 variety (nativised in Kachru's terminology), which is introduced mainly via the educational system. It plays an important role in secondary and tertiary education as one of the media of instruction. Kachru (1983a: 9) refers to a cline (i.e. a graded continuum) of bilingualism in English and another Indian language, comprising a zero point (i.e. no competence in English), a central point and an ambilingual point (maximal competence in English, whilst having L1 fluency in an Indian language). Indian English of educated speakers is marked by a host of features at all levels of structure (for example, the use of retroflex consonants in place of alveolar stops of English English; special compounding patterns; cultural lexis specific to the subcontinent (for example, idioms like a crocodile in a loin-cloth); and a slightly bookish style compared to L1 Englishes, involving Latinity, seemingly overpolite diction and a 'moralistic tone' (Kachru 1983a: 39).

There are subvarieties characteristic of the lesser-educated in specific occupations. One such – Butler English (a near-pidgin variety used by house-servants in the Madras Presidency – will be considered in detail in 7.2.2. Babu English is the much-caricatured flowery language of some moderately educated clerks and others, who are less proficient in formal English than they realise. Mehrotra (1982: 163n.) provides some amusing examples of this register. He cites the case of the clerk who asked his employers for ten days' leave because 'the hand that rocked the cradle has kicked the bucket'; and of the job applicant's motivation, 'I am bubbling with zeal and enthusiasm to serve as a research assistant.' These are mild in comparison to the babuisms in the following acknowledgement in an approved PhD thesis: 'I consider it to be my primordial obligation to humbly offer my deepest sense of gratitude to my most revered Guruji and untiring and illustrious guide professor ... for the magnitude of his benevolence and eternal guidance.'

We must note, however, that these are mostly written examples, and may not reflect colloquial patterns. That is, Babu English is a genre or register, rather than a sociolect. Furthermore, the floral quality of language on display here is not unknown in many English-as-L2 classrooms the world over. Other stigmatised varieties of Indian English like Bearer English and Cheechee English are discussed in Kachru 1983a.
Realistically, the English of the indentured workers coming from Madras and its environs was more likely to resemble the Butler English end of the scale rather than the 'close to standard except for accent and lexis' variety (Kachru's ambilingual point). The English of the few literate clerks, teachers and interpreters, too, appears to have been far removed from the standard, judging from comments made by people in authority in Natal, though one should always make allowance for preconceived notions of the superiority of the English. The annual reports of the Protector of Indian Immigrants of the nineteenth century frequently lament the scarcity of interpreters. Regarding the quality of such interpreting as existed in the Natal courts, his comments for 1885 (p. 36) are as follows:

Thus, as often happens, in cases wherein some witnesses came from Northern India and some from its great Southern division, the interpretation becomes broken, disjointed and unreliable...In other instances, Magistrates' interpreters have insufficient knowledge of the English language and convey the words of an Indian witness in 'pigeon English' absurd in its sound and ludicrous in aspect when recorded.

Similar sentiments can be found in the nineteenth-century Inspectors' Reports for schools regarding the competence in English of teachers from India and Mauritius.

Whether the type of English described above is really a pidgin, and whether Butler English took root and spread in Natal, will be discussed in chapters 2 and 7. For the time being I quote three letters written by indentured workers in the early period (and not by proxy, as was often the case with such letters addressed to the Protector) which show the range of abilities existing at the time. The first is presumably what was considered by English-speaking Natalians 'pigeon English', though it is very far from that.

26th/3/89
Most respected Sir
We beg to say the following words to your honour. Sir do you remember an Indian with two wifes & 1 child came to you from country with a letter from his master. well before he came to Durban he stayed at P. M.Burg one day for a rest stayed a man's house Manie Balakistan on the same day. Well when the man was out, Balakisten and another man friend of Balakisten named K. Thorasawmy.

Both were broken the letter which was sended to by his master. But they closed in this same enveloppe a-gain The same man has written a letter & posted to you too. He wanted to pay for them & deliver them from the endenture
Therefore we humbly beg you to maintain this. Because there is no allow to read another man’s letter.

The man who is coming his name is Verasamy. The words which was written in the letter that his master told him to go to the [unclear, proper noun] Hospital. But Verasamy refused to go there. therefore his master send him to you with a letter.

But we have nothing to do with it. Look the man named Thorasawmy is working under a lawyer. They blaming the other poor Indians for nothing and chiding them. Well they themselves doing so. must want somebody to punish them. The 2 mans are assisting the lawers to translating to tamil.

I am sir
your obdt
svt

The second letter has some affinities with the Babu English of India, in its elaborate and over-polite diction. The writer is a cook at a hospital.

Most respected Sir,
With due respect and submission I most humbly beg to inform your Lordship this few lines for yours favor. Which I have been under your honor so long time for this small sallary. it would not support me. therefore I most humbly begging your honor to increase my wages more ten shilling. Hope your Lordship would not put me in to delay, if not I shall give the notice for my rejoin.

I shall pray for yours long long life and prosperity.
I remain
Sir
Yours most obdt servant
Moonswamy Cook
& Dept Hospital
19/6/89

My third example, written – like most of those addressed to the Protector – by speakers of Tamil or Telugu, contains several turns of phrase which make it more akin to present-day SAIE than the language of the first two letters. (These and other linguistic characteristics will be considered in chapters 2, 6 and 7.)

To Cant Hitchins Esqr
A. B. C. Agent
Port Natal
Complaint for Money

Sir
We four boys beg to ask your advise on the following question. We have been working for you for the last 5 years and have given satisfaction.
Three months ago we lent your head sirdar to sivapragasum each £5 all together £20 which he was to return this on November ist which he has not done. Can you help to we recover this. He gave promiss to given 4 womens from emigration depot which he has not done this to. When we go and ask the money says you fullers go and give report to your grandfather. Allso he says i wont give a single penny. But he is giving always too much trouble. This is not good reason.

Will you please might have settle this matter and which we shall be thanfull very much.

Yours faithfully

We are your obedent servants

Labours

Such letters give evidence of a fair competence in English, albeit distinctly as a foreigner's variety. In terms of the 'English language family' this is English as L2, not quite nativised, since it is only being used for out-group communication with native speakers. The letters are not indicative of pidginisation, for they show no signs of vocabulary mixing, and have a fairly developed English syntax.

However, it must be borne in mind that these were, in all probability, the best efforts of the most competent English-speaking indentured workers, and that the range could well be extended to include less competent, less literate learners.

Was the knowledge of English among passenger Indians any different? Some of them with established trading contacts had a command of several Indian and European languages. Swan (1985: 8) describes one such: 'Mohamed Anglia was also unusual. A fluent linguist in English, French, Dutch and several Indian languages, he had been a municipal councillor in India. In 1897 he emigrated to the Transvaal as the managing partner of big Mauritian sugar merchants.'

And there was Gandhi, a London-trained barrister fluent in English, Gujarati (his mother tongue) and Hindustani. He was first brought to South Africa as legal consultant precisely because of his competence in English and Gujarati. Arriving in South Africa in 1893 and staying for twenty years, he must have been influential (as a political leader) in setting the standard for English, even though he preferred the use of the Indian languages wherever possible. Gandhi and Anglia were clearly the exception, though, for most incoming merchant Indians could not speak English. This is evident from Gandhi's exhortations to Transvaal merchant Indians to learn English at the turn of the nineteenth century.

As an example of the writing ability (and at the same time a clear reflection of the speech level) of trading-class Indians I quote a letter written by a widow from Baroda, Gujarat. It is addressed to the Master of
the Supreme Court in South Africa, regarding the affairs of her husband, who had been in Durban till his death in 1893.

Kathor 1933

To the Master of the Suprim Court
Perts Mauritizburg
Natal, South Africa.

Re: Deceisied State of Hasen Dawjee of Durban.

Dear Sir
My Husben deiaed on abut 1893 in Kathor India. My Husben Have shop in Durban and money. My attorney Essof Omar give you in my and my daughter rite my first daughter name “Maryam” and second daughter Khatiza that under ages. in 1893 or 1894 May first Daughter Died in Abut 1919. See hase one daughter name “Affess” hase age about 30 yeas nou in Kathor that ful name Affess Mohamed Suleman Asmat Dahe No 620 Amra Street in Kathor and my second daughter Khaliz died in on Feb 1930 in Kathor in Timol Street Kathor. See hase one son name “Gulam Hoosen” ful name Gulam Hoosen Suleman Wakad. Timol Street Kathor and his Hus Bun Suleman Ebrahim Wakad nou in Field Street in Durban Natal and Africa.

My Husban money paid me in on about 1897 or 1898 sum of Rupees 6000/ — in by Kathor Court, then our Sum has bing in my Husben name in your Court Now the sum £144/2/6 or over. Please Dear Sir the Sum send me and Haffes and oblige. In the matters paper bing in your court please kindly send me sum of money.

Your honestly madam
Fatma widow of late Hasen Dawjee

1.4.1.1 Indian English and SAIE

Despite such input from Indian English, SAIE has on the whole more differences from than similarities to Indian English, as will become evident in the ensuing chapters. Such similarities as do exist can be attributed to the influence of early models from India (mainly teachers, interpreters, politicians), but the possibility of occasional convergent developments should not be disallowed. That is, SAIE may have independently evolved a few words and constructions based on similar strategies of L2-learning and on similar substrate influences. Among the more salient similarities between Indian English and SAIE are the following:

(a) Lexis:

- *cut* ‘to slaughter’
- *shift* ‘to move house’ (not necessarily temporarily)
- *knickers* ‘men’s underpants’
18 Historical background

*head-bath* ‘a bath during which one washes one’s hair’
*body-bath* ‘a bath during which one does not wash one’s hair’

(b) Idioms:
*to key a watch* ‘to wind up a watch’
*to eat someone’s head* ‘to pester someone’

(c) Syntax:
Rank reduction (see 4.3.6)
Non-inversion of auxiliary verbs in questions (see 2.3.1.1)

(d) Phonology:
Retroflection (receding in SAIE)
Dental stops for dental fricatives
Approximants for labiodental fricatives (see 5.3.1)

However, the differences between Indian English and SAIE are quite large. In 5.4 examples are given of lexical innovations in SAIE not recorded in Indian English. The following salient English-derived lexis in Indian English given by Kachru (1983a) and Nihalani, Tongue and Hosali (1978) are not part of SAIE:

*chutney-green* ‘dull green’
*dining leaf* ‘leaf on which one eats’
*waist thread* ‘sacred thread’
*prepone* ‘to bring forward’
*flower bed* ‘nuptial bed’
*been-to* ‘one who has been abroad’

There are also words derived from an Indian language which would not generally be understood in SAIE:

*lakh* ‘100,000’
*dacoit* ‘robber, plunderer’
*crore* ‘10 million’
*goonda* ‘a hooligan, criminal’
*bandh* ‘a general strike’
*gherao* ‘a type of sit-in strike’

1.4.2 Learning English in Natal

I have so far tried to ascertain what knowledge Indians had prior to their arrival in South Africa. It is now time to concentrate on the process of learning English on South African soil in the period of indenture. From the beginning a knowledge of English enhanced one’s economic and social standing. Indian interpreters, policemen, sirdars, court clerks and magis-
trates’ assistants were highly valued. Indentured workers with some knowledge of English could command higher wages as cooks, waiters and as railway employees. Merchants were required to keep books in English (Bhana 1985: 247), while secretaries of Indian political bodies were chosen on the basis of fluency in English.

Bughwan (1970: 503) states that English was first transmitted to Indians by native speakers of the language — English missionaries, British teachers and English-speaking sugar-estate owners. This is far too optimistic a view of the social conditions prevailing in the colony. We can instead posit four main possible sources of input to the learner:

(a) schooling, with teachers being native speakers of English;
(b) schooling, with teachers being non-native speakers of English;
(c) contact with native speakers of English in Natal;
(d) contact with non-native speakers of English (chiefly Indians).

Written records suggest that all four sources were significant in shaping SAIE. As far as education in the nineteenth century was concerned, it would appear that the number of non-native English-speaking teachers was at least as great as that of mother-tongue English teachers. The missionary impulse was the first source of education, reaching a handful of migrants. The Roman Catholic Church was the first Christian denomination to start work among the Indian immigrants (Brain 1983: 194). At first Father Jean-Baptiste Sabon was the only Christian missionary to concern himself with the needs of Indian immigrants. Having been sent originally in 1853 to the Roman Catholic population (chiefly Irish and French), Sabon’s command of English was poor (Brain 1983: 194). In 1867 he opened the first school for Indian children, attended by thirty pupils.

The greatest contribution from missionary sources came from Reverend Ralph Stott, a tireless worker in the cause of education for indentured workers and their children. In 1868 he started a day school in the Durban Corporation Barracks and a year later a night school for older pupils. He subsequently employed Henry Nundoo (the Christian North Indian described in 1.4.1), who was reported by the Superintendent of Education in 1871 to be especially attentive to making these pupils learn ‘a quantity of English phrases in daily use between buyer and seller, master and servant’. The number of ‘schools’ (essentially one-room affairs with one teacher in charge of the entire unit) increased gradually in the 1870s and 1880s. An important step was the establishment of an Indian Immigration School Board in 1878, which catered for a slightly larger number of children.
By and large the various schools were beset with problems like poor enrolment (for parents were unaccustomed to formal education and were particularly reluctant to send girls to school, and many plantation owners would have none of it). In 1886 the Inspector of Indian Schools estimated that 90 per cent of Indian children of school-going age were not at school. Those who did enrol were frequently absent, and destined to stay on for two or three years only (Indian School Report 1886: 7).

The School Report for 1886 (section 4) gives an indication of the subjects taught and the levels of achievement: 'Grammar and Geography were weak—a reflection of the teacher's own weakness in these subjects. Reading, Recitation, Writing, both Dictation and Copies and Arithmetic were eminently satisfactory on the whole.'

Reporting in 1885, the Inspector of Indian Schools (run by the Indian Immigration School Board) observed that most of the Indian teachers available were from Mauritius, and that their own education was 'too often of a slight and superficial kind'. (These teachers were mother-tongue speakers of an Indic or Dravidian language, and would have had a knowledge of Mauritian Creole, in addition to English.) The School Report for 1885 lists 24 teachers, 1 assistant and 13 pupil teachers involved in Indian education for Natal. Of these, 27 were Indians (from India, Mauritius and presumably pupil teachers from Natal) and therefore non-native speakers of English, 5 of Eurasian descent, and 1 European. Only 3 had teaching certificates. Of those from India the majority were Christian Indians educated in the south. The influence of these first teachers from India is probably responsible for four salient terms in the educational sphere that SAIE still shares with Indian English: *by-heart* (v.) 'to learn off by heart' (past tense *by-hearted*); *tuition* 'extra classes outside school for which one hires a private tutor'; *further studies* 'higher education' and *alphabets* 'the alphabet, letters of the alphabet'.

Reports of the time frequently call into question the abilities of schoolteachers. The Inspector's report for 1885 (p. 18) reads as follows: 'Trained teachers are a *sine qua non*. No amount of effort on the part of untrained men can make up for the ignorance of the methods of imparting instruction, or qualify a smatterer for the post of Teacher: progress in this respect is slow.'

There were other anomalies. The materials in at least one day-school were 'a few Second Irish Reading Books' (Indian School Report 1885: 89); and the content of the dictation passage for standard 2 contained in the same report would make us smile today, with its emphasis on the severe British winter, snow, dainty birds and parlour windows. The teacher at one school was Francis D'Vay, an ex-sirdar on a sugar estate, whose native
language was French. On a few estates attempts were made to employ as mission-school teachers discharged soldiers who had served in India and gained some knowledge of an Indian language. This was soon abandoned for ‘their conduct was not such as to command the respect of those among whom their work lay’ (Brain 1983: 205).

Of the missionaries in charge of education there were as many of continental origin as of British descent, and even within the British fold there were many of Scots and Irish descent. The following missionaries were in charge in 1885: Rev. S.H. Stott (English); Rev. L.P. Booth (English); Rev. H.J. Schildrick (German); Rev. A. Talon (French); Very Rev. Archdeacon A. Barker (English); Rev. A.P. Troughton (English); Rev. E. Kelley (Irish); J.F. Manisty (French).8

In addition, names like the following loom large in their teaching or influence over missionary education and evangelical work in the period of indenture: Bishop Jolivet (French; though he is reported to have spoken fluent English on account of prior work in England); Father Radulfus Maingot (French – he knew Tamil); Father Justin Barret (French); Father Augustine Chauvin (French); Father Gourlay (French); Rev. Browne (English); Rev. Jackson (English); Mr Rock (Anglo-Indian); Mr Schulze (German); Madame Krovatchovik (Czech?); R. Stott (English); Father Sabon (French; ‘poor English’ and Tamil)

Of these influential early teachers of English ten were of continental origin; one was Anglo-Indian; one Irish; and only five of English origin. There is a (very) small chance that some of the dialect forms in present-day SAIE derive from the influence of these missionaries: mines as possessive (for example, it’s mines); like as phrase-final focus marker (for example, They’re poor, like) also occur in Scots; but as clause-final equivalent of ‘though’ or ‘isn’t it’ (for example, it’s lovely here, but) have parallels in Scots, Irish and northern English dialects; the frequent use of a partitive genitive of (for example, too much of time) may have parallels in French-influenced English (though it also occurs in Indian English). These constructions are not found in other L1 varieties of South African English.

The identification of language-related problems in Indian education in the nineteenth century should not be construed as a belittlement of these pioneer efforts. One should remember that, ideally, teachers in the lower classes would have had to be competent in English and an Indian language (or two). This clearly narrowed down the potential teaching force, and made a perfect command of English amongst teachers a bonus rather than a necessity. Furthermore, education in the colony as a whole was far from perfect. The first primary schools for English children, set up in the 1850s were ‘of varying efficiency’ (Brookes and Webb 1965: 78), and secondary
education began as late as 1858. Mission-school education for Africans reached only a small number, and African education has at the time of writing still to be properly organised in the country as a whole, beyond the ideology of apartheid planning.

The classroom need not be the only source for the acquisition of English. Indeed, it might not have been the main one. Contact with native speakers of English for purposes of trade and hawking of fruit and vegetables must have promoted some use of English. A significant difference between Indian English and SAIE is that whereas the former is often characterised as 'bookish' even in informal usage (Kachru 1983a: 39), the latter shows fewer traces of classroom influence. Contrary to Indian English, SAIE is often hyper-colloquial in situations requiring some formalese.

Kachru (1983a: 204–5) cites the following as instances of the ‘Englishisation’ of Hindi syntax in India:

(a) the use of indirect speech;
(b) the use of impersonal constructions;
(c) passive construction with agent overtly stated;
(d) increase in number of SVO sentences;
(e) the use of parenthetical clauses.

These influences are of a learned nature, rendering the Hindi syntax more formal (at least from the viewpoint of English). We shall see in chapters 6 and 7 that the reverse has happened in South Africa. That is, the interaction between Indian languages and SAIE has been such as to promote constructions such as the following which render English syntax more informal:

(a) greater use of direct speech (see 4.2.7);
(b) decrease in impersonal constructions (see 6.5.1.1);
(c) rare use of the passive with overt agents (see 7.4(l));
(d) increase in verb-final sentences (see 4.3);
(e) rare use of parenthetical clauses (see 4.2).

R. M. W. Dixon (cited in Das Gupta 1986: 74) makes the perceptive observation that Indian English uses Romance verbs like inform, request and require, where native speakers use their Anglo-Saxon equivalents tell, ask and need. However, Indian English gives the Romance verbs many of the syntactic properties of the Anglo-Saxon forms: for example, Please inform him to come; Do you require to read this now? These traits, which give Indian English a bookish twinge, are not characteristic of SAIE. On the contrary, it is the informal items which predominate in SAIE, except in some hyper-formal discourse.
Given that the Indian languages were not all mutually intelligible, and that the majority language of Natal – Zulu – was unknown to the migrants, one would expect there to have been fertile ground for the spread of some simplified form of English. In other English colonies in such a context of migratory (slave) labour, involving a host of languages, a pidgin English often developed (the best example being the Caribbean). The first ‘new’ language that indentured Indians migrating to (British) Guyana and Trinidad learnt was the Creole, developed earlier by African slaves from a pidgin. In Mauritius it was the pre-existing French-based Creole that was learnt for wider communication.

The main reason why an English-based pidgin did not develop in the context of the sugar plantations of Natal was that in Fanagalo a rudimentary lingua franca had already arisen in the colony. Fanagalo is a pidgin drawing on elements of English, Afrikaans and Zulu, chiefly the latter. Although Cole (1953) hypothesised that it was created by Indians in their efforts to learn English and Zulu, it is now clear (Mesthrie 1989) that the pidgin existed in a jargon form for at least ten years before the introduction of Indian labour. There is a strong possibility that indentured workers were responsible for its stabilisation, however. The Protector’s Report for 1878 has a passage regarding the learning of English and Fanagalo (which is referred to as Kafir), by field hands:

> Very often when Indians are employed in out of the way places, there exists a great difficulty in explaining themselves, there being very few who can speak their language. Fortunately, the Indians themselves are very quick in most instances in picking up both English and Kafir, but chiefly the latter. (p. 32; emphasis mine)

The value of Fanagalo must have been that it was easy to learn (in the South African mines, under relatively high-tech conditions, the pidgin is taught in three weeks to newcomers).

The pidgin was useful in communicating not only with Zulus, Englishmen and Afrikaners in Natal, but with other Indians whose language one did not understand. This last practice continues for a few elderly rural women today, but was never widespread because English was favoured as lingua franca, by a developing elite (to be characterised later in this section). More importantly, in the barracks some bilingualism developed in Indian languages (usually Bhojpuri and Tamil). This makes the linguistic situation in the Natal plantations less traumatic than the typical pidgin – creole scenario outlined in the above quote by Sankoff (see 1.3).

That Fanagalo was used to some extent, at least, between English settlers and their Indian employees can be deduced from a few sources. One is a letter of complaint addressed to the Protector by one such employer
regarding what he considered to be the insolence of two of his house-servants. Concerning one who had been rude to his wife, he writes: 'He constantly turns around to my wife when she gives him an order and says it is "luto".'\(^9\) (*Luto* or *lutho* is the word for ‘nothing’ in Fanagalo.)

Another letter to the Protector, written in 1903 on behalf of an indentured worker who lodged a complaint about being whipped by his employer, is more suggestive:\(^10\)

> The Calcutta man told me [ ] would be deducted from my wages for the sheet being torn – and I said ‘Sooga wina manga’ [= ‘Get away, you’re lying’] and went away to my work – this was about four o’clock in the afternoon.

> I did not use the words “Sooga wina manga” to the mistress, but she mistook me, and she gave me ten cuts with a riding whip.

Two uses of the pidgin can be inferred from this: firstly, the plaintiff (a South Indian) claimed to have used Fanagalo in communicating with the Calcutta man (i.e. a North Indian); secondly, the English mistress must have been accustomed to being addressed in Fanagalo since she took the sentence to be aimed directly at her.

If, as I believe, the use of the pidgin was fairly widespread in this context, it would have two almost contradictory consequences for the acquisition of English:

(a) It results in less input from native English speakers, thus inhibiting the development of a variety close to Natal colonial English.

(b) It postpones the need to learn English, inhibiting the rapid development of a simplified pidgin English.

We shall see throughout this work that these two factors are responsible for the ‘average value’ of the linguistic characteristics of SAIE (reinforced since 1948 under Afrikaner rule by segregation in housing and education). We shall also see in chapter 2 that the two factors do not exclude the possibility of a few speakers developing L1-like competence early on, and others from ‘fossilising’ at a pidgin-like stage of English. But these are the exceptions.

There is some anecdotal evidence concerning the learning of English on South African soil by passenger Indians. Hey (1961: 10) quotes a Muslim businessman reminiscing about his father’s experiences:

> He didn’t know a word of English. When he served behind the counter, a customer came in for a tin of condensed milk – he had been educated in Gujarati – he asked the customer: ‘What is condensed milk?’ They pointed it out to him and he would ask them to spell it, and he would then write it down in Gujarati script.
There is probably a touch of romanticism in this account, for if the shopkeeper ‘didn’t know a word of English’, in what language would he have directed his enquiries at the customers? (Perhaps it was Fanagalo.) The point about the Gujarati script does, however, ring true, for the Kaithi alphabet, like many others current in India, is in many respects more useful for recording pronunciations than English orthography.

Those works of Gandhi that deal with his stay in South Africa contain a wealth of information regarding the linguistic repertoires of some of his followers. The following anecdote concerns an experience with other satyagrahis (followers of passive resistance) in a Johannesburg jail in 1908.

When the warder finished the drill and went away, it was continued by a Pathan compatriot of ours named Nawabkhan, who made us all laugh with his quaint pronunciation of English words of command. He rendered ‘Stand at ease’ as ‘sundlies’. We could not for the life of us understand what Hindustani word it was, but afterwards it dawned upon us that it was no Hindustani but only Nawabkhani English. (Gandhi 1928: 153)

Regarding one of the prominent participants in the Satyagraha campaigns, Thambi Naidoo, Gandhi (1928: 147) says the following:

Thambi Naidoo was a Tamilian born in Mauritius where his parents had migrated from Madras state. He was an ordinary trader. He had practically received no scholastic education whatever. But a wide experience had been his school-master. He spoke and wrote English very well, although his grammar was perhaps not free from faults. In the same way he had acquired a knowledge of Tamil. He understood and spoke Hindustani fairly well and he had some knowledge of Telugu too, though he did not know the alphabets of these languages. Again, he had a very good knowledge of the Creole dialect current in Mauritius which is a sort of corrupt French, and he knew of course the language of the Negroes [= Fanagalo]. A working knowledge of so many languages was not a rare accomplishment among the Indians of South Africa, hundreds of whom could claim a general acquaintance with all these languages.

From other anecdotes in the narrative it would appear that those in the forefront of the Satyagraha campaigns had some knowledge of English, but that at mass meetings the number of people who understood it was not so large as to permit English as lingua franca. (Gandhi was, anyway, reluctant to allow English to dominate – even if it could – over the Indian languages.) A good idea of the multilingualism resulting at meetings can be gleaned from extracts describing a mass meeting of Indians in Johannesburg in 1906:

The president Mr. Abdul Gani, began his speech at exactly three o’clock. Everyone felt that Mr. Abdul Gani was at his best. His speech in excellent Hindustani was brief and eloquent...
The English version of Mr. Gani's speech was read out by Dr. Godfrey. The task of moving the first resolution was entrusted to Mr. Nanalal Valji Shah, who spoke in English...

Mr C. K. T. Naidoo seconded Mr. Shah and explained the matter to the Tamil-speaking people in their language...

Mr. Getta of Potchefstroom spoke in Gujarati and supported the second resolution...

Even as Mr. Hajee Habib rose to speak, the audience greeted him with cheers. His speech was so caustic and impassioned that even those who did not know Gujarati said they could follow its purport. Now and then, Mr. Hajee Habib used English anecdotes...

When Mr. Hajee Ojer Ally stood up to second the fourth resolution, the whole theatre resounded with prolonged cheers which took some time to subside. Then Mr. Ally made a thundering speech in English...

Mr. Moonlight Moodliar then supported the resolution in a Tamil speech... (*Indian Opinion*, 22 September 1906, translated and reprinted in *Collected Works of Gandhi*, vol. V, 439-43)

As a footnote to this meeting I cannot resist repeating that the venue, the Empire Theatre, was burnt to the ground the next day.

Around the turn of the century some children born in the colony were starting to learn English. The magistrate and commentator on life in Natal, James Stuart, mentions in his diary entry for 19 November 1900 'an ordinary-looking Europeanised Indian who could speak English fairly well'. The entry must also be taken to imply that the situation was exceptional enough to warrant comment. We learn from the Census of 1904 that 5 per cent of a total of 100,918 Indians (or 5,211) were literate in English. Writing in 1909 Gandhi warned against the use of English in contexts where an Indian language would do: 'We observe that some Indian youths, having acquired a smattering of English, use it even when it is not necessary to do so, as if they had forgotten their own language... When talking among themselves, they use broken English rather than pure Gujarati, Hindi or Urdu. They even carry on their correspondence in English' (*Indian Opinion*, 30 January 1909, translated and reprinted in *Collected Works of Gandhi*, vol IX, 177).

A few points regarding the difficulties in acquiring English must be noted. The first concerns the proportion of learners to potential sources of (natural) input. Within twenty-five years of the first migrations the number of Indians outnumbered that of the English-speaking population of the colony. In 1911, the first Union census indicated the population of Natal to be as follows: 953,398 Africans, 133,420 Indians, 98,114 Whites, 9,111 'Coloureds'. The ratio of Indians to Whites was from the point of view of language learning far from optimal, but not as disastrous as in colonies in
which a pidgin English developed. Bickerton (1981: 4) believes that in plantations that gave rise to creoles the proportion of target-language speakers to learners was in the region of 1 to 5. We should also bear in mind the minimal social contact between learners of English and speakers of the target language in nineteenth-century Natal. Whereas English undoubtedly held economic attractions for many migrants, I would venture to add that there were others to whom the sound of English could only mean ‘bad news’ (for it meant brushes with authority – the police, the courts and plantation bosses).

Swan (1985: 10–12) discusses the rise of a ‘new elite’ in South African Indian politics around 1905. For the most part they were ‘colonial-borns’, i.e. the offspring of indentured or ex-indentured labourers. The group included a few highly trained lawyers and civil servants, accountants and a lone newspaper publisher. Occupying less prestigious positions were teachers, bookkeepers, clerks, interpreters, petty entrepreneurs and small farmers. As an example we can consider James Godfrey, a London-trained barrister and the youngest son of a mission schoolmaster who had come to South Africa from Mauritius. His family’s lifestyle was described by contemporaries as European, and they spoke English from infancy (Swan 1985: 11). Prominent in the group were Christians of Tamil background. To them must be attributed the role of linguistic trend-setters for young people aspiring to participation in politics towards the end of the period of migration.

1.5 English in the post-indenture period

From 1911 to 1940, the acquisition of English was slow, and the same trends discernible as for the period of indentureship. In 1925 fewer than one third of all Indian children of school-going age were at school (Maharaj 1979: 348). The Natal Mercury of 29 July 1936 reports the same proportion and adds that girls especially, who were in a majority, were not being given the benefit of schooling. In 1937 the Broome Report stated that ‘viewing the rapidity with which the present system of Indian primary education has sprung up and the shortness of the average school life, it would appear that the vast majority of Indian schoolchildren do not acquire the rudiments of primary education’.

The Census of 1936 gives a very clear picture of language trends in this period. Although the Census groups Indians together with people of Chinese and Japanese descent as ‘Asiatics’, we can take the label as being almost synonymous with ‘Indian South African’ since they made up 97 per cent of the total. Tables 1.3 – 1.5 (adapted from the 1936 Census) show
that at this time more males were learning English than females, more urban people were learning it than rural people, and that children were learning English at school rather than at home.

Glimpses of the range of abilities among those who did command English at this time can be found in contemporary newspaper reports, though one must be careful to separate caricature from reality. The Natal Mercury of 7 June 1936 carried a report on Raja, an ex-indentured worker turned fruitseller wishing to return home to Madras: 'He has a tenacious mind which pursues its ideas slowly one at a time, and expresses itself in an almost unintelligible mixture of Indian [sic], Kitchen Kafir and English.'

Generally, Fanagalo (the so-called Kitchen Kafir) played an important role among the indentured and their descendants during this period. I have anecdotal evidence of its being used in rural areas to facilitate communication between pupils and missionary-teachers in the earliest stages of
schooling in rural areas, if there were no teachers with a knowledge of Indian languages. (And given the range of languages anyway, a knowledge of, say, Tamil alone would not have been enough.) One informant recalled being taught in Fanagalo by his missionary-teacher in the first few days of school in the 1930s as follows: ‘Ai chena sabona, chena good morning; ai chena Singis, chena English; ai chena slala, chena sit down …’ (‘Instead of sabona say good morning, for Singis say English, for slala say sit down …’)

If the informant’s recollection is accurate, then the instruction not to use the Fanagalo words had to be issued in the same language. This particular interaction involved the teaching of English by a French-speaking missionary to Tamil-speaking children via the medium of a Zulu-based pidgin.

Another informant could not remember her own interactions in her first days of school with the mission-school sisters, but clearly recalled her mother’s once being summoned to school to ascertain whether there were other children of school-going age at home. This question had to be addressed by the sister in Fanagalo, to which the answer ‘five’ was indicated by the use of fingers.

Oral testimony also gives an indication of the use of Fanagalo as the medium of communication between overseers and workers in some plantations. This was dramatically apparent in one interview with an old man who had been a field hand in the 1940s. In recounting aspects of his life he used English, but in describing the attitude and speech of a harsh overseer switched unconsciously to Fanagalo. (The use of Fanagalo as the medium of communication between a few Indian hawkers and their White customers continued into the 1960s and early 1970s — Billy Nair, personal communication.)

An indication of the English of the offspring of the trading class is offered by a report on the 1913 strike carried in the Natal Mercury of 15 November 1913:

The opinion of a Mahommedan trader of Verulam was asked as to how the strike was going along; but, not speaking English, he entrusted the answering to his son, who replied: ‘I think the situation better now. Going more slowly. Gone back to estates.’ Asked if he thought the Indians would soon begin work, he replied: ‘I think so, because they have no food.’

At the other end of the scale was the language of the predominantly Christian elites. If the following speech, delivered by Dr M. R. Peters, at a political meeting in which he laments the lack of leadership among younger people, is at all representative, then it would seem that the speech of the elites was closer to English English standards, but not identical to them:
'But there is one great consolation: there are many of our young men, to see from the B. A. pass lists, who are qualifying, and it is among them that we are going to find our leaders. I do not say that all men of degrees are good, some would be rotters, but they will be the leaders' (Natal Mercury, January 1940).

There are features that mark this as L2-like discourse: lexical choices like to see from, men of degrees and rotters; the choice of modal auxiliary would be and the article the in the phrase they will be the leaders. In present-day SAIE such usage would indicate a middle-range speaker, rather than 'elite SAIE', which it can be said to represent in the period under consideration.

U. Mesthrie (1991) details the activities of the Joint Indo-European Women's Associations (established in the early 1930s) in the Transvaal and Natal. From our point of view these associations afforded wives of the new elites closer contact with native (and sympathetic) models of English than other SAIE learners. In addition to co-ordinating social-welfare projects, one of the aims of the regular meetings between Indian and English women was to facilitate the acquisition of advanced skills in English speech and literacy. In Durban the Indian Women’s Reading Circle, a branch of the Durban Indian Women's Association had meetings with English women at which the focus was on reading and creative writing.

The Cape Town Agreement (between the governments of South Africa and India) of 1927 is said to be the turning point for the provision of better facilities in education. The agreement was basically that India would assist in the voluntary repatriation of Indians from Natal, provided that the upliftment of those who chose to remain in Natal, in terms of education and living conditions, would be undertaken. To oversimplify somewhat, this resulted in the setting up of more primary schools, and the provision of secondary education. Sastri College, a boys' high school, was set up in 1930, with further secondary schools being established in the 1940s. Maharaj (1979: 362) states that progress in this regard was slow, and that by 1958 four thousand Indian pupils were at high school (4.4 per cent of the total Indian school population).

The Cape Town Agreement stressed the importance of English in the future of Indian South Africans. The Natal Indian Congress representation on the Indo-European Joint Council of 1936 put it thus: 'The Indian would then become like the Jew and the Malay, he would in all probability to a great extent follow the faith of his fathers and know the language of his fathers, but the language – the language of the world's commerce and intercourse that would predominate him [sic] would be English' (Sunday Tribune, 2 August 1936).
An Indian language remained the language of the home, however, till at least the 1950s (and even later in rural areas). This started to change with the spread of schooling, when children in the late 1950s and early 1960s brought back English – the language of the school and playground – to the home. A common pattern for families with children born in the 1950s was for the first and second children to enter school with little or no English. The English they brought home from school helped subsequent children to enter school with at least a smattering of English. The last-born child frequently had enough exposure to make her/him comfortable in English when making a first appearance at school, and frequently had only a passive competence in the ancestral language. It was the child who often accustomed the parent to the use of English in a domestic setting. Grandparents were different: typically, they continued speaking only an Indian language in the home. Parents and grandparents interacted solely in an Indian language, whereas children used either English or an Indian language with their grandparents, depending on the competence of both parties. Sometimes older children used the Indian vernacular with their parents while their younger siblings used English.

By the 1990s the cycle has advanced one generation further. Most grandparents speak some English (having learnt it either at school or from their children in the 1950s), and those who did not learn it then are now forced to do so, in order to be intelligible to monolingual grandchildren. This means that an Indian language survives tenuously in the home as the language used between grandparents mainly, and occasionally between parent and grandparent. Parents often reply in English to the grandparents’ vernacular.

A closed cycle of reinforcement of English occurs in a situation involving language shift. The child (using child-language) is quite often a source for the grandmother’s (or, less commonly, the mother’s) knowledge of English. The English of the mother/grandmother in turn reinforces the child’s child-language. The pre-school child thus often lacks sufficient exposure to the adult and formal English which the education system places a high value upon.

The process which I have called a ‘closed cycle of reinforcement’ is apparent in the quote below, from an elderly female teacher of Urdu in Durban. When asked by Aziz (1988: 60), who was investigating the current status of Urdu in Natal, why she used English as medium of instruction, she replied (in Urdu): ‘No pupil would open his mouth to speak to me in Urdu so I preferred to speak to him in English. He would have no embarrassment and I also would be improving my English. The parents do the same’ (emphasis added by Aziz).
An elderly SAIE speaker discussed a situation in which his wife once knew no English, and his grandchildren no Tamil: ‘Now with her purposes too, her grandchildren all growing, y’see, now she must communicate with them in the language they understand. So she goes along with that language – English. They teach the grandparents how to speak the language.’ Even more poignant is the petition of a group of elderly female teachers of Urdu to the MCF Teacher Training Centre regarding the need for adult literacy classes in English (Aziz 1988: 70):

We are a group of Urdu teachers involved in teaching the language and other related subjects, who are untutored in English. We cannot communicate with our pupils who speak, read and write only English. As a result, our religious education is suffering. Therefore we most earnestly request the MCF (Education Committee) to institute English classes for us so that we are able to teach our children Urdu, Arabic and other subjects through English medium.

Though the learning of English was not always painless, the transition from Indian languages to English generally took place with relative swiftness and without opposition. If we view 1960 as a turning point when many children were arriving at school with English as L1, then the shift could be said to be effective within fifty years of the end of indentured immigration. (For some families, especially of a Gujarati background, the shift has not reached its full conclusion.) Although sentimental attachment to the Indian languages is strong among older people, and cultural and religious bodies frequently lament the diminishing expertise in the ‘mother tongue’, no one denies the value of English. The rapid decline of the ancestral languages is treated in detail in Mesthrie (1991: ch. 3). A brief summary of the causes of the decline follows:

(a) Lack of economic value, since English reigned in the market-place. A career as teacher of Indian language has never been a viable option, given (d) below.

(b) Lack of integrative value, since none of the five major Indian languages was intelligible within the entire Indian community, and none could serve as ‘neutral’ lingua franca. That is, English served the dual purpose of vertical communication with employers, and horizontal communication with others of Indian ancestry. (However, Fanagalo, Bhojpuri and Tamil did play secondary roles in out-group communication.)

(c) Lack of prestige, since the speech forms of the indentured workers were village dialects far removed from more prestigious literary styles. (Gujarati, the language of the merchant class, is an exception here, and has never suffered for lack of prestige.)
(d) Lack of systematic vernacular education, which has – for the most part – been restricted to part-time classes, with poor facilities, enrolment, attendance, and salaries for teachers.

(e) Lack of ties with India: Whereas merchant Indians were able to maintain links with their families and home villages in India, the majority of indentured workers and their offspring lost all such contact and opportunities to renew them. South African laws prevented the arrival of new groups of Indian immigrants who might have acted as renewers of linguistic and cultural traditions.

(f) Further competition from Afrikaans: The imposition of a second colonial language as compulsory subject for ten years at schools since the 1960s, in a province in which the language has little function, pushed the Indian languages even further from the consciousness of children.

Despite the imperfect circumstances surrounding its acquisition, there is a high value placed upon English by SAIE speakers. Now that it is a first language for a majority of SAIE speakers it has developed stylistic flexibility. The English of the most educated speakers is close to standard English, if and when they choose to deploy that particular style. This work will not, however, be focussing on this formal or semi-formal educated style; rather, it will be concerned with the evolution of the colloquial style characteristic of the home, street and neighbourhood.
Variation in SAIE: a first glimpse

2.1 The gathering of data

In a panchronic analysis of the morphology and syntax of a dialect in the late stages of language shift, care has to be exercised in making the data base rich enough to glean all the nuances of natural speech. By *panchronic* is meant the study of language along both the synchronic and diachronic dimensions. I have already suggested in chapter 1 that there is much in the way of diachronic variation and change as the dialect has moved from rudimentary L3 to L2 to L1. On the synchronic level there is much fluctuation today according to the speaker variables of age, education, social class and ancestral language, and according to situational variables like purpose of the discourse, the nature of the audience/addressees, topic, etc.

A partial explanation for the enormous syntactic variety within SAIE is the uneven pace at which different speakers have moved towards English. As with Bickerton's well-known study of the Guyanese continuum, the movement can be shown to be 'not without sidesteps and hesitations' (1975: 17). That is, we are not dealing with a simple linear progression towards the standard, but with a complex system that allows for, and indeed covertly places high value upon, a measure of backsliding according to earlier norms of the L2. Bickerton (1975: 17) could well have been speaking of SAIE when he wrote:

>a synchronic cut across the Guyanese community is indistinguishable from a diachronic cut across a century and a half of linguistic development, and that therefore a grammar of the whole Guyanese continuum should be indistinguishable from the diachronic grammar that could have been written if all Guyanese had moved as close to standard English as some of them have. Thus the Guyanese continuum, far from being a quagmire of anomalies designed to bedevil the descriptivist, reveals itself as an unusual, though perhaps not unique, case
of the preservation of diachronic changes in a synchronic state, and therefore an unrivalled natural laboratory for the study of linguistic change processes which can normally only be inferred from written materials.

Substituting SAIE for Guyanese, and century and a quarter for century and a half would yield a fairly accurate assessment of the state of SAIE morpho-syntax. How does one go about tapping the source of variation?

2.1.1 The sample

This study focuses on speech rather than writing, since we are dealing with a primarily oral dialect. A few plays have successfully exploited the oral resources of SAIE for satirical and humorous purposes, but it has not otherwise been committed to writing. Schoolchildren's essays aim at standard English, though in effect what is often achieved is a near-standard, with some dialect constructions filtering through. Whereas previous studies of SAIE have concentrated on analysing the written efforts of students (Bughwan 1970), and on eliciting morphological features from students under experimental conditions (Crossley 1988), for the purposes of this study the obvious task was to get as close as possible to the natural idiom of everyday speech of a cross-section of the community. The successful project would have to ensure representativeness of the speakers studied, and the 'naturalness' of their speech. Regarding the size and composition of a useful linguistic sample Sankoff (1980: 51–2) says the following:

The literature, as well as our own experience, would suggest that even for quite complex communities samples of more than about 150 individuals tend to be redundant, bringing increasing data-handling problems with diminishing analytical returns. It is crucial, however, that the sample be well chosen, and representative of all social subsections about which one wishes to generalise.

The SAIE sample consisted of 150 speakers from various parts of Natal, interviewed between 1987 and 1988. In consultation with sociologists who had experience in questionnaire-based studies of the community, interviewees from representative areas in Natal were chosen:

Coastal Natal: the city of Durban (see map 3), and two rural areas on the south coast – Umkomaas and Sezela (see Umzinto district, marked '3' in map 4);
Variation in SAIE

Only places having more than 1000 Asiatics are indicated
Figures in brackets indicate number of Asiatics with a knowledge of English

- Johannesburg 10256 (7565)
- Benoni 1070 (854)

Map 3 Distribution of Indians in South Africa – 1936

The Midlands: the city of Pietermaritzburg, and the country town, Howick (see Pietermaritzburg district, marked ‘8’ in map 4);

The Uplands: the city of Ladysmith (see Klip River district, marked ‘32’ in map 4), the town, Estcourt and the country town, Mooi River (see Estcourt district, marked ‘19’ in map 4) and the country towns, Dannhauser and Glencoe (see Dundee district, marked ‘34’ in map 4).

The number of potential SAIE speakers roughly determined the number of interviews conducted. For the cities, municipal valuation rolls formed the basis of deciding whom to interview, addresses being chosen on a systematic basis. That is, given a valuation roll for “Indian residential areas” the number of pages was divided by the number of interviews required, yielding a number (say, x). An interview with one of the householders from every $x$th page was planned. Should the occupants not be at home (a rare occurrence), or should the property be undeveloped (also rare), the simple expedient of knocking on the next door proved fruitful. This procedure could in certain circumstances lead to a bias against people who are not at home by day (workers, students, etc.) However, this bias was overcome by conducting the interviews mainly during December to January, when schools and most factories close down for the annual summer holidays, affording the fieldworker a good chance of finding adults at home. Within the large city of Durban care had to be
Gathering of data

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS

1. Port Shepstone 2571 (1112)
2. Alfred SB (58)
3. Umbilo 12576 (2718)
4. Maputo 160 (98)
5. Pietermaritzburg 3205 (3214)
6. Richmond 959 (546)
7. Camperdown 512 (105)
8. Utrecht 11225 (6847)
9. Polokwane 57 (36)
10. Underberg 16 (16)
11. Impendle 287 (58)
12. Lions River 1579 (514)
13. Durban 3891 (44570)
14. Nkomazi 0 (0)
15. Idasa 10187 (6000)
16. Lower Tugela 8953 (4861)
17. Mapumula 13 (8)
18. New Hanover 1137 (2630)
19. Estcourt 1587 (848)
20. Umbetho 1255 (479)
21. Hluphakazi 31 (14)
22. Nqomazi 0 (0)
23. Babanango 12 (4)

Map 4 Distribution of Indians by magisterial districts of Natal - 1936

Brackets indicate number of Asians with knowledge of English.
Circles on the map indicate areas where fieldwork was undertaken.

The number of speakers interviewed in each area is given in table 2.1.

In rural areas (Umkomaas and Sezela), for which valuation rolls were not available, a judgement sample was used, and interviews set up at times suitable to householders. The speech of one person per house was analysed. If there were several people willing to participate, a group interview was held, and the idiolect of the person contributing the most was chosen for subsequent analysis. No other constraints were imposed on choice of informants, beyond place of residence. It was hoped that this would cover the potential variables of social class/income; ancestral language and town...
versus country. Other variables like gender, age and education were controlled on an *ad hoc* basis, where possible. For example, if in a particular locality it was found that female interviewees were outnumbering males, where a choice subsequently presented itself in a particular household, a male was selected.

A comparison with statistics in recent government censuses is given in appendix A. There is a very close fit between the proportions of the cells relevant for sociolinguistic analysis and those reported for Indian South Africans in recent censuses. In particular, the fit for educational levels, ancestral language, gender and rural versus urban domicile was very close. For age levels the correspondence was close, except for the greater proportion of persons over fifty and the smaller proportion of people under twenty in my survey. No data on social class is available in the censuses for comparison. Both the census and my survey give a picture of a community that is now largely urban, largely moderately educated (with seven to twelve years of schooling), with a majority of people having Tamil and Bhojpuri as ancestral languages.

I believe that the size and representativeness of the sample were adequate for the purpose of syntactic analysis within a social framework. By way of comparison, Labov's (1966) study of New York City English drew on eighty-eight speakers, Trudgill's Norwich study (1974) involved sixty interviewees, and Macaulay's project in Glasgow (1977) was based on
forty-eight interviews. Further details regarding the sizes of more salient groupings (by age, gender, etc.) will be given in the various tables in chapter 3.

2.1.2 Conducting the interviews

No fieldworker in sociolinguistics can afford to ignore the insights of Labov (1972a) and Milroy (1987) concerning the gathering of data. Labov’s work addresses a number of theoretical and practical issues relating to the nature of the vernacular and ways of studying it. He characterises the vernacular as follows: (1972a: 208)

In other styles, we find more systematic speech, where the fundamental relations which determine the course of linguistic evolution can be seen most clearly. This is the ‘vernacular’ – the style in which the minimum attention is given to the monitoring of speech. Observation of the vernacular gives us the most systematic data for our analysis of linguistic structure.

The linguist-fieldworker has to confront what Labov has identified as the observer’s paradox – that the vernacular which (s)he hopes to elicit and observe is precisely the speech form which a speaker uses when not being observed. Labov suggested ways of circumventing the paradox, chiefly by devising ways of breaking down barriers between interviewer and interviewee. This involved, *inter alia*, group interviews and interaction with natural (i.e. self-selected) groups like adolescent gangs. Labov (1972a: 209) believed, however, that the best way of obtaining sufficient good data on the speech of any one person is through an individual tape-recorded interview. He suggested that making subjects relive a traumatic experience at a certain stage of the interview (“danger of death” episodes) caused them to drop their linguistic guard temporarily. In focussing on the event rather than the act of speaking, people came closest to the vernacular within an interview situation.

Milroy (1980) has preferred to study speech within the social network it is embedded in. For traditional, working-class communities with dense social networks like the ones she studied in Belfast, data can best be elicited by participant observation. Becoming a member of the speech community gives one access to vernacular forms in a way that asking questions as an outsider would not.

For the purposes of this study the interview proved more viable than Milroy’s social-network approach for several reasons. Firstly, as a native speaker of SAIE I already had access to speech networks (more traditional ones based in a rural area, as well as more recent urban ones). These
networks ensure that I come across a whole range of variation, including hyper-vernacular forms, on a daily basis, and three different substrate-influenced varieties. The issue for this native speaker cum fieldworker is not whether he is digging deep enough, but whether his own speech networks are replicated on a wider scale. For this reason it seemed more important to spread my nets widely across the speech community in Natal and obtain statistical weighting for "deep" and highly variable phenomena that I had been exposed to all my life. Entering some other network over an extended period of time would have entailed pretending to be an outsider attempting to become an insider. In addition to the 150 individual interviews, I took the opportunity of recording (covertly) close friends and relatives at random, and used these to make inferences about style-shifting, a complex area which cannot be resolved by individual interviews.

Success with the individual interviews was enhanced by several factors. As a member of the same minority group within apartheid society, I found ready acceptance in most homes. None of the interviews were pre-arranged, as previous experience had shown that this tended to give the event formal status. Furthermore, older people would have been tempted to arrange for a younger, educated person to fill in. Most people were ready to talk, despite my being less than explicit about all the objectives of the study. In country districts people were positively helpful. I took care not to present myself as a figure of authority, and only if specifically asked did I indicate my position as academic in a language department. Ohmann (1986) suggests how important the dimension of relative power between interviewer and interviewee can be in influencing the latter's speech choices. Many people took me to be a minor participant in some university-based project which I seemed to know very little about. Only university-educated people expressed the desire to know details concerning the project.

In initiating the interview I generally used a mid-range speech level, neither too educated nor incongruously uneducated. I subsequently accommodated (unconsciously) to the type of speech favoured by the interviewee (see further 2.4.1). The 'danger of death' question, which most often led to accounts of motor accidents and swimming mishaps, proved very useful in extracting vernacular styles (cf. Milroy 1987: 40 for a contrary finding in her Belfast fieldwork).

The ideal interviewer ought to be chameleon-like in adapting to different interview conditions, and sympathetically urge forth stories waiting to be told, and participate in them. Early in his work Labov had placed emphasis on those 'channel cues' which are suggestive of a successful interview approximating natural speech: laughter, variation in pace and pitch,
questions being asked of the interviewer and several people talking at the same time.

I was fortunate in having many informants who were naturally garrulous, and who used the vernacular without having to be prodded. The one group who – for the most part – gave very little in the way of long pieces of conversation comprised teenagers. They were conspicuously on their guard, putting their best foot forward, answering no more than was required, and had generally no experience with death, disease or evil (yet!). Their overcareful style can be attributed to the influence of the classroom (ongoing for this group), and to the fact that many young speakers are still carving out their own style for conversing with outsiders. For many SAIE speakers this process only comes with their entry into the job market, where they face a variety of English speech styles close at hand for the first time. Many of the male adolescents normally use an extensive slang vocabulary in their relaxed style. The kind of everyday discourse I was attempting to elicit would often be couched in slang, yet slang was inappropriate for conversations with an educated stranger – ergo the monosentential replies.

As far as the quality of the recordings – all performed with a micro-tape recorder – goes, there were no problems in decipherment, since interviews were almost always conducted indoors. For phonetic and morphological analysis all 150 interviews proved adequate. However, for detailed analysis of a particular syntactic construction, not all interviews proved equal in length, richness and value of the data. As we shall see in chapter 3, for the detailed comparison of certain constructions it will be necessary to analyse 134, rather than all 150 interviews.

A problem raised by Macaulay (1988) regarding the term vernacular is of especial significance to this study. He points to three uses of the term in recent sociolinguistic literature (there are other uses in political and non-specialist usage):

(a) a style of speaking in which minimum attention is given to the monitoring of speech (as in the quote above from Labov 1972a: 208);

(b) a non-standard variety that is characteristic of a particular region, class or ethnic group – e.g. Labov’s characterisation of Black English Vernacular in the United States as ‘that relatively uniform grammar found in its most consistent form in the speech of Black youth from 8 to 19 years old who participate fully in the street culture of the inner cities’ (1972b: xiii);

(c) a third (more abstract) sense which overlaps with both the above characterisations is found in the work of Milroy (1980). In this view
(which Macaulay characterises as 'chimerical') few dialect speakers use the vernacular consistently. The base of the vernacular is narrow in terms of the number of speakers using it at a frequent level.

While (a) describes a concrete way of speaking and (b) describes a non-standard variety, (c) denotes a particular manner of using a non-standard variety. The tension between these characterisations can be gauged from the fact that under definition (a) every speaker of a language has a vernacular (including speakers of the standard dialect), whereas this is not true of (b) or (c). Let us label these three uses of the term $V_1$, $V_2$ and $V_3$ respectively.

In a highly fluid continuum characteristic of the New Englishes (see 2.2) I would venture to suggest that a person's vernacular is not necessarily her/his 'lowest' speech style. That is, most speakers command a certain range on the continuum of variation, moving upwards on (special) formal occasions and downward on informal ones. A speaker's unmonitored level is an average value of these. Moving below this level is a consequence of accommodation towards speakers who are significantly lower down on the scale, and requires some special monitoring. (To anticipate my terminology and analysis, this is the same as saying that the vernacular of the speech community as a whole resides in the mesolect rather than the basilect today.) A similar claim for Guyanese Creole (Bickerton 1975: 182) will be considered in 2.2.

Put more concretely in terms of my field interviews: though I was quite successful in eliciting relaxed, informal speech, there was always one level held in reserve for conversation with intimate family members. To expect to elicit this by even the cleverest techniques is unfeasible, unless one were that intimate family member. Each person in this language-shift continuum might have several vernacular styles, one for conversing with friends, one for intimate family, one for close friends of the opposite sex, etc., each one requiring a minimal amount of monitoring. Of relevance here are the five styles posited by Joos (1959): intimate, casual, consultative, formal and frozen. The vast majority of my interviews showed a casual style, some a consultative style and only a handful an intimate style. Bell's (1984) characterisation of stylistic variation as a type of 'audience design' – a special 'tailoring' of language to fit the requirements of various types of listener – is of relevance here. It is possible for a good interviewer and interviewee to enact the roles that require casual style, but to go further into the realm of intimate discourse is rarely possible. In my experience, interviewees under forty who treated the interview as occasion for their most intimate style proved to be socially inept, from the actual content of
their speech. This is not meant unkindly: of the four speakers who fell into this category one was inebriated at the time of the interview, one adult male of thirty-five still required his mother to organise his life for him; one forty-year-old female was said to be slightly retarded by her family, and lived as a spinster doing the domestic chores while the rest of the family went out to work; another forty-year-old fell into almost the same category. Of these four none were confident enough to enter into marriage (still a compulsory institution in the community), all were dependent upon elders – the males upon their mothers, the females upon elder brothers. I shall return to the problem of what counts as vernacular at the end of 2.2, after developing more terminology and illustrating the syntactic range to be found in SAIE.

2.2 The polylectal continuum

It is clear from the wide range of competence exhibited by the 150 speakers that SAIE is not a unitary phenomenon. The interview output of a sixty-year-old housewife and that of a middle-class, urban schoolgirl are startlingly different. Although a case can be made that the speech forms of these two do not belong to the same ‘dialect’, this is only true if we compare them in isolation. Taking all the possible varieties in between these two extremes, we will find it hard to locate rigid cut-off points between them.

The terms basilect, mesolect and acrolect are used by creolists wishing to describe the wide range of (overlapping) varieties that creole languages develop over time, especially if they remain under the influence of the colonial language. Basilect denotes the ‘deep’ creole, furthest removed from the colonial language; acrolect the variety used by members of the creole speech community, which is closest to the colonial language; mesolect denotes the mid-range. These lects themselves may have more finely distinguishable varieties, so that one could speak of basilects (upper, mid and lower), mesolects, etc. Most commonly, it is the mesolect which shows the greatest variation. The terms are, according to Bickerton (1971: 464) used for convenience of reference, rather than in any rigorous sense. Implicit in the terminology is the claim that the morpho-syntactic variation is so great as to warrant the setting up of subsystems, and that ‘ordinary’ regional dialects of English do not generally exhibit such a range. It is true that everyone makes adjustments in their speech according to register and audience, but in a creole system the changes are immense, affecting morphology and syntax quite drastically.
Platt (1975) has suggested that the range in the New English variety spoken in Singapore (Singlish) is reminiscent of the lectal levels discussed in creole studies. The basilect of a New English variety is the type of English spoken by people with little contact with L1-English and with little or no formal education; the acrolect is the variety used by mainly educated speakers showing but slight differences from the colonial form of English. In terms of Bell’s persuasive notion of style as audience design, it is necessary to add that New Englishes differ from the ‘mainstream’ varieties he considered in a crucial way. Because of the differential circumstances of acquisition (L2 for some, equal L1 for some, only L1 for others), the type of ‘tailoring’ favoured by individuals is significantly more variable than in regional English dialects, say. It is this differential range and ability, resulting in large-scale downshift, which necessitates the terms basilect, mesolect, etc. I do not think that these terms have any significance for speech varieties that are acquired in an environment with a long tradition of English as the main (first) language of a community.

‘Downshift’ in SAIE will be exemplified in 2.4; it is first necessary to characterise the lectal range. Samples of these follow.

**Basilect:**

**QUESTION:** How often (do) you go to Durban?

**RESPONSE:** Where we go! Hardly we go, visit Durban too. Sometime ‘olidays, my ‘usband take his brother’s house an’ his sistern-law there an’ all of his connection. My connection-all staying Merebank. Sometime holidays we go, but this year ‘oliday we had, y’know, like we had some problem an’ all, like we want to go visit, I don’ like to go stay that two-three weeks an’ all – they living ‘ard life like us too, they earn little bit money too. We must think too, we just can’t go sit down, y’know, like brother or sister, anybody can be, like Durban-side they must pay water, this-thing rate, lights, that-all they must pay ... (55-year-old, rural, female, working class)

**Mesolect:**

**QUESTION:** Tell me about the time you had a heart-attack.

**RESPONSE:** ... I went an’ bought one soda water. So I had a soda water in the cafe, I took my coat out, took my jersey an’ all out, I chucked it on the table. I sat, sat, sat – I said no’, I felt I must reach home. I didn’t trust anybody to drive that van because it was lent to me from somebody else. So somehow or other I managed, I jumped into the van, an’ I drove the van an’ came, I just came an’ parked here an’ lied down. My son was here, this second, third fellow of mine. Phoned by
Dr T. G. Singh, while I'm lying on the bed, I donno what happened, the wife gave me little bit of sugar-water. I just drank that sugar-water, and eh, just when I finished drinking the sugar-water I became normal ... (60-year-old, urban, male, working class)

**Acrolect:**

**Question:** What would you say was the worst moment of your life?

**Response:** I would say it was my second year in university when I was doing law. And I'd switched from my BA in my first year to Law in my second year—because my first year BA—I mean, I got through so easily that I felt 'varsity is easy now, let me do Law. So I switched to Law, but unfortunately for me, I—towards the end of the year I—my wisdom y'know—I had this wisdom problem—and I had it quite severely.¹ But I was determined to go on writing. And that year I was doing Latin and Private Law and all those things—five different courses, simply because my sister-in-law is now an attorney and she was doing most of these courses ... (25-year-old, urban, female, middle class)

The example of the acrolect happens to accord with standard English norms. However, there are some non-standard features to be found in the acrolect (see 2.3)—in addition to its distinctive phonetic characteristics.

A more recent development is the rise of a small group of well-educated people who have acquired newly created jobs as television announcers, especially in programmes geared to an Indian listenership. Such post-acrolectal speakers, who use an essentially non-SAIE system (drawing largely, but not solely, upon Conservative South African English), fall outside the ambit of this study.

### 2.3 Characteristics of the basilect

The basilect is a focussed variety, in the sense of Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985). That is, it has clearly defined characteristics at all levels of structure (phonetic, lexical and morpho-syntactic), unlike the other subvarieties of SAIE, which show greater fluidity (diffuse, in their terms). Although basilectal speech carries little overt prestige in the SAIE community, it is nevertheless intelligible to all SAIE speakers. We shall see that this is not true of one sub-variety of SAIE spoken by a small set of individuals, which I shall characterise in section 2.5 as pre-basilectal. It is actually easier to define a basilectal speaker than the basilect itself. The problem that gives rise to this apparent contradiction is that we are
dealing with a continuum rather than with discrete lectal types. There are very few linguistic features that occur in the basilect alone. Definition of the lects can, for the most part, only be executed on the basis of frequency of occurrence, rather than in terms of categorical presence or absence. Experience in linguistic description teaches us not to expect clear edges and watertight compartmentalisation of sociolects. We can define a basilectal speaker as one who uses feature X (to be listed), even in public situations, and is unaware of the stigma attached to using the feature beyond an informal or family domain. (That is, the definition includes attitudes to language use, not just morpho-syntactic frequencies.) The active competence of a basilectal speaker does not extend beyond the basilect, though (s)he would have no difficulty in comprehending informal acrolect. (Most acrolectal speakers would adjust downwards in speaking to her/him anyway).

An acrolectal speaker is one whose upper limit is close to standard English, but who may prefer a mesolectal style in domestic and peer-group settings. That is, few – if any – people have the acrolect as vernacular. A mesolectal speaker is one who is aware of the inappropriacy of basilectal speech beyond a domestic or peer group setting, but whose ‘public’ style falls somewhere between the basilect and the acrolect.

It is possible to slot speakers into one of these groups on the impression that their speech makes. My impressionistic classification of the 150 speakers interviewed is given in table 2.2. The ratio of speakers of the pre-basilect:basilect:mesolect:acrolect is thus roughly 1:4:12:3. My classification of speakers is based on their overall linguistic performance in the informal-interview situation. In 3.8 and 5.2 I will examine the extent to which this impression is backed up by the statistical picture of speakers’ use of particular syntactic and morphological variables.

For the present task of characterising the differences between the three SAIE lects, I have chosen eight speakers from each level, whose affiliation is unproblematic, and quantified their use of thirteen salient linguistic features. These features will not be examined in any great detail, since the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-basilect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-basilect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 Absence of auxiliary inversion among twenty-four speakers in three types of questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wh-</th>
<th>Yes-no</th>
<th>Rhetorical</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>12/17</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>38/25</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>3/7</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>4/9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>0/9</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/13</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15/33</td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>33/57</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aim of this section is to provide an overview of the syntactic variation existing in SAIE. Chapter 3 and parts of 4 and 5 will examine a few select features in detail, as used by all (or almost all) 150 interviewees.

2.3.1 Syntactic characteristics

2.3.1.1 Auxiliary inversion

Common in most varieties of informal English is the use of statement word order, with rising sentence intonation for non-echo questions, where the syntax of formal standard English requires inversion of an auxiliary verb and subject NP. An example is You can do it? for formal standard English Can you do it? Non-application of the inversion rule occurs in most other varieties of South African English, where it is limited to interrogatives. SAIE generalises the rule to include wh-questions. That SAIE makes particularly high use of non-inversion in questions can be gauged from the statistics in table 2.3, and from occasional remarks by people exposed to informal use of the dialect for the first time. The inversion rule does, however, occur in SAIE, mainly by educated speakers in more formal contexts. Although not many interrogatives were used by interviewees, there were enough to illustrate the variation by lects. (See further 2.4, especially 2.4.1). Sentence (1) shows the high occurrence of non-inversion in the basilect, while (2) illustrates the variation possible in the mesolect.

(1) What / must / do? If my father say I must go an' plough today what I can do?
(2) I think it's bit too dark, the tea. Must I put some more milk in it?... Now you haven't... you didn't go back to eating meat?... So whereabout in India she's? How many years she's there now?

2.3.1.2 Do-support in questions

For many SAIE speakers interrogative questions lacking an auxiliary have a parallel syntax to those which have an auxiliary; i.e. they do not use do in this construction. In most styles, SAIE has You go there? and You saw
Table 2.4 Non-use of do-support in wh- and yes-no questions by twenty-four speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wh-</th>
<th>Yes–no</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>14/17</td>
<td>21/26</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

me? where other dialects, including standard English require Do you go there? and Did you see me? Again, anecdotal evidence suggests that speakers of other dialects of South African English coming into contact with informal SAIE notice the frequent absence of do-support. (This rule, of course, goes hand in hand with the (non-) inversion rule.) Note that do-support always occurs in negative statements and negative questions, except in the pre-basilect.

2.3.1.3 Rhetorical questions

One particular type of rhetorical question in SAIE, formed by the placement of a wh-word (chiefly where, less commonly what, when and how), differs crucially from its standard English counterpart in semantic terms. In English English these words retain a sense of place, time, thing or manner, when used rhetorically. In the following English English sentences where implies ‘nowhere’, what implies ‘nothing’, when implies ‘never’ and how implies ‘in no way’, if used rhetorically.

(3) Where (on earth) will I find it?
(4) What could I say?
(5) When will I find the girl of my dreams?
(6) How could I have let him do that?

In SAIE the semantics of such rhetorical markers need not be restricted in this way, though like (3)–(6) they all carry emphatic negative import. Thus, one of my interviewees’ reply to the comment, But you look young, was, Where young! (= ‘I’m certainly not young’).

Generally, the rhetorical use of where implies ‘certainly not’; while the use of what is more confrontational. Thus What I must go! indicates ‘I don’t want to go/ Why should I go?’ Note that a standard English equivalent with inversion is not possible (*What must I go?). As table 2.3 suggests these questions do not allow inversion in the basilect.
Table 2.5 *The use of rhetorical questions by twenty-four speakers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sentences (7)–(10), together with the interviewer’s questions that gave rise to the first two, give some indication of the semantics of the construction in SAIE.

(7)  Q: Do you go to Durban much?
     A: Where we go, hardly we go! (= ‘We don’t go, we hardly go!’)
(8)  Q: Your age?
     A: Forty, what must feel shy, must tell no’? (= ‘Forty. Why must one feel ashamed of admitting one’s age?’)
(9)  When I told him! (= ‘I told him long ago’)
(10) How they were saying! (= ‘They were saying terrible things’)

The multiple origins of this construction are discussed in 7.3.3.2(c). Although fairly widespread across the SAIE spectrum in ultra-casual speech (in my experience), the construction was used mainly by the basilectal speakers in the interview situation (see table 2.5).

2.3.1.4 Copula deletion

Variable use of copula *be* is characteristic of some varieties of English, perhaps the best known being US Black English (Labov 1972a). SAIE makes limited use of copula deletion as a syntactic rule. A large measure of the deletion is phonological in nature, the segment most affected in this (non-rhotic) dialect being [a]. *Are* (or its reduced form *'re*) between a word-final vowel and a word-initial consonant is deleted (as in *You very clever*). If the following word is the indefinite article, then *'re* surfaces (as in *You’re an ass*), though the latter is more plausibly interpreted as ‘linking *r*’. The forms affected are thus *we, you, they plus are*, and not *I’m, he’s, she’s or its*. The following (informal) paradigms give some indication of the phonological nature of the rule (where * denotes an ungrammatical form):

* *I a sick man.*
  We sick people.
* *You a sick man.*
  Y’all sick people.
* *He a sick man.*

* *I very sick*
  We very sick.
* *You very sick.*
  Y’all very sick.
* *He very sick.*

(Full forms with copula *is* and *are*, are also used.) Whereas *I’m* is never reduced to *I*, the third-person *’s* copula form is occasionally deleted,
Table 2.6 Non-phonological copula deletion by twelve speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-NP</th>
<th>-Adj</th>
<th>-PP</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>4/26</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>12/56</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>0/42</td>
<td>0/25</td>
<td>0/21</td>
<td>0/88</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>0/17</td>
<td>0/32</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/59</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due mainly to restrictions on time, only twelve speakers were examined for copula deletion in this section.

possibly on account of consonant-cluster simplification – see sentences (11) and (12). Another rule favours absence of the copula in negative environments (13) and (14), or in sentences containing the deictics that, and less commonly this, there, here, as in (15)–(16). Finally, if the subject of the sentence is deleted so is the copula, as in (17)–(18).

(11) Vijen very clever, man. \( (is > \theta) \)
(12) What Dan's age? \( (= \text{‘What’s Dan’s age?’}) \)
(13) Harry not there. \( (is > \theta) \)
(14) This man not there, the children won’t look after me. \( (= \text{‘If this man isn’t there...’}) \)
(15) My brother that. \( (= \text{‘That’s my brother/He’s my brother’}) \)
(16) From Sezela that people. \( (= \text{‘Those people are from Sezela’}) \)
(17) Lot Christian people, lot of them. \( (there are > \theta) \)
(18) Such a lazy fellow! \( (he’s > \theta) \)

A sentence like (18) is permissible in informal standard English; it has been included here because it is the only type used by acrolectal speakers. The complications of copula absence need not detain us any further, since our aim in this section is simply to illustrate variable use of the construction made by different groups of speakers. In table 2.6 phonologically motivated absences of are and sentences deleting both the subject and the copula have been excluded. We might note in passing that copula deletion is used in intimate styles by all speakers, though as the taped data shows, mainly basilectal speakers use it in other styles. (The figures in table 2.6 include occurrences of both present and past forms of the copula, the latter being hardly ever deleted.)

A strong indication that we are not dealing just with phonological absence of the copula is the fact that there is significant strong correlation in the basilect between copula absence and speakers from a Dravidian language background (where the copula is frequently deleted under non-phonological conditions in the present tense – see 6.3.2).
2.3.1.5 Variation in the use of -ing

Whereas most speakers use the be + -ing morphemes as markers of progressive aspect, basilectal speakers extend their meaning considerably, to include the following:

(a) **Historic present of narration**: In this construction, used as a stylistic device to create a vivid and immediate effect, the present form of be combines with -ing, instead of the expected past form of be – see sentence (19). This popular option is not used in the acrolect, which is a more detached speech variety by comparison. Another type of historical present uses be + -ing to replace the preterite, with certain verbs – for example, tell in (20). While the conversational historic present is found in most varieties of English (Wolfson 1979), the form used is usually the simple present.

(b) **Perfective aspect**: In sentences with an adverbial phrase of time some speakers use be + -ing, instead of the have + PP of standard English – for example, (21). The reduced form 're is deleted after the pronoun forms that govern it.

(c) **Past habitual**: In rare instances the -ing is used in place of used to, as in (22). The more usual option, however, even in the basilect is to use used to or 'll (the reduced form of will).

(d) **Stative/non-progressive**: This seemingly contradictory use of be + -ing is very common. Verbs that are stative in English English are used with the -ing ending, with the forms of be usually undergoing (phonologically motivated) deletion – sentence (23).

(19) I'm suffering here now and the pain is getting worse. (= ‘I was suffering and the pain was getting worse’)

(20) Hawa, she's telling she cooks an' all. (= ‘Don't you remember, she said she (still) cooks and so forth’)

(21) I'm staying this house seven years. (= ‘I've been staying in this house for seven years’)

(22) Soonez the rain come, saying, 'Look here, we mus' go an' plough today'. (= ‘As soon as the rain would/used to come, he would/used to say…’)

(23) We thinking now why we can't get eddication. (= ‘We now regret not getting an education’)

Limitations on space prevent a detailed examination of the use of tense and aspect in SAIE in this work. For our current concerns we need to note the prevalence of non-progressive be + -ing in the basilect, as opposed to the other lects (table 2.8). A phrase with be + -ing in the basilect can have any of the interpretations given in table 2.7, depending upon context. Note that only functions 1, 6 and 7 are possible in colloquial standard English, given an appropriate complement and/or discourse context.
Table 2.7 *The functions of be + -ing in SAIE in the phrase I’m working and their formal equivalents in standard English*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantics of the phrase I'm working in SAIE</th>
<th>Formal standard English equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Present progressive</td>
<td>‘I’m working’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stative</td>
<td>‘I work’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preterite</td>
<td>‘I worked’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perfect, progressive</td>
<td>‘I’ve been working’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Historical present, non-progressive</td>
<td>‘I worked’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Historical present, progressive</td>
<td>‘I was working’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Future progressive</td>
<td>‘I will be working’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8 *Use of be + -ing by twenty-four speakers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present be + -ing</th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic present</td>
<td>39 (28.1%)</td>
<td>8 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>70 (50.4%)</td>
<td>18 (32.1%)</td>
<td>13 (39.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>5 (3.6%)</td>
<td>3 (5.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present progressive</td>
<td>24 (17.3%)</td>
<td>27 (48.2%)</td>
<td>19 (56.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past be + -ing</th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past progressive</td>
<td>24 (52.2%)</td>
<td>20 (48.8%)</td>
<td>16 (94.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>11 (23.9%)</td>
<td>15 (36.6%)</td>
<td>1 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past habitual</td>
<td>11 (23.9%)</td>
<td>5 (12.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By considering the present and past progressive uses of *be + -ing* in table 2.8 a clear picture of the differences between the three lects emerges: *be + -ing* signals progressive activity a quarter of the time in the basilect (i.e. 48/185 or 25.9 per cent); half of the time in the mesolect (47/97 or 48.5 per cent); and approximately three-quarters of the time in the acrolect (35/50 or 70 per cent).

2.3.1.6 Reduplication

This is a feature occurring widely in pidgins and creoles (Todd 1974: 19), New Englishes (Platt, Weber and Ho 1984: 114–5), and in Indic (but not Dravidian) languages.² In informal SAIE it is a favoured device, used for emphasis, to denote intensity, frequency or distribution. The following categories, given in decreasing order of frequency, may be reduplicated.
Characteristics of the basilect

Basilect Mesolect Acrolect

Stative Present progressive Historical present Perfective

Figure 2.1 Present be + -ing by lectal group

(a) Adjectives: for example, big-big apples = ‘many and big apples’, clever-clever people = ‘many clever people, various clever people’. Note that the construction differs from the English construction in a blue, blue day, since SAIE reduplication does not generally occur with singular nouns (hence *a big-big apple is ungrammatical). In terms of intonation SAIE treats the reduplicated adjective as a compound, whereas blue, blue day uses a ‘comma intonation’.

(b) Verbs: In participial and gerundial form reduplication is extremely common:

(24) Waiting-waiting we got so fed-up. (= ‘We got fed-up of waiting for so long’)
(25) I’m running-running, but I can’t catch him. (= ‘Even though I was running fast (and for long) I couldn’t catch him’)

Other verb forms do not generally permit reduplication, except if they are used as the equivalent of a gerund or participle:
(26) He ran-ran and came. (= 'He came (by) running')
(27) *He ran-ran to the shop.
(28) We talked-talked and stayed. (= 'We spent the time talking')
(29) *We talked-talked to the man.

(c) Adverbs: Now-now in common with the rest of South African English is a frequently used informal equivalent of 'immediately'. Most commonly, adverbs denoting speed or urgency allow reduplication (fast-fast, quick-quick – less commonly quickly-quickly, hurriedly-hurriedly). Other items that occurred in the corpus were separate-separate (= 'separately') and little-little (= 'little by little').

(d) Verb phrases: As a stylistic rule for creating suspense or to emphasise duration a phrase – most usually a verb phrase – is repeated. (Although this is not strictly lexical reduplication, there is some similarity between reduplication and phrasal repetition.)

(30) An' this chap sitting down, looking at me, looking at me – turned round and says me ...
Table 2.9 Reduplication and phrasal repetition by twenty-four speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phrasal</th>
<th>Word-level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) *Wh- words*: In SAIE (especially the basilect) duplication of *who*, *what* and *where* has a grammatical function, as shown in (31)–(33).

(31) Who-who came? (= ‘Who of several people came’)
(32) Where-where y’all went? (= ‘Where of several places did you (pl.) go?’)
(33) What-what he told you? (‘What of several things did he tell you?’)

This type of reduplication, rare in other English varieties (if not non-existent), is considered from an acquisitional perspective in 7.3.3.3.

(f) *Other*: Reduplication of nouns is not allowed, except in a few items in children’s speech, where they function as adjectives, for example, *house-house* game (= ‘a game involving houses’), *lie-lie* (= ‘in jest, artificial’). Grammatical elements like auxiliaries, prepositions, conjunctions and intensifiers very rarely undergo this process. I have heard expressions like *must-must* to denote intensity of (internal) obligation, for example, *He must eat pickle, must, must, must*. This is a special type of external repetition, however, since *He must-must eat pickle* is ungrammatical. No such restrictions occur in the neologisms *so-so* and *just-just*: hence, *so-so big* (= ‘so big and so many’), *just-just now* (= ‘very recently’). The last two are not yet in widespread use.

Table 2.9 gives the statistics of word and phrasal reduplication among the twenty-four speakers analysed.

2.3.1.7 Only as focus marker

Basilectal speakers use *only* (phonetically [onli:], [wanli:] or [wâli:]) as focus marker after NPs.

(34) I stay next door to my mother only. (= ‘I live right next door to my mother’)
(35) Q: Who’s the youngest here?
   A: She’s youngest only. (= ‘She’s the youngest’ – with stress on she)

*Only* may also be used in its English English sense, limiting the meaning of a lexical item. In (34)–(35) this ‘limiting’ meaning is only a secondary
Table 2.10 *Use of* only *as a focus marker by twenty-four speakers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.11 *Use of* modal *'d* *by twenty-four speakers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0/11</td>
<td>0/8</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nuance, however. Table 2.10 shows that focus *only* is solely a basilectal feature (with one exception). For correlations between the use of this focus marker with specific substrate languages, see 6.3.2.

2.3.1.8 Deletion of modal *'d*

Modal *'d* (the reduced form of *would*) is rare in SAIE, except at the acrolectal end of the continuum. It is generally replaced by *'ll* (the reduced form of *will*). A sentence like *He said he'd do it* is decidedly acrolectal; a basilectal equivalent would be *Daffale said he'll do it* (*daffale* < that fellow).

Before verbs or adverbs beginning with liquids, modal *'d* (or rather, its equivalent *'ll*) is deleted. Thus, on paper a sentence like *I like to go there* is potentially ambiguous in SAIE, stating a fact ('I like going there') or a wish ('I'd like to go there'). Intonation patterns clearly disambiguate them in speech, however (the first is distinguishable by a prolonged rise–fall contour over *like*).

The adverb *rather* frequently occurs without modal *'d*, as in some other varieties of South African English (for example, Cape 'Coloured' English). In these varieties a sentence like *I rather do my work now* has immediate force, expressing a definite choice, not a hypothetical one. That *rather* has undergone a semantic shift can be seen from (36), which has the force of a polite imperative.

(36) You rather do it now. ( = 'You had better do it now')

Table 2.11 gives a simple count of the actual attestations of *'d* in its standard use.
2.3.1.9 Rephonologised English lexis

As a last illustration of the differences between the lects in an informal-interview situation, I present five items from English which have undergone phonological and semantic change, and have low prestige in SAIE today. *Intappears* (derived from *it appears*) is used by older speakers as an equivalent of *apparently*. It is not quite equivalent to its etymon, which belongs to more formal registers, since it is followed by S complements rather than S (i.e. *that* + S) complements. Thus (37) is the norm in the basilect, whereas (38) is unattested.

(37) Intappears they coming next week.
(38) /*Intappears that they coming next week.

Likewise *hawa* (phonetically [hæwə:] or [hawə:]) and *dawa* ([dæwə:] or [dawə:]) are not identical to their etymological sources, *here you are* and *there you are*. They have three different functions.

(a) As isolated phrases they are semantically equivalent to their sources – see (40).
(b) Followed by S, they have an emphatic function, equivalent to ‘of course, I told you, don’t you remember?’, etc. – see (39).
(c) Followed by an NP they are equivalent to *here is/there is* – see (41).

In their emphatic function (b) *hawa* and *dawa* may co-occur with their etymological sources: thus, *Dawa its there*.

A prominent sentence negator in SAIE is *hakke* (my spelling, phonetically [ʰækɛ], sometimes [ʰəkɛ],) probably based on *huh-uh*.

(42) Q: Did you see them?
    A: (emphatic) Hakke.

The figures in table 2.12 show that as far as occurrence in an interview situation is concerned, this feature is used mainly by basilectal speakers.

The last feature, not strictly a rephonologisation, concerns the reduction of *was born* to *born*. Although it would appear at first sight to exemplify auxiliary deletion (of passive *be*) it is considered in this subsection for two reasons:
Table 2.12 The use of four rephonologised items by twenty-four speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>intappars</th>
<th>hawa/dawa</th>
<th>hakke</th>
<th>born</th>
<th>% use of born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Speakers who use born without was do not generally use passives with be. (For them passive be is not there to be deleted in the first place.)

(b) Born forms part of a set of semantic terms with similar syntactic properties – see 2.5.1 (k)

Sentence (43) is a not uncommon reply (in terms of structure) to the third question in the interview, regarding the birthplace of interviewees.

(43) I born La Mercy-side. (= ‘I was born in/near La Mercy’)

2.4 Style-shifting between lects

We have established that there is a significant amount of variation in SAIE, according to three so far intuitively defined groupings. A case still has to be made that what we are dealing with here is not a simple co-existent system (in the sense of Tsuzaki 1971) of standard (acrolect) with dialect (basilect), and some random mixing (in the mesolect). Indeed, summarising the variation discussed above in one table (2.13) might suggest that the co-existent-system approach is a viable one.

However, there are several indications that we are dealing with a continuum and not a co-existent system. In the first place SAIE is not the same as the basilect, which is what the standard vs dialect dichotomy forces us to accept. The basilect is best characterised as older (and less educated) speakers’ speech. Children learning English do not learn the basilect first, rather they appear to learn a slice of the continuum, with social class (which includes the parents’ level of education and life expectations for their children) determining exactly which part of the continuum is learnt. Some basilectal constructions are reminiscent of child language, and the cycle of reinforcement between children and grandparents learning English together for the first time in a language-shift situation has already been noted in 1.5. Among the basilectal constructions that children do not appear to learn are: only as focus marker, intappars, and born for was born. In addition, children of middle-class background acquire constructions that are rare in the basilect – for example, do-support, auxiliary inversion, etc. at an early age. However, even middle-class children use
Table 2.13 Summary of the use of twelve features in SAIE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Basilect %</th>
<th>Mesolect %</th>
<th>Acrolect %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Auxiliary shift (absence)</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do-support (absence)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rhetorical questions (presence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Present-copula deletion</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-progressive be + -ing</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reduplication</td>
<td>n: 22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Focus only</td>
<td>n: 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Modal 'd' (absence)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intappears</td>
<td>n: 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hawa/dawa</td>
<td>n: 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hakke</td>
<td>n: 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Born</td>
<td>n: 22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

some typically basilectal forms: hawa, dawa, copula deletion, etc. In summary then, few children appear to learn only the basilect or only the acrolect as a system; rather, they master a part of the continuum: basilect-mesolect; mesolect-acrolect or (rarely) basilect-acrolect.

Bickerton raises the same problem in connection with the Guyanese Creole continuum (1975: 182):

In an evolving system like that of Guyana, what is their vernacular? If by 'vernacular' we imply some unitary, monolectal variety within the system that is somehow more natural to them than any other, there is no clear evidence that any such entity exists, since from an early age, speakers are exposed to a large part of, if not all, the range of variation that exists within the community.

Part of the problem resides in the conflicting sense of the term vernacular. Bickerton contests the applicability of the notion of vernacular for Guyanese Creole that I have labelled V₁, suggesting that a V₂ definition is closer to the mark. Likewise, if we were to characterise SAIE as one focussed system (and this is probably not feasible), that system would be closer to the mesolect than the basilect. The mesolect carries less stigma than either the basilect or the acrolect. That is, in informal situations an SAIE speaker has to strike a balance between not sounding too basilectal (with its undertones of lack of sophistication, rural, aged, etc.) or too acrolectal (which could be interpreted as ‘putting on airs’, being cold, distant, etc.). A similar pattern has been observed for creolophone societies. Washabaugh (1977: 334) describes three ‘pressures’ that adult speakers in a post-creole continuum are caught up in: (a) a pressure to avoid basilectal forms; (b) pressure to acquire the acrolect and (c) pressure to use a casual style in informal situations.
These pressures have far-reaching consequences in the syntactic behaviour of SAIE speakers. Though table 2.13 gives the impression of relatively firm boundaries between the lects (especially between the basilect and the rest), two factors must not be forgotten. Firstly, the table draws upon only twenty-four speakers, eight from each lect, chosen because they seemed the ‘best’ representatives of the lect in question. (My aim has been, so far, simply to illustrate the characteristics of the lects.) Secondly, opportunities to ‘drop back’ to an intimate style are seldom afforded in an interview situation. (The style of many speakers was ‘casual’, but not ‘ultra-casual’—and there is little one can do about that.)

The few glimpses of pressure (c) that were revealed on tape were illuminating, however. One acrolectal speaker, after being drawn into the interviewer’s confidence, and wishing to be friendlier than she had sounded up to that point, asked two questions: Religion – you got that, eh – Catholic? and It must be a really bad experience? The personal tone accompanying these remarks was suggestive of a desire to be friendly and helpful, and was enhanced by the use of syntactic properties that are atypical of the acrolect: topicalisation (see 4.4) and absence of have before got in the first question and non-inversion of auxiliary and subject in the second. Conversely, a mesolectal speaker not wanting to sound over-deferential, uneducated, easy-going (and powerless – see 7.6) might well increase the use of ‘formal’ constructions such as do-support, auxiliary-inversion, perfective have, etc.

Another speaker (a college lecturer), whose interview style can best be described as upper-mesolectal to acrolectal showed similar patterns of style shifting in a generally relaxed interview. In the middle of the session she turned to her husband, who had just returned from shopping, and asked You bought cheese, Farouk? Once again, an intimate style required a switch away from the acrolect constructions (do-support, in this instance). The reply of the husband, a high-school English teacher, was even more revealing. Not realising that the tape was running he said, in an ultra-casual style, No’, but lot butter I bought. This single utterance contains a number of basilectal features that he himself might harangue against in the classroom: a predilection for topicalisation (see 4.4); lot for ‘a lot of’ (or ‘much’ in classroom English); and a basilectal pronunciation, [no:] for acrolectal no (= [nou]).

A third example of the pressure comes from an upper-working-class male whose relaxed performance on tape was clearly mesolectal. In speaking to his six-year-old daughter, he ‘dropped back’ significantly, using the following expressions: Tell what’s the name; Tell – tell how you play colour-cards. Later he had to restrain the exuberant child with Wait,
wait, daddy talking. Incidents like this were by no means isolated: whenever children made an appearance, interviewees downshifted to a basilect-like variety. In this manner the basilect remains the speech form that working-class children are constantly exposed to, and led (covertly) to value. It does not constrain them from acquiring a variety of speech styles, however.

Another argument for not considering the SAIE system to comprise a bipolar ‘dialect plus standard’ mechanism comes from a study of the acrolectal end of the continuum. The acrolect is not the same as standard English or the (White) South African English variety used in Natal. In terms of both accent and syntax there are subtle boundaries which few speakers traverse. Only a few speakers are genuinely bidialectal in SAIE and South African English. These tend to be young professionals employed in prestigious commercial houses, where they come into contact with South African English employers and clients, and a few radio and television announcers. Those who carry the South African English dialect home run the risk of being gently ridiculed (‘Your mummy’s using her Standard Bank accent’) and, in my observation, switch to the mesolect in intimate styles.

What are the syntactic features that the acrolect shares with the basilect and mesolect, and that mark off the acrolect from general South African English?

(a) y’all as plural pronoun form. This form, which is below the level of social consciousness for most SAIE speakers, occurs in informal letters (where it is usually spelt you’ll) and formal speeches. It has a genitive form y’all’s.

(b) Copula attraction to wh- in indirect questions, which results in sentences like (44)–(45):

(44) Do you know what’s/what is roti?
(45) I don’t know when’s/when is the plane going to land.

In sharp contrast is the (standard) South African English equivalent with the copula occurring after the subject NP of the embedded clause. The equivalent of (44) would have stress on sentence final is: Do you know what roti is?

(c) The use of of in partitive genitive constructions beyond standard English contexts:

(46) The trouble with him is he’s got too much of money.

More importantly, when acrolectal speakers drop back in their informal speech with close friends, the level is better characterised as mesolectal (as we might expect from Washabaugh’s pressures). In this respect, I was able
to study three speakers operating within my own speech networks. Two
would qualify as acrolectal in an interview situation, however informal and
casually conducted. In their intimate speech styles (untaped) interesting
changes occur. Speaker A uses a highly elliptical style, with a great deal of
subject deletion, reduplication, non-inverted auxiliaries in questions, lack
of do-support, a high proportion of topicalisation, copula deletion, non-
standard aspect markers like finish and already (see 6.6.1.2) and some
rhetorical negation. These, however, occur only in short, occasional or
intimate comments. For longer discourse, however informal, the speech
becomes more acrolectal.

Speaker B has a fuller command of the entire range, and accommodates
to the speech of people around her. On formal and public occasions she
uses the acrolect. With family members who are basilectal she uses the
basilect (except for a few features that are stereotyped as older speaker
speech for example, intappears, born for was born), but in most settings uses
the mesolect. She thus illustrates Bell’s concept of ‘audience design’ rather
well.

The third speaker operating within my speech networks agreed to be
interviewed. Her speech level on tape was mid-mesolect. That she has good
command of the basilect is clear to me from her speech performance in
ordinary day-to-day discourse. Her repertoire is not, however, a simple
vacillation between the basilect and attempted standard; rather it consists
of a series of accommodations to the perceived status and speech levels of
her interlocutors. In the same speech event, much to my initial surprise, she
would change from one style to another in accordance with the person
being directly addressed (and the topic – though as Bell shows topic can be
viewed as a kind of displaced accommodation to an original audience). To
label her vernacular as basilectal (as I was initially tempted to) would
involve a very abstract view of the term vernacular. For the purposes of this
study she is listed as mesolectal, her highest lect. Her vernacular (= V₁)
ranges from the basilect to the mesolect, depending on audience design.

2.4.1 Interviewer accommodation

It is not possible to report on style-shifting in a systematic way in the
speech of interviewees, or in the repertoires of the three speakers casually
observed in a range of situations. Quantification regarding shifting proved
possible from an unlikely source – the speech of the interviewer. Trudgill
(1986: 5–11) fruitfully analysed his own patterns of phonetic accom-
modation to interviewees in his research on Norwich English. For SAIE it is
the syntax which is at least as variable as the phonetics. Of the twelve
salient features described in 2.3.1 at least two can be systematically observed in the questions of the interviewer: auxiliary inversion and do-support. For once, the interviewer’s utterances prove richer than those of the subjects (in the twenty-four interviews analysed there were 399 yes–no interviewer questions as against ten from the interviewees).

I believe my informal speech norms to be generally governed by those of the SAIE community. In childhood I had access to basilectal and mesolectal speech at home and in the neighbourhood, with acrolectal input in the classroom. As one of the aims of the interviews was to elicit as much as possible by saying as little as possible, it was important to respond to what was perceived as the interviewee’s most natural level. This precluded a formal interviewer’s style. On the other hand, one had to beware of sounding incongruously basilectal (or ‘uneducated’), especially with acrolectal speakers.

I analysed my own speech with the twenty-four interviewees reported on in section 2.3.1. Excluded from the analysis were echo questions, which simply repeated a statement of the interviewee with a question contour for solidarity. Also excluded were ‘half-questions/half statements’ which were intended to elicit a response from the interviewer, but whose falling intonation foreshadowed an obvious answer.

Central to my analysis here is the fact that the rest of the questions involved no pragmatic differentiation. Non-inverted questions were functionally equivalent to inverted ones in the count. They differed in terms of the stylistic (or lectal) associations they carry within SAIE. Furthermore, the questions were all raised in the same context. Each speaker was asked the same questions about their background, interests, life style, work and brushes with danger.

The figures for auxiliary inversion show a high degree of unconscious accommodation to the three lectal levels. Table 2.14(a) gives the figures for the interviewer, while 2.14(b) gives the corresponding patterns in the speech of the twenty-four interviewees.

### Table 2.14 Absence of auxiliary inversion in yes–no questions in the speech of interviewer and twenty-four interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lectal Level</th>
<th>Interviewer (%)</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With basilectal speakers</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>With interviewer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With mesolectal speakers</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With acrolectal speakers</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.15 Absence of auxiliary inversion in wh-questions in the speech of interviewer and twenty-four interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Interviewer</th>
<th>(b) Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With basilectal speakers</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With mesolectal speakers</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With acrolectal speakers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.16 Absence of do-support in yes–no questions in the speech of the interviewer and twenty-four interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Interviewer</th>
<th>(b) Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With basilectal speakers</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With mesolectal speakers</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With acrolectal speakers</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.17 Absence of do-support in wh-questions in the speech of interviewer and twenty-four interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Interviewer</th>
<th>(b) Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With basilectal speakers</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With mesolectal speakers</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With acrolectal speakers</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For auxiliary shift in wh-questions the interviewer figures are lower, but subject to the same pattern of lectal accommodation (see table 2.15).

The patterns for do-support are also governed by 'audience design'. Table 2.16 gives the figures for the non-occurrence of do-support in positive yes–no questions. As mentioned in 2.3.1.2 do-support is virtually obligatory in negative SAIE sentences. For wh-questions the figures are given in table 2.17.

The figures give a remarkably clear picture of how one subconsciously accommodates to speakers in SAIE, and adjusts one's syntax accordingly. Note that we are not dealing with different levels of formality, since the interviews were constant in this respect – as informal a level as possible within the constraints of an interview was aimed at. Of course, not all
Pre-basilectal speakers

speakers are capable of such large-scale changes. A basilectal speaker might attempt to ‘adjust upwards’ in speaking to outsiders or to acrolectal SAIE speakers, but the syntactic adjustments are minor. Basilectal speakers are defined as precisely those whose highest level is the basilect.

Finally, it should be stressed at the time of interviews I had no intention of analysing my own speech, and used question patterns unselfconsciously with the aim of striking up good relationships with interviewees and obtaining reliable data.

2.5 Pre-basilectal speakers

Among the 150 speakers studied the competence of six was such as to place them outside the three groups outlined so far. Although their accents would place them as Natalians of Indian descent, the speech of this fourth group arguably lies outside the mainstream SAIE described in this work. Some overlap occurs in the kind of morphological and syntactic simplifications between this variety and the basilect. I call such speakers, whose command of English is makeshift, and who have difficulties in expressing themselves even about domestic topics, pre-basilectal. Pre-basilectal speech is sometimes difficult to follow, even for one who understands all the nuances of the basilect.

Pre-basilectal speakers are mainly home-bound (or ‘loners’ at work), over fifty years old, with narrow social networks centring around the family and neighbours. Their main interactions with family are in an Indian language, and their command of Fanagalo seems better than of English. Two further common factors are possibly coincidental: they were all first-language speakers of Tamil or Telugu, and lived much of their lives in poverty. (It is possible, for instance, that the survey failed to pick up older speakers of other languages from relatively affluent homes, whose English might be akin to the pre-basilect.)

Socially and linguistically these emergent speakers of English are the mirror-image of the last young speakers of a dying language – Dorian’s ‘semi-speakers’. Dorian (1981) coined the term semi-speaker to refer to those (few) young speakers whose command of a dying ancestral language is imperfect, but who – out of a high degree of language loyalty – continue using it with elders and among themselves. The existence of semi-speakers for one Indian language of Natal – Bhojpuri – is discussed in R. Mesthrie (1991: ch. 5). Table 2.18 shows the mirror-image relationship between semi-speakers and pre-basilectal speakers.

The factors which gave rise to semi-speakers of Gaelic in East Sutherland were, according to Dorian (1981: 106–9):
Variation in SAIE

Table 2.18 A comparison between semi-speakers and pre-basilectal speakers in Natal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-basilect</th>
<th>Semi-speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect command of English</td>
<td>Imperfect command of an Indian language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent in an Indian language</td>
<td>Fluent in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation of English speakers in family</td>
<td>Last generation of speakers of an Indian language in family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great influence on English from an Indian language</td>
<td>Great English influence on Indian language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English used with few people (non-family members)</td>
<td>Indian language used with few people (family members)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) late birth-order in a large family;
(b) personality traits like gregariousness;
(c) temporary exile from one's speech community;
(d) the influence of grandparents.

For SAIE pre-basilectal speakers, the factors are the opposite:

(a) early birth-order in a large family;
(b) personality traits like non-gregariousness;
(c) living with one's family and working close to home for most of one's life;
(d) possible influence of grandchildren (in forcing pre-basilectal speakers to use English in the home).

Although pre-basilectal speech is uncharacteristic of SAIE today it is of potential interest for three reasons:

(a) One is tempted to hypothesise that the earliest efforts of Indian learners in the nineteenth century might have resembled the pre-basilect, i.e. it might be a forerunner to SAIE of today.
(b) There is a variety spoken in parts of South India, which it might be related to – Butler English.
(c) It raises the question of pidginisation on the plantation fields.

These issues will be discussed in detail in chapter 7. In the rest of this section I will illustrate some examples from the pre-basilect and outline the major differences between the pre-basilect and the basilect. Two fragments of pre-basilectal speech are given below:
The two children here only here. Four children got – daughter; got four
daughter. Two eh, look-atting us; son look-atting the two children. Other
two there. You know Agra Road? You know Harial? Plumber that man.
Siva Moodley – plumber? Oh, you know? Somani people there. Nice
Ladysmith, eh! You go see now, my daughter telling. Yah, last week
wanly. Came, daughter came, went holiday. (Sixty years, female, now
urban, no education, housewife, Hindu, Tamil speaker.)

(= 'Two of my children live here. I have four children, all daughters. Two
look after me. My son-in-law has two children. The others live elsewhere.
Do you know Harial/Siva Moodley, a plumber who lives in Agra Road?
Oh, you do! Many people live there. Ladysmith is a nice place, isn't it?
My daughter, who came down on holiday, said that I should go and visit
them there'.)

There wonly learnt-it English, but I forgot but, too much. I donno too
much, I'm not educated but ... Yah, mother India, father India. Only one
girl I am for my mother, four brothers ... No' I don't know nothing. I
small. Sixteen I married an' came 'way. Father died that side. No one to
look after me. (Seventy-two years, female, no education, now urban,
Telugu speaker, Christian, housewife.)

(= 'I learnt English there (on the farm). I've forgotten a great deal. I'm
not even educated ... Yes, both my parents came from India. My mother
had four sons, and I was the only daughter ... No, I didn't recall anything
about that. I got married at the age of sixteen and moved to Pinetown.
My father had died (in Umzinto), and there had been no one to look after
me. ')

2.5.1 Pre-basilect and basilect

As with the overlap between the basilect and the mesolect, there are few
features of the pre-basilect that do not occur in the basilect. It is the far
greater frequency of these features in the pre-basilect that is the determining
factor. Features which are characteristic of the pre-basilect are less
strongly represented in SAIE proper. These are listed below.

(a) -ing as verb ending, without auxiliary: This form serves as marker of the
present as much as of the past, in terms of frequency. Table 2.19 gives the
figures for five pre-basilectal speakers:

(47) Everyday he travelling. (= 'He travels daily')
(48) Singaro saying that ... (= 'Singaro said that ... ')
(49) Going there by my grandfather. (= 'We used to go to my grandfather's')

(b) Present verb forms for past: There were twenty-six tokens of this type
(as opposed to 76 'normal' past forms).
Table 2.19 Use of -ing in the pre-basilect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-ing</th>
<th>Normal English</th>
<th>English endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual/stative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: auxiliary + -ing as progressive: n = 10.

(50) Q: Your parents never tell you where they came from?  
A: They tell, forget now. (= ‘They told me, but I’ve forgotten’)

(51) Now only I went an’ sit down in the house. (= ‘I went and sat inside the house just now’)

(c) Existential-locational and possessive got: There were fourteen instances of got as ‘full’ verb meaning ‘to own, to have’ (as against two occurrences of have), and eleven instances of got as existential or locative verb (with no occurrences of standard English existential-locational be).

(52) That time haven’ got the motor car. (= ‘People didn’t have cars then’)

(53) My mother’s photo got there, come an’ see. (= ‘My mother’s photograph is there – come and have a look’)

(54) ’Nother room got there. (= ‘There’s another room there’)

(d) Copula deletion: There were 65 instances of non-use of the copula (25 in the present, 40 in the past tense), as against 13 instances of its presence. The figures include instances of subject + copula deletion, and deletion of auxiliary be (to facilitate comparison with Hosali and Aitchison’s (1986) study of Butler English of India in chapter 7).

(55) I think nowadays very hard too. (= ‘I think that nowadays it is very hard too’)

(56) Those time no school. (there were > 0)

(e) all as incipient plural marker: Of the eighteen instances of all only two paralleled standard English all. Pre-basilectal intonation suggests that all is treated as a suffix to a noun.

(57) My brother-all came there. (= ‘My brothers came there’)

(58) My brother know the story-all. (= ‘My brother knows the stories/all the stories’)

(f) **Plural endings:** There were sixty-nine nouns taking -s endings, as against twenty-two in which the -s did not appear. Neither the presence of preceding numerals nor the simplification of consonant clusters is sufficient to explain the lack of -s, where expected.

(g) **Omission of prepositions:** Prepositions are rare in the pre-basilect, unlike mainstream SAIE, where the deletion of prepositions is infrequent. There were fifty-three instances of deletions in the pre-basilect, as against only thirteen occurrences of prepositions.

(59) I born that Fence Park. (= ‘I was born in Fence Park’)
(60) I speak my sistern-law, my sister-all I talk. (= ‘I speak to my sister-in-law and to my sisters’)

(h) **Subject deletion:** Sixty-one sentences had the subject NP unstated, but the verb intact.

(61) Any prayers do. (= ‘I do all the prayers’)
(62) Was working in the hospital. (he > 0)

(i) **Subject and verb deletion:** A reflection of the rudimentary nature of the pre-basilect is the deletion of subject and main verb, two constituents which are not usually grouped together in analyses of English. This occurred twenty-four times in the subcorpus under consideration.

(63) Small baby. (= ‘I was a small baby then’)
(64) No friends, my sister only. (= ‘I have no companions, save for my sister’)

(j) **Only as a focus marker:** This construction, which has been outlined in 2.3.1.7, is much more common in the pre-basilect than in the rest of SAIE. There were nineteen instances of only as focus marker, and only two instances of its use in the normal standard English range. By way of comparison, for the eight basilectal speakers studied in 2.3.1.7 the total occurrence of only was seventeen.

(65) Q: Where’s Fence Park?
    A: Durban only. (= ‘In Durban’)
(66) Q: Which language do you feel is better?
    A: Telugu only. (= ‘Telugu!’)

(k) **Recurring phrases:** Certain phrases pertaining to birth, upbringing, marriage and death recur in the pre-basilect. These are: I born, I married, X died (where the usual English phrases are I was born, I got married, X is dead – n = 24); look-attering for ‘looking after, bringing up a child’ (n = 5); and no madder, no fadder for ‘X was an orphan’ (n = 4).

(67) I born La Mercy-side. (= ‘I was born in/near La Mercy’)
(68) We from born we stayed. (= ‘We stayed there from birth’)


Table 2.20 *A comparison of deletions in the pre-basilect and basilect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-basilect</th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 Total</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present copula</td>
<td>2 1 3 0 6</td>
<td>4 3 16 13 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past copula</td>
<td>0 2 3 7 14</td>
<td>4 3 5 11 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing with aux.</td>
<td>0 1 5 0 6</td>
<td>5 5 4 4 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing alone</td>
<td>9 7 17 6 39</td>
<td>1 0 1 1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>0 0 10 3 13</td>
<td>3 3 14 11 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>2 30 23 9 64</td>
<td>4 3 8 16 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>3 5 2 0 10</td>
<td>44 51 37 64 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>8 5 14 12 39</td>
<td>3 4 5 17 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(69) No’, I don’t like married. (= ‘No, I didn’t like to get married’)

(70) My other brother work. Then after that married. (= ‘The other brother worked and then got married.’)

Examples like (68) and (69) show that *born* and *married* may function as both nouns and verbs in the pre-basilect. In the basilect they are active verbs that are passive in meaning. *Born* occurs to the exclusion of *was born* in the pre-basilect – for the five pre-basilectal speakers the ratio was 5:0. In the basilect the two forms co-occur roughly evenly. For the eight basilectal speakers studied the ratio was 22:20.

The crucial difference between pre-basilect and basilect is that where elements are deleted variably, the proportion is often much higher than 50 per cent in the former, much less than 50 per cent in the latter. For example, as table 2.20 shows, prepositions show up 20 per cent of the time in the pre-basilect; 87 per cent in the basilect.

Further discussion of the pre-basilect is postponed till chapter 7 – in particular the issue of whether it is a fossilised early interlanguage stage of SAIE generally, or even the remnants of an earlier pidgin stage.
3.1 Introduction

My aim in this chapter is to examine in detail the kind of syntactic variation resulting from the language shift out of which SAIE arose, via analysis of a single phenomenon – the relative clause. Of a total of 15,530 sentences in the corpus, 543 involved restrictive relative clauses. A small number of non-restrictive clauses (six), infinitive relatives (three), and related constructions like clefts and pseudo-clefts were excluded from the analysis. The 543 relative clauses can be divided into nineteen categories, some startlingly different from options taken in standard English. The use of particular relativisation strategies will be shown to correlate with certain groups which can be characterised in social and linguistic terms, and according to the nature and level of language acquisition. A brief characterisation of the variation in relative-clause usage in British dialects will serve as a prelude to the diversity of SAIE forms.

3.2 Relative clauses in English dialects

The standard ways of forming relative clauses via appropriate relative pronouns (who for human NPs, with case variants whom and whose; which for non-human) and their alternatives with that (for any noun in principle) and zero for object relative NPs are too well known to describe in detail here. Information on other dialects is less easily forthcoming. Trudgill (1983a: 41) provides a list of possibilities within regional dialects of England, the first two being standard (and hence non-regional):

(1) He’s a man who likes his beer.
(2) He’s a man that likes his beer.
(3) He’s a man at likes his beer.
(4) He’s a man as likes his beer.
(5) He’s a man what likes his beer.
(6) He's a man he likes his beer.
(7) He's a man likes his beer.

Sentences (2)–(4) are related in their use of a complement particle that is not derived from a \textit{wh}-form. \textit{At} in sentence (3) can be interpreted as a phonetically reduced form of \textit{that}, though the \textit{Oxford English Dictionary} points to a historical derivation from an Old Norse form \textit{at}. The \textit{OED} relates the use of \textit{as} in sentences like (4) to \textit{such} ... \textit{as} constructions. \textit{What} is stigmatised as an uneducated or lower-class form, but falls in with \textit{who}, as an originally interrogative form, harnessed in the history of English to function as a relative pronoun. Sentence (6) shows a pronoun strategy without complementiser \textit{that}, while (7) shows a contact relative – one which generalises the English rule that \textit{who} or \textit{that} may be deleted in relative clauses if the relative NP is in object focus, to subject focus relative NPs as well. One could argue that it is a type of relative clause in which the relative pronoun is simply not inserted.

3.3 Types of relative clauses in SAIE

The relative clauses of SAIE are best grouped into four broad categories defined in partly functional and partly historical terms: \textit{standard relative clauses}, \textit{almost-standard relative clauses}, \textit{substrate-influenced relative clauses}, \textit{discourse-governed relative clauses}. These are exemplified and characterized in detail below:

3.3.1 Standard relative clauses

These are postnominal relative clauses introduced by an appropriate relative pronoun, \textit{that} or zero (with object focus – i.e. the relativised NP within the relative clause has object function). \textit{Who} is considered an appropriate relative pronoun in object-focus relative clauses for colloquial speech. In the informal speech captured on tape, there were no instances of \textit{whom}. Some SAIE speakers do use \textit{whom} in their most formal styles and in writing, however. Included in the count were temporal and locative NPs introduced by \textit{when} (after an NP denoting time) and \textit{where} (after place NPs). Standard relative clauses in the corpus will not be exemplified here, since they concur with international English usage.

3.3.2 ‘Almost-standard’ relative clauses

These are of two types: (a) the first type keeps the structure of the standard relative clause, but differs in the choice of relative pronoun. The most common of these pronouns in the SAIE corpus were \textit{what}, \textit{which} one and
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occasionally which, for human NPs. (Note that the English dialect relative particles at and as, as illustrated in the sentences from Trudgill, are not used in SAIE).

(8) But the kind of boodle what I'm earning is grand, man.
(9) That's the maid which one was here ... she washes dishes an' all (= 'The one who was here was the maid ... she washes dishes etc. ')
(10) This is my daughter which left school.

(b) The second type of 'almost standard' relative clause is the contact relative, a term used by Jespersen (1983[1933]: 360–1) for a construction in which a subject NP is relativised without an overt relative pronoun.

(11) We talking about my friend lives down there ...
(12) You saw that-one died? (= 'Did you see that-one that died?)

These have Janus-like domain NPs, which face both clauses. That is, they typically involve an object domain NP and a subject relative NP: We're talking about my friend - my friend lives down there. Sentences like (13), taken from Appalachian English (Wolfram and Christian, 1976: preface), where subject embedding breaks up the continuity of the NP, are rare in SAIE. There was only one attestation in the corpus, as against forty-three of the 'Janus' type.1

(13) Everybody lives in the mountains has an accent all to theirself.

Lass (1987: 187) raises the possibility that contact relative clauses involve phonological reduction of the complementiser that, rather than a genuinely zero strategy. For SAIE it is more plausible that a zero strategy is operative, especially since there is an independent type of zero strategy (see 'near relatives', 3.3.4.1).

3.3.3 Substrate-influenced relative clauses

Relative clauses in Indic and Dravidian languages differ almost entirely from the postnominal relative clauses of English. The Indic languages favour a correlative construction. An example from Gujarati will serve as a prelude to further discussion.

(14) Je veparl marī sathe avyo, te veparl Harilal corr businessman me with came that businessman Harilal ka bhāi che.
of brother is

'The business man who came with me is Harilal's brother' (literally: 'Which businessman came with me, that businessman is Harilal's brother')

Sentence (14) presents a prenominal relative clause, with a correlative marker je, which functions as a signal that the following NP will be
repeated or referred to in the following (main) clause. This main clause NP is preceded by a demonstrative having a related phonological form (te). A striking feature of sentence (14) is the occurrence of the full NP in both clauses. However, a frequent option in the Indic languages is to replace the second NP (in the main clause) with a personal pronoun/remote demonstrative. Both alternatives set the correlative construction apart from the kind of subordination found in English relative clauses.

Correlatives are limited to OV languages (Downing 1978: 400), though they are not typical of them. In particular, they are not found in rigid OV languages like Japanese and Turkish. Of relevance to this study is the rarity of correlatives in the rigid OV language, Tamil (Asher 1985: 25–6). When correlatives occur in Tamil they usually have an indefinite interpretation: 'whoever ... (s)he', 'wherever ... there', and so forth.

Tamil favours a 'prenominal external' relative clause without a relative pronoun. Characteristic of this construction is a relative suffix (-a) on the verb of the relative clause, and a single occurrence of the domain NP, as exemplified in (15) and (16).

(15) Taccan aticca vaṇṇan
carpenter.nom beat.past.rel pt washerman.nom
ccneki pōnan
Madras.dat go.past.3sg.masc.
'The washerman whom the carpenter beat went to Madras' (literally: 'The carpenter-beat(en) washerman went to Madras')

(16) Vaṇṇane aticca tacca
washerman.acc beat.past.rel pt carpenter.nom
ccneki pōnan
Madras.dat go.past.3sg.masc.
'The carpenter who beat the washerman went to Madras' (literally: The washerman-beat(ing) carpenter went to Madras')

The head noun always follows the relativised material and is stripped of case marking. This may lead to ambiguities which are usually resolvable in pragmatic terms. Masica (1972) cites Annamalai's example (1969) of sapta ele, whose possible meanings in a relative clause include 'the eaten leaf/leaf I ate', or (in a discussion of carnivorous plants) 'the eating leaf/leaf that ate'. Tamil speakers, however, would normally interpret the clause as 'the leaf on which I/someone ate'.

Indic languages have a relative clause type that resembles this usage, except that the verb in the relative clause occurs in participial form, and the agentive NP in the relative clause takes on instrumental or genitival marking. This participial type of relative (as I shall call it) occurs in several Indo-European groups. Example (17) is from South African Bhojpuri:
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(17) Mira ke siyail kapra bahut accha he.
   GEN sew.pp clothes very nice is
   'The clothes which Meera sews are very nice/ Clothes sewn by Meera are very nice'. (literally: Meera's-sewn clothes are very nice/ Clothes of Meera's sewing are very nice')

Indic languages also permit an English-like relative clause which is postnominal and deletes the NP in the main clause. This is an infrequently used type. Example (18) is from Hindi-Urdu:

(18) vah admi nahē āyā jiske bare me bāt kar rahe the
   that man not come.pp who.obl about in talk do be past.1.pl
   'The man we were talking about didn't come'

As far as SAIE is concerned there has been some transfer of relativisation strategies from the substrate languages, especially in the speech of older speakers. There is evidence of Indic correlative and participial strategies, and Dravidian 'prenominal external' strategies. The correlative construction in SAIE is not as syntactically rigid as in Indic, but can be said to have the following properties:

(a) It involves a prenominal relative clause, introduced by a wh-relative pronoun (most commonly which-one, sometimes indefinite who). There is no special correlative form of the pronoun, however.
(b) The wh-relative has an anaphoric pronominal counterpart in the main clause.
(c) Most commonly, the full NP occurs in the preceding subordinate clause – see (19), as in the Indic languages. The NP may sometimes occur in its full form in both clauses; or – more frequently – may be replaced in both clauses by the pro-form one (as in (20)).

(19) But now, which-one principal came here, she's just cheeky like the other one.
   (= 'The principal who arrived recently is just as stern as the previous one')
(20) Which car they supposed to give us, someone else got it. (= 'Someone else got the car they were supposed to give us')
(21) Which-one I put in the jar, that-one is good. (= 'The ones (i.e. pickles) I put in the jar are the best')

The strongest reason for considering these to be substrate-influenced types, and not any other, is their occurrence in the English of speakers of Indic rather than Dravidian background (see table 3.10 under 'correlatives').

The second class of substrate-influenced relative clauses in SAIE resembles the prenominal, Dravidian prototype without relative pronouns. These are found in the speech of basilectal speakers, but are not characteristic of the group. For ease of interpretation the relative clause has been bracketed in (22) and (23).
(22) That's all [we had] trouble. (= 'That's all the trouble we had')
(23) People who got [working here for them] sons, like, for them nice they can stay. (= 'It is nice for people who have sons (who are) working for the company, since they are allowed to stay on in the barracks')

In sentence (23) there are two relative clauses: the first, a postnominal one (who got sons); the second, a Dravidian-influenced, participial, prenominal relative (working here for them).

A third substrate-influenced type follows the Indic participial strategy. It is marked by the presence of agentive nouns in the relative clause, which are expressed in the genitive case. In other respects it is similar to the prenominal-external type (i.e. in being prenominal and in deleting the relative NP):

(24) That Neela's-knitted jersey is gone white. (= 'That jersey which Neela knitted/knitted by Neela has gone white')
(25) You can't beat Vijay's-planted tomato. (= 'You won't find better tomatoes than those which Vijay planted/which were planted by Vijay')

The stress patterns suggest that the genitive-agentive noun and the verb together form a compound unit. The status of the verb form in the relative clause is problematic. Is *knitted* in (24) a past (active) verb or past-participial (passive) form? Even the Bhojpuri equivalent would be ambiguous between the interpretation 'which Neela knitted' and 'which was knitted by Neela'. (The past participle of transitive verbs in Bhojpuri is inherently passive in the type of focus conveyed, whereas that of intransitive verbs is active, rather like English.) My intuitions are that the verb form is that of the passive participle in SAIE. Unfortunately, the matter cannot be resolved simply by taking a verb like *bit* whose past verb and past participle forms do not coincide (*bit - bitten*). Basilectal speakers who use this type of relative clause rarely use PP forms like *bitten, eaten, swum and drunk* - substituting preterite forms instead.

Correlations between specific types of substrate-influenced relative clauses and ancestral languages of speakers will be considered in 3.5.7. It should not be assumed that these substrate influences are necessarily interlanguage forms, since they occasionally surface in the usage of children having little or no competence in an Indian language.

3.3.4 Discourse-governed relative clauses

Givón (1979: 222n.) has pointed to two different modes of organisation of syntactic material in languages. The first (syntactic mode) involves tight syntactic marking and subordination, while the second (pragmatic mode) involves looser syntactic organisation (i.e. parataxis). This characterisation
is of special significance in the study of the evolution of language-learning systems like pidgins and (to a lesser extent) creoles, adult second-language acquisition and the acquisition of a first language by children. Pidgin syntax, for example, is usually lacking in rules for embedding and subordination. Formal markers indicating a relationship of subordination of one clause to another are generally absent. Extended pidgins and creoles, however, develop distinctive markers of relative clauses and other subordinate clauses, as is elegantly demonstrated in Sankoff and Brown's (1976) study of syntacticisation in Tok Pisin.


(26) Da boi jas wawk aut fram hia, hiz a fishamaen. (= 'The boy (who) just walked out of here, he's a fisherman')

Bickerton suggests that the use of personal pronouns in such sentences represents an intermediate stage between zero relative forms and the full range of English relative pronouns. Sentence (26) thus represents a rudimentary, discourse-governed relative clause. The route from discourse to syntax in this case involves moving away from loosely organised clauses with zero relatives towards a fully syntacticised stage with overt relative markers based on English forms, and the deletion of the copy pronoun in the relative clause. (Romaine (1988: 242) claims that a similar progression can be traced in children's acquisition of English. In her study of the speech of children in Edinburgh she found no evidence of embedding of relative clauses in the earlier stages of syntactic development; the children preferred the simple conjunction of clauses or the use of independent sentences. Only later did they acquire the syntactic means for making the relation between propositions and clauses explicit.

The last major category of relative clauses in SAIE can best be understood in similar terms. Three subtypes can be identified, and contrasted with a related strategy of discourse organisation which does not count as relativisation - the use of parataxis. This latter option occurred in a number of instances in the SAIE corpus, when speakers showed preference for loosely strung clauses or simple co-ordination where, from the viewpoint of semi-formal English, a relative clause might have been equally appropriate. (This is not to say that such run-on sentences do not occur in other English dialects.)

(27) No, I've got a boy...he's only coming on Monday. (Possible alternative: 'No, I've got an assistant who'll only come in on Monday')

(28) That's our late guru - we named the ashram after him. (Possible alternative: 'That's our late guru who(m) we named the ashram after')
(29) She had a child and the child died in the ship. *(Possible alternative: 'She had a child who died on board the ship')*

### 3.3.4.1 *Near-relatives*

While sentences (27)–(29) do not seem to involve relative clause strategies, there are other paratactically organised clauses which are intermediate between non-relatives and fully syntactically realised relative clauses. Like the Hawaiian English example (26) these use personal pronouns instead of relative pronouns. Examples (30)–(33) show that all four combinations of focussing and embedding are possible (*focussing* refers to the role of the NP in the relative clause, *embedding* to the role of the NP in the matrix clause).

(30) How the dead man, doctors cut him, he woke up and got up ... (= 'How the dead man whom doctors had operated on came to life and got up ...') object focus; subject embedding.

(31) I'm a man, I don' go church an' all. (= 'I'm a man who doesn't go to church, and so forth') subject focus; object embedding.

(33) I put a litee from Renishaw, I don' even know him, in the goals. (= 'I put in a youngster whom I don't even know, to play goalkeeper') object focus; object embedding.

(34) Fallers they din' sleep, they sleeping. (= 'Fellows who hadn't slept (all night at the casino) were asleep (the next day in their cars on the roadside') subject focus; subject embedding.

That these are best considered rudimentary relative clauses can be inferred from two factors. Firstly, they involve the use of interruptive (or centre) embedding (in (30) and (33) without an overt link between clauses, which is a process of partial syntacticisation). Secondly, where embedding is not involved, the intonation patterns (and especially the lack of pause) suggest a clause-chaining effect into one sentence unit (in (31) and (32)). These 'near-relative clauses' contrast with the non-relative clause parataxis of (27)–(29), where the pause between clauses is not suggestive of chaining.

### 3.3.4.2 Resumptive pronoun strategy

This strategy involves a *trace* of the relative NP in the embedded clause of an otherwise standard relative clause. The trace usually takes the form of a resumptive pronoun (sometimes called a *shadow* or *copy* pronoun), although deictic particles might also be used.

(35) I was this girl that I always used to read in the bus. (= 'I was a girl who always used to read in the bus')
3.3.4.3 Topicalisation strategy/pronominal apposition

In this group of relative clauses a copy pronoun is used, not in the embedded clause, but in the matrix sentence. The strategy is used with topicalised (or left-dislocated) domain NPs, and the relative clause breaks up the coherence between the topic (the domain noun) and the main verb.

(37) One chap who used to stay here, he was a builder – Arjun.
(38) The assessor that seen the car, he reckon he’ll probably write it off. (= ‘The assessor that examined the car said that he’d probably write off the damages’)

This topicalisation strategy is used with subject, object or indirect-object domain NPs. For some speakers it seems to be the only way to relativise on matrix PPs (see further table 3.18).

(39) Anything they want to tell now, it takes up time to adapt to it. (= ‘It takes time to adapt to (= ‘understand’) anything that they used to say’)
(40) Thing that is coming to you from the government, man, you should be appreciated with that thing. (= ‘You should be appreciative of a thing that comes to you from the government’)

Topicalised relative clauses are in some ways similar to the substrate-influenced correlatives of 3.3.3. Correlatives, however, have as one of their defining features the fact that the *wh*-word precedes the NP of the first clause. Furthermore, while topicalised NPs may take zero or *that* as relativisers, correlatives take a *wh*-phrase only (*who, what, which one* and *where* in the present corpus).

3.3.4.4 Preposition-chopping strategy

In other instances it is the prepositional phrase of the relative clause that receives special treatment. Some speakers resort to preposition chopping in the relative clause, though not as commonly as reported for Brazilian
Portuguese (Tarallo 1986). Chopping occurs most frequently with locatives and related cases (*in* + NP, *at* + NP), but also with genitives (where *whose*/*of whom* are deleted), path/goal (*to* + NP) and accompaniment (*with* + NP).

(41) I'm very well versed with Afrikaans, but there's nobody I can speak. (*with > 0*)
(42) ... like a big yard that you do gardening an' all. (*in > 0*)
(43) That's the place I retired, you know. (*to > 0*)

3.3.4.5 Paratactic relative clauses with possessives

Finally, there are sentences which are close to standard usage, except for the occurrence of a possessive pronoun in the matrix clause:

(44) You like my shirt I bought?
(45) Remember Mr Vahed's coat, he used to wear? (= 'Do you remember the coat that Mr Vahed used to wear?')

The most natural interpretation of (44) is a restrictive one: 'Do you like this shirt which I bought?' However, in the context of utterance, the relative clause was tacked on almost as an afterthought: 'Do you like my shirt?... I bought it'. This type of relative clause, which we shall characterise as 'paratactic with possessive', is not fully grammaticalised in the dialect. In this and other respects it is like the near-relatives of 3.3.4.1. It also shares some similarity with sentences having an object which doubles as a topic – see 4.4.1, especially sentences (87)–(89).

At this stage one might start to wonder whether 'anything goes' as far as relativisation in SAIE is concerned. Does the dialect exhaust all the relativisation strategies known to humankind? Not quite. There are some strategies that are not found in SAIE, and some constraints on existing strategies:

(a) As already indicated, contact relative clauses almost always involve object rather than subject embedding (see 3.3.2).
(b) Informal SAIE speech does not manifest 'pied-piping' (Ross 1986) – thus, *who you gave it to*, rather than *to whom you gave it*. (*Whom* and *whose* are not used in informal SAIE.)
(c) The dialect does not have internal (or 'circumnominal') relatives of the sort outlined by Keenan (1985: 143), in which the domain noun occurs within the relative clause (only).
(d) Among the non-standard relative particles current in British English dialects, *as* and *at* do not occur in SAIE.
Table 3.1 *Frequency table for relative clauses in SAIE, by broad type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse-governed</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost standard</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substrate-influenced</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 *Frequency table for standard and non-standard relative clauses in SAIE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>that</em>-relatives</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-relatives</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>who</em>-relatives</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>where</em>-relatives</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>which</em>-relatives</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participial relatives (postnominal)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>when</em>-relatives</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-standard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-relatives</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact-relatives</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalisation strategy</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>What</em>-relatives</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlatives</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resumptive pronoun</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition chopping</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratactic with possessive</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenominal external relatives</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participial relatives (prenominal)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>which-one</em> relatives</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>that-one</em> relatives</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Proportions of relative-clause types

The total of 543 relative clauses can be categorised in various ways. Table 3.1 gives the breakdown in terms of the four broad divisions set. A more detailed breakdown according to construction type in decreasing order of magnitude is given in table 3.2.4

Taking formal standard English as a point of comparison (from which contact relative clauses, resumptive pronouns, *what*-relative clauses and others are all excluded) the percentage ratio of standard to non-standard
relative clauses can be seen to be exactly 50:50 from table 3.1. If we take as a norm the colloquial forms uttered by Standard English speakers, then the ratio increases in favour of "standard", since constructions like the contact relative, the resumptive pronoun and the topicalisation strategies might count as passably standard.

3.5 The social profile for relative clauses in SAIE

The wide array of attested types in SAIE holds the promise of interesting sociolinguistic variation. We can *prima facie* anticipate variation along the following parameters: style, class, English education, age, urban–rural domicile, vernacular language background and gender. However, it will not be possible to report on the dimension of style in this chapter (but see 2.4).

The question whether areas of syntax are as amenable to sociolinguistic study as the better known phonetic and morphological variables has too long a history to repeat here (see Lavandera 1978; Weiner and Labov 1983; Winford 1984). I take the view of Cheshire (1987) that it might be more useful to set aside the debate regarding the appropriateness of the syntactic variable, and continue with quantitative analyses of non-phonological data where possible.

At this stage of choosing a linguistic variable or quasi-variable for syntax, two issues have to be addressed. The first concerns the danger of assuming comparability of standard and non-standard forms across dialects, as if they were embedded in the same grammar (Harris 1984). Harris's examples, drawn from tense and aspect usage in Hiberno-English and standard English, demonstrate that differences in surface forms may also involve differences in underlying semantic distinctions.

For the majority of relative clauses the issue is unproblematic: *what* as (non-standard) relative particle is, after all, semantically equivalent to (standard) *that*, say. A speaker who produces *which* as relative marker for [+ human] nouns is not following a special semantic rule in SAIE, since (s)he also uses *who* in the same context in apparent free variation. Likewise, prenominal relatives in SAIE do not seem to involve any pragmatic or other differences from postnominal relatives. I do not think that relative-clause usage in the basilect and acrolect are so disparate as to belong to different grammars, since there are speakers who use a variety of relative clause-strategies as if they were equivalent, and who do not seem to be engaged in any kind of dialect switching.

An exception might concern focussing. Surely a speaker who says *The work that I did, my father didn't like it* is making an emphatic distinction...
The social profile for relatives

from one who says *My father didn't like the work that I did?* True enough. In terms of the relative-clause analysis presented here, however, the significant choice is between the first utterance and its standard equivalent in terms of focus: *The work that I did, my father didn't like.* (Both alternatives exist in SAIE and, as we shall see in 3.7, there are clear social correlations involved.)

The second caveat comes from Labov (1982: 87):

There are a number of variables that can be studied now by noting only each occurrence, but not each non-occurrence, since it has not yet been possible to close the possible set of variants. Studies of the aspect markers of the Black English vernacular, like invariant *be* are still at this stage. The same is true for the distribution of relative clauses, where we can't yet define the set of possible choices that the relative is selected from. Here, quantitative work is confined to tracing the relative frequency of occurrence in some globally defined section of speech, controlled for length by an independent measure like number of sentences, pages, or hours of speech.

The best way of organising the SAIE data seems to be not along the lines of frequency of occurrence, but by the ratio of standard to non-standard constructions. Since this distinction is a social, and not a functional (or logical) one, the exercise truly belongs to the domain of sociolinguistics. We need not attempt to standardise the length of fragments analysed, since the ratio of standard to non-standard relative clauses ought to remain reliable irrespective of length of interview, provided the techniques of interviewing are (roughly) constant. One broad type of relative clause is studied in relation to other types of relative clauses, rather than to non-relative clauses. Admittedly, this will not solve the theoretical problem of defining the syntactic variable, nor of deciding how to close the set of alternatives to the construction being studied.

To sum up, it seems that the relative clause is an amenable area for the investigation of social syntax. Of course, the standard/non-standard dichotomy is not the only important parameter in a newly developed dialect. Nor should it be interpreted as having some built-in, prescriptive bias. Perhaps a better way of characterising the differences would be to draw a distinction between 'created' and 'inherited' types of relativisation. That is, there are, on the one hand, many relative clauses in SAIE which are acquired from adequate access to standard models, mainly at school. There is an equally large set, however, which shows speakers being forced to draw upon substrate strategies and universals of discourse organisation, in response to inadequate input from L1 models in former times. In this sense we are indeed dealing with a broad dichotomy between relative
clauses 'inherited' from standard English, as against others previously 'created' under less than perfect language-learning circumstances.

Given the fairly uniform nature of the interviews, which were as informal as possible, it is significant that four groups can be discerned: those who used only standard relative clauses; those who used only non-standard forms; those who used both standard and non-standard forms; and a group who did not use relative clauses in the interviews. The number of speakers who produced no relative clauses can be further differentiated on the basis of the reasons for the non-appearance of relative clauses in the interview situation. The brevity of some of the interviews prevented the appearance of a variety of constructions, including relative clauses. Interviews with teenagers sometimes proved unrewarding, because they had less to say for themselves in the interview situation, treating it like a classroom event.

The most significant reason for the non-appearance of relative clauses had nothing to do with the length of the interview. Thirteen speakers, who were engaged in fairly long and uninhibited conversation about a variety of topics, produced no relative clauses because they were older basilectal or pre-basilectal speakers whose syntactic repertoire did not include the construction in question. Finally, there was only one speaker who was engaged in a fairly long informal discussion, who was not basilectal, pre-basilectal or a teenager, and who happened to produce no relative clauses. He alone stands outside the social profile for relative clauses in SAIE. These sixteen speakers who fall under the category 'teenage style', 'brief interview' or 'by chance' are excluded from the analyses of this chapter, from table 3.4 onwards.

The 150 speakers were arranged into five groups according to their characteristic use of relative clauses (as in table 3.3). The prior classification of speakers was made according to their linguistic behaviour, and attempts
to ascertain the social correlates of the groups followed (a type of cluster analysis). This differed from the procedure followed by Labov (1966) and Trudgill (1974), in which social-class groupings preceded analysis of the variables. The difference is not a substantive one, since either way one has to decide what the social classes are, and how to assign individuals to particular classes.

Table 3.4 gives a breakdown of relative-clause usage according to four groups: (a) speakers who do not use relative clauses in their repertoire (labelled pre-bas-R); (b) speakers using only non-standard relative clauses (labelled bas-R, who essentially evince the 'creation' of relative clauses; (c) speakers using only standard relative clauses (labelled acr-R); and (d) speakers having a mixed bag of relative clause types (mes-R). The extent to which these groups overlap with the impressionistic grouping of speakers in chapter 2 will be treated in 3.8.5

3.5.1 Statistical analysis

An appropriate set of statistics that represent the strength of relationships within two-way tables of cross-classified observations, between two sets of ordinal categories constituted by the rows and by the columns of the table, will include the gamma statistic, $\Gamma$ and the Somer’s statistics $D(C/R)$ or $D(R/C)$. The gamma statistic is appropriate when neither of the ordinal sets of categories is implied to be an explanatory factor for the associated ordinal set, whereas $D(C/R)$ and $D(R/C)$ are intended respectively to be appropriate when the row categories are implied to be explanatory for the column categories, and conversely.

These statistics are analogous to the correlation coefficient (which measures the strength of the linear relationship between two variables on interval or ratio scales) in that they are positive or negative fractions and assume extreme values $+1$ or $-1$ when there is a perfect direct or indirect relationship between two sets of ordinal categories. Moreover, there is associated with each statistic a frequentist interpretation: $= \text{Prob}$
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(concordant pair) (discordant pair). Here we consider any pair of observed individuals say \((A, B)\), and their associated pairs of ordinal categories from each of the two sets, say \(A:(3, 2)\) \(B:(4, 4)\). A concordant pair is one for which the row categories and the column categories both move up (down) their ordinal scales, and a discordant pair is one for which they move in converse directions. Thus \(A:(3, 2)\) \(B:(4, 4)\) are concordant since \(3 < 4\) and \(2 < 4\); but \(A:(3, 2)\) \(B:(4, 1)\) are discordant since \(3 < 4\) and \(2 > 1\).

Equivalently, if we choose a pair at random from all individuals included in the two-way table the probability that they are concordant in their ordinal categories is: \(\text{Prob (concordant)} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\Gamma}{2}\), and \(\text{Prob (discordant)} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\Gamma}{2}\). Somer’s D statistics have similar interpretations but refer to pairs in which it is given that they differ in row categories, \(D(C/R)\), or that they differ in column categories \(D(R/C)\). The BMDP software package 4F calculates these statistics and their associated standard errors. (The other more familiar statistical measures are not delineated here.)

These tests show that of the possible social correlations with the R-groups education, social class, first- or second-language competence in English and rural–urban networks are very strong; age and ancestral language are significant, despite some sampling problems; but gender is not significant.

3.5.2 Classification of lectal groups by education

The level of education is the best indicator of the lectal group into which individual speakers fall as table 3.5 shows. There is clear evidence for increase in years of education to be strongly associated with increasing use of standard relative clauses. The gap between the basilect and the mesolect is greatest at zero education; it then narrows, but starts widening again after six years of schooling, because of gains by acr-R from mes-R. Likewise, the gap between mes-R and acr-R progressively narrows after nine years of schooling.

3.5.3 Classification by English as L1 or L2

A first hypothesis might be that much syntactic variation can be accounted for by differentiating speakers who have English as a first language from those who do not. Table 3.6 shows that there are indeed strong correlations between ‘R-group’ affiliation and the L1/L2 parameter (provided we set up a third category of speakers who have English and an Indian language as equal L1s). However, the correlations are not as strong as for educational levels.
Table 3.5 Crossing-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education in years</th>
<th>Bas-R</th>
<th>Mes-R</th>
<th>Acr-R</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 64.491; \text{ df } = 10; p = 0.0; \Gamma = 0.717 \pm 0.067; t = 8.156; D(R/C) = 0.445 \pm 0.051.\)

Table 3.6 Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and first and second language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Equal L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas-R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-R</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-R</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 28.652; \text{ df } = 4; p = 0.00; \Gamma = -0.636 \pm 0.094; t = -5.733; D(R/C) = -0.388 \pm 0.069.\)

Table 3.7 Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and social class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas-R</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-R</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 14.452; \text{ df } = 4; p = 0.0060; \Gamma = 0.496 \pm 0.117; t = -3.662; D(R/C) = -0.225 \pm 0.069.\)

3.5.4 Classification by social class/income

In deciding whether a speaker fell into one of three social-class groups, High (H), Middle (M), Low (L), family income per household was used as an indicator and checked against area of residence and type of dwelling. Table 3.7 shows the breakdown according to these groups.

Table 3.7 reflects a strong association between increasing standard forms of relative clauses and higher social-class groups. Although the figures are statistically reliable, the impression that no H-group speakers fall into the basilect needs to be corrected. There are a few elderly women
Table 3.8 Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and urban–rural networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas-R</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-R</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 9.129; \text{df} = 2; p = 0.0104; \Gamma = 0.518 \pm 0.134; t = 3.198; D(R/C) = 0.309 \pm 0.092.$

with little education (and often of Gujarati-language background) who might count as basilectal, though none happened to be caught in the nets of this survey. In practice, such speakers are shielded from long conversations with strangers by younger people of the household more proficient in English.

Table 3.7 nevertheless shows the following:

(a) (i) The majority of bas-R speakers come from the social class L.
(ii) The majority of mes-R speakers come from L as well.
(iii) The majority of acr-R speakers come from social class M.
(b) (i) The majority of H speakers fall into mes-R.
(ii) The majority of M speakers fall into mes-R.
(iii) The majority of L speakers fall into mes-R.

These correlations are indicative of the current ‘level’ of the speech community. Although class correlations according to the standard/non-standard (or ‘created’ vs ‘inherited’) dichotomy are emerging, the overlaps at this point in time are considerable.

3.5.5 Classification of lects by urban–rural networks

The breakdown by rural–urban domicile (i.e. whether speakers had lived most of their lives in a rural or urban area) is given in table 3.8. The table provides clear evidence for less standard forms of relative clauses in rural areas.

3.5.6 Classification of lects by age

Age is significant as an indicator of type of relative-clause usage, as table 3.9 shows.

The table shows the overall tendency for older speakers to fall into bas-R and mes-R. However, it is clear from the table and from a knowledge of
Table 3.9 Cross-classification of speakers by relative-clause usage and age in years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>20-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas-R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 38.573; \text{df} = 10; p = 0.000; \Gamma = 0.464 \pm 0.097; t = 4.488; \text{D(R/C)} = 0.280 \pm 0.062. \]

The figures are probably skewed. The two teenage speakers who fell into the bas-R category showed an unusual degree of rapport with the interviewer, and consequently 'dropped back' stylistically much more than other teenagers, who generally produced no relative clauses. A larger sample would doubtlessly reveal many mesolectal speakers in the under-twenty group.

Table 3.10 Classification of relative clauses by speakers' language background and language family associated with each type of relative clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background and numbers of SAIE speakers</th>
<th>Indic only</th>
<th>Both families</th>
<th>Dravidian only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indic only</td>
<td>'Pure' Correlative</td>
<td>Place Correlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indic (75)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dravidian (55)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

other sociological factors that two overlapping subpopulations may be distinguished: the age range 30-60+, and the age range 0-39. These groups appear to exhibit contrasting patterns. Among older speakers, increase in age is associated with lower lects; but the violation of this pattern among younger people is evidence of teenagers and young adults favouring colloquial and in-group styles that draw upon the basilect. The corresponding \( \Gamma \)-values and \( \text{D(R/C)} \) values for these subgroups are:

- 30-60+: \( \Gamma = 0.561 \pm 0.100 \), \( t = 5.057 \)
- \( \text{D(R/C)} = 0.330 \pm 0.065 \)

- 0-39: \( \Gamma = 0.0013 \pm 0.232 \), \( t = 0.054 \)
- \( \text{D(R/C)} = 0.008 \pm 0.140 \)

3.5.7 Classification of lects by ancestral language

Given that the Indic and Dravidian languages present different strategies of relativisation, it might be expected that substrate-influenced relative clauses in SAIE follow this broad linguo-gloss. Table 3.10 shows that this expectation matches reality: 'pure' correlatives and compound relative
clauses were used by speakers of Indic background only; prenominal external relative clauses were used by speakers of Dravidian background only; place correlatives (where ... there) and indefinite correlatives (who ... (s)he) are used by speakers from both groups (corresponding to the fact that these are the only subtypes of correlatives that are common to Indic and Dravidian). Table 3.11 illustrates the more general distribution of the R-groups according to speakers' ancestral-language background.

Despite the small size of the cells for certain languages (reflecting actual patterns within the speech community – see appendix A), certain trends are discernible. Bas-R and mes-R are strongly associated with the languages of indenture, especially with the Dravidian family, and slightly less so with the Indic languages Urdu and Bhojpuri. On the other hand, people having Gujarati as ancestral language (i.e. of trading-class background) and families with a relatively long history of English (i.e. middle-class Christians) fall into mes-R and acr-R. Obviously, it is not the ancestral language per se that determines R-group affiliations, but the social characteristics of speakers of particular languages.

### 3.5.8 Summary of social correlates to relative clause usage

The polarities between basilectal and acrolectal syntax with respect to the relative clause can be synchronically explained in terms of social and historical factors. The statistically reliable factors are education, order of acquisition (i.e. English as L1 versus L2), age, social class and rural–urban upbringing. Gender is not a statistically reliable indicator.

Bas-R speakers tend to be over forty, rural, of a low socio-economic background, with English as a second language and little formal education. The mirror image is the acr-R group with the following characteristics: younger speakers (often under twenty) with at least ten years' education, urban, middle or high socio-economic group.

The mes-R group is intermediate in terms of social characteristics as well. In terms of age, it draws upon the middle rather than the extremes.
shown by bas-R and acr-R, with the bulk of its speakers between the ages of twenty and fifty-nine. In terms of education, its speakers have more than four years of schooling. It is neutral with respect to other factors, drawing on male and female alike, on all socio-economic groups, urban and rural speakers and L1 and L2 speakers alike.

3.6 Relative clauses by functional patterns

Much of the characterisation of relative-clause usage has so far been of a formal (i.e. stressing the form that the syntax takes) and sociolinguistic nature (in terms of educationally sanctioned usage vs non-standardness). It is now time to examine relative-clause usage in SAIE in terms of functional criteria. I will concentrate on three concepts: focussing, embedding and the relative-clause hierarchy.

3.6.1 Focussing and embedding

Table 3.12 gives the breakdown of relative clauses according to embeddedness and focus. The hierarchy in SAIE is: O/S  O/O  S/S  S/O. In order of frequency we have the following prototypical patterns:

O/S:  I got a few friends that plays - y’know – guitar, organ and so forth.
O/O:  I got a lot of prayer books that I like reading.
S/S:  And then who wants to stay they can stay.
S/O:  All the communities I taught were good.

In general, object embedding (O/S and O/O) is overwhelmingly more frequent than subject embedding (S/S and S/O), the respective percentages being 80.1 and 19.9. With respect to focussing the differences are smaller: subject focussing (S/S and O/S) accounted for 55.4 per cent of the relative clauses, while object focussing accounted for the remaining 44.6 per cent.

These figures are similar to those reported for schoolchildren in Edinburgh aged six to ten (Romaine 1988: 234), as table 3.13 indicates. Both SAIE and Scots figures indicate that object embedding is more popular than subject embedding. This could be a reflection of one of several factors:

(a) Nouns carrying ‘new’ information are more likely to be relativised. In English it is most often the object which bears new information, while the subject carries ‘given’ or ‘old’ information.

(b) There is a cross-linguistic tendency for ‘heavy’ NPs to come later than simple NPs in sentences, which makes sense in terms of the pragmatics of production.
Table 3.12 *Focussing and embedding in SAIE relative clauses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/S</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/O</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/S</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O/O</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.13 *Focussing and embedding in SAIE and by Scots children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAIE (%)</th>
<th>Scots (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object embedding</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject embedding</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject focus</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object focus</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>543.0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) In terms of organising discourse in real time, it is probably easier to make an additional predication (in this instance via a relative clause) on an object NP rather than a subject NP, given that objects occur after subjects in almost all languages.

(d) In terms of syntactic organisation in an SVO language it would seem simpler to execute right-branching (i.e. O/S and O/O) rather than centre-embedding (i.e. S/S and S/O).

With respect to embedding strategies the SAIE figures are fairly similar to those reported in other studies. Bickerton and Odo (1976: 274–9) in their study of Hawaiian Pidgin English observe that the few speakers who produce relative clauses do so by operating on the object NP far more often than on subject NPs. Sankoff and Brown's data (1976), likewise, point in the direction of a preference for object over subject embedding (though not as sharply as for SAIE or Scots).

3.6.2 The relative-clause hierarchy in SAIE

The cross-linguistic hierarchy postulated by Keenan and Comrie (1977, 1979), dealing with focussing rather than embedding, is operative in SAIE, with all positions being relativised, except the last: object of comparison. Sentences like *The man who even Mary was taller than* do not appear to be part of colloquial SAIE. (It would not be surprising if a few acrolectal
Table 3.14 *The Keenan–Comrie hierarchy for SAIE relative clauses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject &gt;</th>
<th>Direct object &gt;</th>
<th>Oblique object &gt;</th>
<th>Locative &gt;</th>
<th>Temporal &gt;</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.15 *The revised Keenan–Comrie hierarchy for SAIE relative clauses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct object &gt;</th>
<th>Subject &gt;</th>
<th>Oblique object &gt;</th>
<th>Locative &gt;</th>
<th>Temporal &gt;</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.53%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

speakers used it in educated contexts, under the influence of formal standard English, however.) Although Keenan and Comrie do not place much emphasis on the criterion of the frequency of relative clauses involving individual positions on the hierarchy, we can report quantitatively on these here. Table 3.14 shows that the Keenan–Comrie hierarchy is indeed supported by the SAIE data in terms of the absolute numbers of occurrences of subject relatives, object relatives, etc.

Table 3.14 lists the absolute occurrences of subjects, objects, etc. in relative clauses. However, if we consider the number of subjects, objects, etc. available for possible relativisation in the entire corpus, then the hierarchy is violated. The proportion of direct objects actually relativised to the number of direct objects available far exceeds that of other categories. This revised table, based on an analysis of the speech of one-fifteenth of the total corpus, is shown in table 3.15. The percentages reflect the proportion of functions relativised to the total functions available.

Positions lower down on the hierarchy posed problems for some speakers in terms of the use of a preposition and relative pronoun. There was a high degree of ‘promotion’ – that is, recasting the relative clause so as to make it resemble the form of those higher up in the hierarchy, which are more ‘familiar’ and ‘easy’. This essentially took the form of preposition chopping – see 3.3.4.4.

It is significant that the sentences with genitival relative clauses, which occupy the lowest rung of the hierarchy, were promoted to direct object and scarcely recognisable as genitives. The resulting sentences, (46) and (47), count as ‘near-relative clauses’.

(46) It struck the bucket, we were holding the handle, so it struck the whole bucket. (= ‘It struck the bucket, whose handle we were holding’)
No', I had two girls, one has just turned twenty-one, she just got married in December. (= 'I had two daughters, one of whom has just turned twenty-one and been married in December')

This runs counter to Gass's findings (1979) that despite correlations with the upper end of the hierarchy, adult L2 learners in her experimental study found it easier to relativise on the genitive than on the immediately higher positions. (The study aimed to test whether instructing learners on a lower rung of the hierarchy – for example, object of prepositions – would result in generalisation to all the higher positions.) She suggests that an explanation lies in the salience of whose as a pronoun or that whose + N was perceived and used as one unit. It could well be that natural acquisition patterns (as in the data from Scots and SAIE) differ from L2 learning arising from instruction in English as a second language.

A final point in connection with the Keenan–Comrie hierarchy is that the prediction that, where resumptive-pronoun strategies are used they are more common lower down, does not seem to be borne out in SAIE. All resumptive pronouns but one in the corpus (see 3.3.4.2) involved subject focus, the one exception being a locative NP.

3.7 Some acquisitional perspectives

The data does support the notion that there is a historical shift from certain basilectal strategies to more standard ones. This shift can be exemplified by the ‘basilectal relative-clause spread’ of two speakers (showing a variety of ‘created’ relative clauses), as compared to the ‘acrolectal relative-clause spread’ of another two (showing a range of strategies inherited from the standard) in table 3.16.

The evolution of relative clauses can be deduced from table 3.17 and figure 3.1, which give the breakdown of relative-clause types according to lectal levels.

As noted earlier, pre-basilectal speakers tend not to use relative clauses. In the basilect a variety of relative-clause strategies appear, the most favoured type being the discourse-governed relative clause. In particular, it is the ‘near-relative clause’, (or pronoun strategy) which accounted for a very large portion (34.3 per cent) of all the relative clauses in the basilect. The shift towards standard and near-standard relative clauses in mes-R can be seen by totalling these two groups (70.9 per cent in mes-R). It would be circular to claim a shift to 100 per cent standard ‘inherited’ relative clause use in acr-R, since acr-R was defined by this criterion. However, the social correlates show that the group has some homogeneity in terms of education, age and social class.
Table 3.16 Relative-clause types exhibited by four speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prenominal external</th>
<th>Basilectal spread</th>
<th>Acrolectal spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlative</td>
<td>Near relative</td>
<td>Topic relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17 Cross-classification of relative clauses by R-group source and broad relative-clause type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substrate-influenced</th>
<th>Discourse-governed</th>
<th>Near-standard</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas-R</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-R</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-R</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Near-standard</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-bas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bas-R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mes-R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acr-R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ■ major strategy □ minor strategy

Figure 3.1 Types of relative clauses favoured by R-groups

An interesting difference shows up between the three lectal groups with respect to the topicalisation strategy for matrix PPs. This is a mesolectal strategy, _par excellence_. When acrolectal speakers relativise on matrix PPs, they do so without topicalisation. Basilectal speakers do not use the topicalisation strategy (with one exception, who used all three occurrences under the basilect in table 3.18).
Table 3.18 Cross-classification of speakers by impressionistic lectal group and topicalisation strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic PPs with pronoun apposition</th>
<th>Topic PPs without pronoun apposition</th>
<th>Non-topic PPs (without pronoun apposition)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basilect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very similar figures hold for the R-groups (except that by definition acr-R has 0 per cent topicalised relative clauses with pronominal apposition).

3.8 Comparison between lectal groups and R-groups

A brief comparison between the impressionistic classification of speakers into the four groups outlined in chapter 2 and the R-groups of this chapter is given here. The $\Gamma$-coefficient of 0.919 for table 3.18 shows a very strong relationship between the lectal groups and R-groups.

To summarise:

- Basilectal speakers generally fall into bas-R; a small proportion fall into mes-R or pre-bas-R; but none fall into acr-R.
- Mesolectal speakers generally fall into mes-R; a small proportion fall into bas-R or acr-R; but none into pre-bas-R.
- Acrolectal speakers generally fall into acr-R; a small proportion fall into mes-R; but none fall into bas-R or pre-bas-R.

These results are unsurprising, given that the impressionistic scaling of speakers had a morpho-syntactic, lexical and phonetic basis, and that the use of relative clauses contributes to the syntactic impression a speaker makes. That is, a certain amount of circularity is necessary in making these comparisons.

3.9 Phylogenetic parallels

The data suggest a parallelism between relative-clause usage in SAIE and its ontogenetic development in other English dialects, assuming Romaine’s findings for Scots’ schoolchildren to be ‘normal’ (see 3.3.4). (One difference is that Scots children do not use oblique objects earlier on, whereas basilectal SAIE speakers do.) The question could equally well be raised whether there are phylogenetic parallels within the history of English. That is, does the evolution of relative-clause strategies in SAIE have any
Table 3.19 Cross-classification between relative-clause usage and impression-based lectal groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-basilect</th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-bas-R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas-R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 117.767; \ df = 6; \ p = 0.0; \ r = 0.919 \pm 0.097; \ t = 9.883; \ D(R/C) = 0.695 \pm 0.051.$

similarity with the development of relative clauses in the history of English English?

Old English had a complex of strategies for expressing relativisation: a definite-article/demonstrative form (se/peet/seo) concording in gender and case with the head noun; a complementiser strategy (pe); and a ‘mixed’ strategy (Lass 1987: 189) using either complementiser pe + (shadow) pronoun (he/hit/heo) or article + demonstrative. A less commonly-used strategy involved the zero relative.

*Wh*-relatives appear on the scene in the Middle English period. They are derived from indefinite and interrogative pronouns of Old English. *Who*, for example, begins to be used in the fifteenth century, but only in very formal styles. It occurs first with genitives and indirect objects, with the nominative being the last form to appear.

It would be a dubious enterprise to relate the shift from basilectal relative clauses (excluding substrate influenced types, obviously) to acrolectal relative clauses in SAIE to the exact history of English English. Some strategies used by basilectal speakers in their creation strategies are worth mentioning, however – especially since they are parallel to findings regarding the borrowing of relative clauses across languages. One pattern discernible in mainly basilectal speech is the used of stressed *who*, whose status is intermediate between that of a kind of interrogative and relative particle:

(48) My mousi ... who should look after him ... got cancer. (= ‘My maternal aunt – do you know the one *who* used to look after him? – is suffering from cancer’)

(49) You know the people, *who* – y’know – they saved – y’know – somehow or other they saved – y’know ... (= ‘The people – do you know the ones *who* saved somehow or other ...’)

(50) Q: Who’s Roshni?
A: *Which one* made those lovely samoosas ... (= ‘She’s the one *who* made those lovely samoosas – do you remember?’)
Sentence (50) is interesting in that the second speaker's entire response is a relative clause which modifies the NP uttered by the first speaker. This type of relative formation out of discourse practice is reminiscent of the evolution of *ia* as relative-clause marker in Tok Pisin (Sankoff and Brown 1976).

While sentences (48)–(50) are basically relative clauses built out of seemingly interrogative material, (51) and (52) show the close relation between complementiser *that* and demonstrative *that* in relative clauses for some speakers. Once again, it is the stress on the particle that gives it this intermediate status:

(51) They got one special van, *that* takes away hospital. (= ‘They have a special van that takes people to the hospital’)

(52) We’re having a little bit of storm in the sea – *that’s* – y’know – causes the current to come ...(= ‘We’re having some sea-storms that cause the current to come closer to the shore’)

One other sporadic type points to the process of building a relative clause in ways that mirror patterns in earlier stages of English. It involves a *wh*-relative particle coupled with demonstrative *that*, as in (53). It is, however, a ‘one-off’ instance, rather than a regular rule of SAIE.

(53) Sing that song for him, what that alone you was singing. (= ‘Sing the song for him which you were singing alone previously’)

These processes share a great deal of similarity with syntactic borrowings across languages. Appel and Muysken’s overview (1987: 158–60) of borrowings involving new relative-clause types in specific languages suggests that when a language adopts a new relative clause with a relative particle, the latter is often based on a question word from the language doing the borrowing. Thus Konkani, which developed a prenominal relative clause under influence of Kannada, harnessed the native question word *khancō* as relative particle. Turkish borrowed a postnominal relative clause from Persian, and though the relative particle *ki* is from the donor language, Lewis (1975), cited by Appel and Muysken (1987: 159), suggests that it was probably influenced by an old Turkish interrogative element, *kim*. Finally, Nahuatl uses a native interrogative element *tlēn* (= ‘which’) at the beginning of relative clauses under Spanish influence. Nahuatl speakers may also introduce a deictic element into the initial position of the relative clause, an innovation which cannot be traced directly to Spanish.

A penultimate point regarding relative clauses in SAIE relates to the functional order of acquisition. Tables 3.12 and 3.13 showed that object embedding was far more common than subject embedding in SAIE. However, as the patterns were remarkably consistent across the three lectal
Table 3.20 *Proportion of non-standard to standard relative clauses by embedding type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject embedding</th>
<th>Object embedding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-standard relative clauses</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard relative clauses</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.21 *Occurrence of be/get/have in relative clauses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main clause</th>
<th>Relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be</td>
<td>get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas-R</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-R</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-R</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

levels it was impossible to claim that object embedding emerged before subject embedding in the dialect. There is evidence that for the dialect as a whole not only is object embedding more frequent, but it involves proportionally fewer deviances from the standard relative clause. Table 3.20 gives the proportion of non-standard to standard constructions according to subject and object embedding.

It is a possibility that object NPs are more easily relativised, whereas the comparative difficulty of subject relativisation causes many speakers to fall back on ‘fossilised’ non-standard strategies learned earlier on.

Finally, there is a noticeably large proportion of the main verbs *be* (existential), *get* (mainly existential, less commonly possessive) and *have* (possessive) in both main clause and relative clause. A dialect that is in the process of acquiring relative clauses may well first favour them in presentative matrix sentences. Table 3.21 gives the statistics. The overall frequencies are: *be* 31.3 per cent in matrix clause, 12.2 per cent in relative clause; *get*: 14.2 per cent in matrix clause, 2.6 per cent in relative clause; *have*: 3.3 per cent in matrix clause, 2.6 per cent in relative clause. The three verbs make up 48.8 per cent of all main clause occurrences and 17.1 per cent of all relative clause occurrences.
3.10. Conclusion

The relative clauses to be found in present-day SAIE are startling in their diversity. Charted against sociolinguistic grids, this diversity takes on more familiar patterns. Decrease in age and increase in education, particularly, account for preferences for more standard types of relative clauses. It is not the case, however, that older substrate-influenced and discourse-governed strategies are being totally cast aside. In intimate styles many basilectal forms continue to be used by a wide spectrum of speakers (see 2.4) The average (mesolectal) speaker seems to be able to carry both inherited and created relative clauses in her/his repertoire. That is, while a trend towards increasing use of standard forms does exist, it is not necessarily destructive of non-standard forms. It results in the addition of a (semi-formal) style to younger speakers' repertoires.
4

Word-order principles

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter we shall examine the main principles that govern variation in word order in SAIE, with emphasis on three striking characteristics: a high ratio of parataxis to hypotaxis; a wide range of constructions associated with a verb-final language; a high degree of topicalisation. The last of these three will be subjected to a detailed quantitative scrutiny.

4.2 Parataxis

This denotes a preference in some languages or dialects for the loose conjoining of clauses rather than the (hypotactic) use of subordination. These are to be conceived of as tendencies on a continuum, rather than absolute poles. It would be inaccurate to claim that SAIE shows a greater preference for parataxis than hypotaxis, since even the basilect shows use of a wide range of subordinating particles (for example, that, if, then, etc.). Nevertheless, in comparison with most dialects of English the degree of parataxis seems significantly higher. It is not possible to give statistics here: our justification for this statement will be qualitative – showing the range of permissible paratactic clauses in the basilect.

4.2.1 Paratactic circumlocution

Basilectal speakers use an oral mode which favours circumlocution. In the following three examples, from three different speakers, a short pause is indicated by /, a longer pause by //. (This notation is required since the use of commas or full stops might impose the norms of RP intonation and pause structure on the data.)

(a) (Regarding his father's indenture) Then/ it appears/ some of the people said/ 'Look here/ we going 'way to South Africa/ come 'way
with us’/ then what this/ my father did/ he joined them/ he came 'way to South Africa/ he came here/ then/ he came 'way to South Africa/ he ... you know where they employed him/ in Estcourt it appears/ in Estcourt/ y’know he was in railway/ in railway he was tea-boy or something like that/ he finished his girmitt there in Estcourt/ from there then/ after that y’know my/ my fathern-law went and told him/ there’s farm in Umkomaas/ come 'way// then/eh/ y’know my wife’s father told my father said there’s farm in Umkomaas/ you must come 'way.

(b) (In answer to the question how the speaker came to speak both Tamil and Telugu) You know like you come to my house/ coupla times your neighbours too meet/ now you catch up my word and I catch up your word/ that’s how it is//

(c) (Regarding the need to study Indian languages) You see morning I was reading in the Post too/ in the Post too it was/ yesterday Perumal brought and came/ I was reading, it was there // Telugu, Tamil, Hindustani ...
(6) Sunday night was very hot, he saying he wanna go for a swim. (*since/because > 0*)
(7) I came here, I learnt it straightaway. (*after > 0*)
(8) Got injection, I cried. (*when/after > 0*)
(9) ... in the house here, everybody comes – big people – we’ll talk Tamil. (*when > 0*)

4.2.4 Co-ordination without *and* or *but*

It is quite striking that the basilect has a tolerance of parallel clauses, where many English dialects prefer co-ordination with *and* or *but*, and the deletion (gapping) of equivalent constituents:

(10) She went Dannhauser, she died.
(11) I went to Dr Naidoo, I’m saying, ‘Pain is there.’
(12) My sistern-law getting grant, my brother getting grant.
(13) My father died with me, my mother died with me.

The intonation contour for these suggest that we are dealing with one rather than two sentences in each instance. Whereas sentences (10)–(13) deal with *and* co-ordination, (14)–(16) show the frequent absence of adversative *but*:

(14) Winter comes, no rain.
(15) Hammach we told him to go to matric, he din’ wanted to go now. (*Hammach = ‘no matter how much’*).
(16) I tell her to go workshop, she don’ wanna go.

These sentences without overt *and* or *but* are part of a larger trend towards run-on sentences in the basilect and mesolect. Several examples of these are given in 3.3.4 under constructions that are not quite relative clauses:

(17) I adopted one son – he went ‘way to Navy now.
(18) Just one of those things – you have to live with it.

4.2.5 Interruptive embedding

In 3.3.4.1 attention was drawn to a ‘near-relative’ construction involving either interruptive embedding, or run-on sentences. Although they qualify as partially syntactised relative clauses, they involve essentially a paratactic arrangement without subordinating or co-ordinating particles.

(19) I tell you Mr Maharaj – he was my teacher – he’ll send me to Mr Singh. (*= ‘I tell you, Mr Maharaj, who was my teacher, would send me to Mr Singh’*)
4.2.6 Two clauses for one

Occasionally basilectal speakers expand what would be a phrase in the acrolect into a full clause:

(20) 'Cos I left there, it's quite long now. (= 'I left (work) there a long time ago')
(21) I was reading, it was there. (= 'I read it there (in the newspaper)')
(22) We sold that thing, it was long time ago. (= 'We sold it a long time ago')

4.2.7 Direct speech

The use of direct quotes after verbs of saying and thinking is noticeably higher in the basilect than in the acrolect. (See, for example, 4.2.1(c) and sentence (11) above.) This is part of a greater predilection that the basilect shows for paratactic arrangement of clauses. There is an extension of the pattern to other verbs like want and like, where a pseudo-quote replaces an infinitive clause (see further 7.3.2.4(a), and sentence (28) below).

(23) He wants I must go.
(24) Doctor told me I must bring her back.

4.2.8 Adjacency violations

In addition to the paratactic tendencies outlined thus far, one other property contributes to the impression of the basilect being rather loose in its phrase structure. This has to do with its tolerance of what would count as adjacency violations in the standard dialect. The adjacency condition for English stipulates that an NP receiving case must be next to its case assigner (Stowell 1981). Thus object NPs generally follow the verb directly. In the SAIE corpus this was often violated.

(25) They used to talk so nicely Tamil.
(26) We speak at home Telugu.
(27) It was most of the time English.
(28) If I see anywhere my friends, I talk.
(29) I'm going now home.
(30) And I don't think again we'll go.
(31) Though I visit very often to Durban, but I don't like it.
(32) They give me free everything.

The adverbials which intrude between verb and object (direct or indirect) may refer to time, place or manner. Further work has to be done to decide what the conditions are under which such intrusion takes place. For instance, is the adverbial being attracted to the verb or is it taking up penultimate main-clause focus position?
4.3 OV influences in a VO dialect

Another striking characteristic of SAIE word order is the influence of the (S)OV typology of its Indic and Dravidian substrates. Although the basic order in SAIE is definitely SVO, the dialect has a greater tolerance than most (if not all) other English varieties for constructions typically associated with an OV language. However, the order SOV in main clauses is not viable in SAIE; it occurred only four or five times in the corpus of 15,400 sentences (in pre-basilectal or basilectal speech only):

(33) My sistern-law anything tell, I get angry.
(34) She her own-house got.
(35) It's in the garden planted.

On the other hand, there a great many topicalised sentences with the order OSV (to be discussed in section 4.4). Although this is probably not attributable to basic word-order patterns in Indic and Dravidian, it has the spin-off of placing the object before the verb.

On a striking number of occasions the phrase I donno occurred after its complement clause:

(36) Bus is tumbling down, I donno. (= ‘I didn’t know that the bus was tumbling down’)
(37) You want full one, I donno? (= ‘I don’t know whether you want a full one’)

Other OV influences pertain to particular constructions or to elements within the noun phrase. These are discussed below.

4.3.1 Quasi-postpositions

The use of side, time, part and way approaches that of postpositions:

(38) Like, Durban-side my sister-them must pay for the lights, for the water an’ all. ( = ‘In Durban my sister’s family have to pay for light and water’)
(39) We have our lunch twelve a’clock-time. ( = ‘We have our lunch at/ at about twelve o’clock’)
(40) Tomorrow I’m going doctor afternoon-part. ( = ‘I’m going to the doctor tomorrow in the afternoon’)
(41) We talk Telugu-way. ( = ‘We speak (in) Telugu’)

Once again, this is possible evidence of an indirect transfer, since the postpositions of the substrate languages are – like the prepositions of English – bleached of meaning. ‘Full’ meanings implied by side, time, etc. are not used in the Indic substrates and rarely in Dravidian. Direct transfer would involve structures like We talk Telugu-in, which are not attested at
any stage of SAIE. A few exceptions concern the postposing of opposite or otherside in some basilectal speech, which would appear to be based on Tamil usage (the postposition etire).

(42) He went that house-opposite. (= 'He went opposite that house')
(43) You know R.K. Khan-otherside, one school? (= 'Do you know a school opposite the R.K. Khan hospital?')

There is also an idiom widely used in most SAIE lects, last-before week (= 'the week before last'), which uses before as a postposition.

Although English has similar-looking forms: daytime, Stateside, etc., these are generally NPs, not PPs as in SAIE. (For example, they may function as prenominal modifiers to other NPs in general English (daytime person, roadside cafe), but not in SAIE (*farm-side person, *morning-part work.) These quasi-postpositions are discussed from various angles in 6.6.2.1 and 7.3.2.3.

4.3.2 Co-ordination

Older basilectal speakers use as one of their co-ordination strategies a pattern reminiscent of OV structure, in which ellipsis is rare, and the marker too occurs in final position in both clauses:

(44) I made rice too, I made roti too. (= 'I made both rice and roti')

A related pattern occurs without overt marking of co-ordination:

(45) Thursday I cooked, Friday I cooked. (= 'I cooked on Thursday and Friday')

Similarities with the substrates are once again in spirit, rather than in matters of exact detail. Tamil, for example, marks phrase co-ordination by means of the suffix -um, attached to each co-ordinated element, as in (46).

(46) Rāman-um Murukan-um vantānka.
    Raman-co-ord Murugan-co-ord came-sg
    'Raman and Murugan came'

Furthermore, sentence co-ordination of the sort favoured in English is rare in both Indic and Dravidian, where preference is given wherever possible to a subordinating 'conjunctive' construction. Sentence (47) is an example from Urdu:

(47) khāna khā ke cali gāi hogī
    food eat.inf CONJ move go be.presum.3rd.fut.fem
    'She must have eaten and left'
The sentence establishes a causal link between the action expressed in each clause; with the verb of the subordinate clause occurring in stem form. This conjunctive construction also results in partial transfer in SAIE, where the flavour of the construction, rather than a word-by-word (or morpheme-by-morpheme) translation occurs.

(48) He bring an' sells mango. (= ‘He brings mangoes and sells them’)
(49) Most of the time she sit an’ sews.

What makes this conjunctive-like is the intonation which binds the conjoined verbs as a unit, and the stem form of the subordinate verb. Sentences (48) and (49) may, however, also occur with the finite -s ending on the first verb. Passé (1947), cited in Kachru (1983a: 38), gives similar examples from Sri Lankan English: for example, to buy and give, to jump and run.

4.3.3 Kinship titles

According to Greenberg’s (1966) sample there is a tendency for proper nouns to precede common nouns in OV languages, and for the reverse order in VO languages. In French – a VO language – titles precede names: Monsieur Dupont, Lac Genève, Boulevard Michelet, etc. English has a mixed system in this regard: Lake Geneva, River Thames, Mount Everest vs Victoria Falls, Fish River, Table Mountain, etc. SAIE has the mixed system of English English, but leans even further in the direction of OV structure, with its tolerance of proper names before titles. Kinship terms originally from an Indian language but now entrenched in SAIE usage always follow proper names: Virend maama ‘(maternal) uncle Virend’, Navin bhai ‘brother Navin’, Rani akka ‘sister Rani’. In informal speech this pattern extends to ‘ordinary’ English terms like uncle and aunt: Johnny uncle, Daisy aunty.

Some titles of respect and forms of address are used in a similar way, especially in rural areas: Bobby police, Naicker teacher, Somera doctor (where Bobby, Naicker and Somera are proper names).

4.3.4 Question-final particles and question order

Questions are often signalled in the basilect, mesolect and informal acrolect by rising sentence intonation, without an accompanying change of word order (see 2.3.1.1). Although this is quite possible in informal English generally, I have shown that the basilect especially makes very high usage
of this pattern. In emphatic, rhetorical styles what is used in final position as interrogative marker, indicating an expected negative answer:

(50) You din’ hear me, what? (= ‘Didn’t you hear me?’)

In indirect questions clause-final what serves as the equivalent of clause-initial if/whether:

(51) But I donno, mother talks, what? (= ‘I don’t know whether your mother speaks Tamil’)
(52) I donno she died or what. (= ‘I don’t know whether she died or not’)

4.3.5 Clause-final conjunctions

Just as what may occasionally take up sentence-final position, two conjunctions, but and too occur clause-finally.

(a) Clause-final but usually has a non-adversative or weakly adversative sense. In sentences (53)–(55) the primary meaning of but is ‘though, really, truly’, etc.

(53) I donno the rain is pouring, but. (= ‘I didn't really know that the rain was pouring’)
(54) She donno Tamil? She can talk English, but!
(55) I was unconconscious, but.

As Indic languages occasionally permit the adversative conjunction in clause-initial or clause-final position, they might be one source for this phenomenon. However, as there are parallels in other varieties of L1 English in the north of England, Scotland and Australia, the construction cannot be said to belong unambiguously to an OV typology.

(b) Clause-final too is used mainly in the basilect, as an equivalent to (clause-initial) if or even if:

(56) It can be a terrible house too, you have to stay in a terrible house. (= ‘Even if it’s a terrible house, you have to live in it’)
(57) Very sick an’ all too, they take them to R.K. Khan’s. (= ‘If they’re very sick, they take them to R.K. Khan Hospital’)

This strategy is considered from a functional point of view in 7.3.2.4(d).

4.3.6 Rank reduction

Kachru (1983a: 40) lists this as one of the striking features of Indian English (for example, key bunch for ‘a bunch of keys’, God-love for ‘love of God’). Essentially, rank reduction involves changing a modifying PP to NP. More significantly for this section, it is accompanied by the preposing of nominal modifiers – a process which occurs to a much greater extent in
OV languages than in a VO language like English. (This is not to deny that English does permit a high degree of adjectival and adjective-like prenominal modifiers, or that rank reduction is not on the increase in English generally.) The following examples and their meanings in context are taken from the SAIE corpus:

- cold-touch 'a touch of cold'
- top house 'a house at the top'
- down house 'a house at the bottom'
- a own house 'a house of one's own'
- own people 'people like oneself'
- my-house wedding 'a wedding at my house'
- my-house people 'people from my house'
- top-house aunty 'the woman from the house at the top'
- light-peoples' house 'houses of people who have lights'
- those-times' people 'people of those times'
- my next-door neighbour 'my neighbour next door'
- my next-door daughter 'my daughter next door'
- nowadays-born babies 'babies born nowadays'
- like-his shirt 'a shirt like his'
- like-this-kind houses 'houses like this'

Some of these phrases involve a complete inversion of the unmarked English order: for example, top-house aunty has the order 3–2–1, compared to the 1–2–3 of the English English equivalent, the woman from the house at the top.

4.3.7 Relative clauses

Finally, in 3.3.3 we have already seen the transfer of three types of relative clause which are associated with an OV typology: correlatives, prenominal-external and participial relatives. (See further 6.3.1 for a discussion of the alleged incompatibility of these constructions with even second-language varieties of English.)

From the viewpoint of language transfer it must be reiterated that the OV influences given in this section play a relatively small role in the overall structure of SAIE, striking though they are to a typologist's ears. For example, we have seen the percentage of OV relatives in SAIE to be small – 4.5 per cent – but not insignificant.
4.4 Topicalisation

The building of relative clauses by some speakers of SAIE with little access to English in previous times is part of a general process involving the development of syntax out of discourse structure. That the result may often reflect natural or 'universal' cross-linguistic tendencies, while differing in detail from the grammar of standard English is quite familiar to linguists. The rest of this chapter will consider one such phenomenon rare (or highly marked) in formal manifestations of standard English, but quite common in informal English, particularly in pidgins, creoles, L2s (nativised or non-nativised) and some social and regional dialects – topicalisation. This phenomenon will be studied from three different perspectives: (a) as one of the features that characterise the SAIE dialect; (b) from the viewpoint of socio-syntactic variation (with comparisons with the results for relative clauses in chapter 3); and (c) as illustrative of the process of building syntax out of discourse in the process of language shift.

The distinction between topic and subject has been most clearly drawn in the work of Li and Thompson (1976). They view subject as a syntactic notion, since subjects frequently control verb agreement and participate in a wide range of syntactic phenomena including reflexives, passives, imperatives and verb serialisation. Topic, on the other hand, is a discourse notion whose function is to announce the theme of the sentence. In so doing, it sets apart the given (or old) information stemming from the discourse and the new information (or the comment).

I shall use topicalisation in this chapter as a loose cover term for several related processes: chiefly fronting (or preposing) as in sentence (58) and left-dislocation as in sentence (59):

(58) Change I haven’t got. (= ‘I don’t have change’).
(59) Tommy – he was a builder.

Prince (1981) discusses three types of fronting processes in US English: topicalisation, focus movement and ‘Yiddish movement’. The first (which I shall call topicalisation proper) puts old information first; this topic must be already evoked in the discourse, or stand in a salient set-relation to something already in the discourse. It often involves a contrastive effect, if a ‘list’ understanding is induced. Focus movement, which shows a different intonational contour from topicalisation proper, puts new information first; the element focussed represents the value of an attribute. Yiddish movement (so-called because it is a characteristic feature of the English dialect of US Jews with Yiddish as ancestral language) is relatively unconstrained. The element moved may either represent new information,
or—in the case of rhetorical redundancy—given information. Examples (60)–(62) are from Prince (1981).

(60) Most of the time I make biscuits for my kids. *Cornbread* you got to make. I don’t mean the canned kind.

(61) Now they’re coming out with a hydraulic crane. *Cherry pickers* *they’re called*. They’re so very easy to upset....

(62) She works with me. Twenty years we’ve been here almost. They demand more from a hairstylist and you get more money for your work.

In sentence (60) *cornbread* is part of an (inferrable) set of ‘breads’ and is salient in the discourse. In sentence (61) *cherry pickers* shows focus movement since it specifies the value of the attribute ‘be called X’. *Twenty years* in sentence (62) is an example of Yiddish movement since it involves new information not prepared for in the discourse—i.e. it is not salient or given in the discourse that the speaker has been in the same location for *n* years.

Left dislocation is a related phenomenon in which the fronted NP is represented by a pronoun trace in the main clause:

(63) *Hilda*, I can’t stand her.

Unlike fronted NPs, a left-dislocated NP is also set off from the rest of the sentence by a short pause. Finegan and Besnier (1989: 224–7) consider the main function of left-dislocation in English to be the reintroduction of information that has not been talked about for a while. In addition, it is usually contrastive, being ‘typically used when speakers go through lists and make comments about each individual element in the list’ (1989: 227).

Li and Thompson (1976) draw a distinction between subject-prominent languages like English (in which the delineation of topics is irregular) and topic-prominent languages like Mandarin Chinese (in which the presentation of topics is regular and part of the repertoire of basic sentence types). Sentence (64) is from Japanese:

(64) *zoo wa hana ga nagai*

elephant TOPIC nose SUBJECT long

‘As for elephants, noses are long’ (or just ‘Elephants have long noses’)

(from Kuno 1978: 77)

The following characteristics of topic-prominent languages set them apart from subject-prominent languages (from Li and Thompson 1976):

(a) Surface coding for topic, but rarely for subject.

(b) Rarity of the passive construction.

(c) Non-use of dummy subjects (like *it* in *It is raining there*).

(d) Control of co-reference by topic, not by subject.
Property (d) is illustrated by sentence (65) from Mandarin (Li and Thompson 1976: 469):

(65) Nei kuai tian daozi zhagde hen da, suo hen zhiqian
    that piece land rice grow very big so very valuable
    'That piece of land, rice grows very big, so it is very valuable'

It in the English translation of sentence (65) refers to the topic, *that piece land*, and not the subject, *rice.*

4.4.1 Topics in SAIE

Like the other New Englishes, SAIE has a predilection for topic formation. In terms of discourse functions, those outlined by Prince (1981) for fronting and Finegan and Besnier (1989) for left-dislocation are certainly applicable to SAIE. The 'givenness' (or 'evoked in the discourse') function can be seen in the frequent answer to one of the questions at an early stage of each interview:

(66) Q: And can you speak Zulu?
    A: Yah, Zulu I can talk!

Focus movement in SAIE is illustrated in sentence (67) and (68).

(67) But I don't know at all that bus is tumbling down. Nine somersaults it went.
(68) Interesting it is.

A third set of SAIE examples loosely fits the description 'Yiddish movement', though it does not generally have the foregrounding effect of its Yiddish–English counterpart. These involve rhetorical redundancy (sentence 69) or new, salient, minimally known information (sentence 70).

(69) Q: When you first went to school, could you speak English?
    A: We was speaking English when we was small. From small we learnt up English.
(70) Q: What can you remember about the recent riots?
    A: The houses an’ all – Inanda an’ all – they was burning all the houses an’ all. (= ‘They were burning all the houses and so forth in Inanda.’)

The contrastive (and ‘list’) function for left-dislocation is illustrated by (71):

(71) But, eh, Perisamy – he fell on a very big stone … Cook-aunty’s sister – she fell in; and her mother – she was that side … and Munsamy’s wife, she’s by Cook’s mother, she fell one side.

However, SAIE goes beyond the functions associated with fronting and dislocation in mainstream varieties of English. Firstly, fronting may occur
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initially in a stretch of discourse, without any apparent recourse to
givenness or contrast. Sentence (72) represents a question asked of me
without any earlier reference to medication:

(72) Your tablet you took? (= ‘Have you taken your tablets?’)

In the same vein, sentence (73) was the first statement of the day in a
household, addressed to a cat trying to force open a window:

(73) Like a wild animal you are.

Likewise, more than one interviewee, curious about the arrival of the
interviewer, asked Your car – where you parked? The existence of a car was
gussed at, since it was neither mentioned in the discourse nor physically
visible. I therefore suggest that while such extratextual inferencing is
possible in other English dialects, SAIE makes especially high use of it.

In sentence (74), B’s reply to A again shows the absence of givenness,
since the fronted NP is negative:

(74) A: Looks like, not only Velliamah’s got a phone, but she doesn’t stay home
    anymore.
    B: No car she got. (= ‘But she doesn’t have a car’)

In simply fronting a salient (but not necessarily given or contrastive)
element SAIE appears to be closer to the ‘pure’ topic mode than the
mainstream English mode.

Secondly, fronting and dislocation occur quite frequently in SAIE, at a
much higher frequency than other first-language varieties of English in
South Africa. Although ‘hard’ statistics are not available for other
varieties of English a preliminary comparison with adult White educated
speakers will be offered in 4.4.6.

The third way in which SAIE strategies differ from those outlined for
English generally by Finegan and Besnier relates to the range of elements
that permit fronting and left-dislocation. The most frequent type in SAIE
involves left-dislocation of subject NPs – a construction not mentioned by
Finegan and Besnier (see table 4.1). Subject dislocation does, of course,
occur in many English dialects; though it remains to be seen whether as
frequently as in the New Englishes. The range of dislocation and
 topicalisation proper in SAIE, exemplified in the ensuing pages, includes
the full variety of semantic roles: temporals, locatives, genitives, comitatives,
instrument, goal, beneficiary, source, dative of purpose, dative to and
even comparative NPs. Also worthy of note is the high proportion of
complement NP topics and complement (intensifier + adjective) topics –
see 4.4.2(c).
Fourthly, SAIE liberally allows topics in embedded clauses (see 4.4.5), extraction of topics from such clauses and stacking of topics. This results in a loose pragmatic word order, especially in basilectal and lower mesolectal speech (the numbers below each phrase denote the least marked sequence possible).

(75) An' then, *just two months ago now*, *'nother one wedding*,  
\[ \begin{array}{c} 
5 \\
2 \\
4 \\
3 \\
1 \\
\end{array} \]
my next-door daughter got married, in Umzinto, *that wedding*,  
I seen him there.  
'I saw him there at a wedding in Umzinto, at which my daughter next door got married, just two months ago'

(76) *Mus' be in working place people, something, they did it for him*.  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc} 
2 & 6 & 1 & 4 & 3 & 5 \\
\end{array} \]
'People must have done something to him at his working place'

(77) Therefore, I mean, I feel, *Phoenix, living like this, I don't like it*.  
\[ \begin{array}{ccc} 
3 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array} \]
'Therefore I don't like living like this in Phoenix'

Fifthly, topicalisation interacts to a much wider extent with other syntactic processes in SAIE than other English dialects. For example, it interacts with both yes–no and wh-questions:

(78) Alone you came? (= 'Did you come alone?')
(79) Your car where you parked? (= 'Where did you park your car?')

It interacts with negation:

(80) I'm here fourteen years; *not with one neighbour* I had problem...
(81) No slang an' all we used to use.

It interacts with indefinite NPs in interesting ways. (Fronting and dislocation were once thought not to operate on indefinite NPs, though Ward and Prince (1986) show this to be false for educated US English.) When indefinite NPs are topicalised in SAIE, they appear to lose the indefinite article:

(82) Big dog he's gonna be.
(83) Small place was Chatsworth here. (= 'Chatsworth was a small place then')

In basilectal speech, topicalisation also interacts with ‘pro-drop’ (or subject deletion) to produce readings which are widely divergent from what they appear to say on paper:

(84) Rajend never see long time. (= 'We haven't seen Rajend for a long time')
(85) Skabeni Hill must walk now. (= 'I have to walk up Skabeni Hill now').
Sixthly, the drive towards topicalisation seems so strong in the basilect as to operate even when speakers have already begun with canonical SVO order. This is effected by the recapitulation of pronoun subject and verb:

(87) We paid seventy-six cents we paid.
(88) We stayed in the Finn Barracks we stayed.
(89) You’re still in the varsity you are?

The salience of the object NP in (87) and (88) and of the indirect object in (89) (reflected in stress and intonation) causes it to double up as topic. I do not think that any kind of verb focussing is involved here, even though these bear a small measure of resemblance to such constructions in the Caribbean creoles – see 7.4(a).

For these six reasons I would argue that topicalisation in SAIE goes well beyond that of mainstream English varieties, in terms of both syntax and pragmatics. In the following sections I will exemplify the different patterns already outlined, discuss their relative frequencies and offer further discourse and sociolinguistic perspectives on topicalisation in SAIE.

4.4.2 Object as topic

Three subtypes can be differentiated in SAIE:

(a) **Left-dislocated object topic**: These involve a grammatical object as topic, with a trace or copy pronoun occurring in the main clause. Less commonly, the entire NP may be repeated, as in sentence (92).

(90) Tasneem too, I had to take her and go to the doctor.
(91) This farm I gave it on least. (**least** = ‘lease’)
(92) This crash bar, I lost this crash bar.

(b) **Object topic without copy pronoun**: This is the most frequently occurring subtype of object topic, frequently resulting in the order OSV.

(93) And ginger we should plant. (**should** = ‘used to’)
(94) Before that only asthma I had.
(95) Banana you want? (**= ‘Would you like a banana?’**)

(c) **Complements**: A construction that is gaining ground in highly informal SAIE involves the pattern: optional, frequently used, intensifier (**so/too/very**) plus adjective complement, plus subject and copula:

(96) Very interesting it is.
(97) Not so bad it was, y’know.
(98) Too sweet it was.
(99) And so fat she was looking.
The construction is also used when the complement noun is overtly expressed.

(100) Sick person I was. (= 'I was a sick person')
(101) Because so much food there be! (= 'Because there is usually so much food')
(102) Surplus that money was. (= 'That money was a surplus')

A parallel construction involves left-dislocation of salient adverbs or adverb phrases:

(103) Nice she cooked it, eh! (= 'She cooked it well, didn't she?')
(104) Too sweet you made it! (= 'You've made it too sweet')

4.4.3 Subject as topic

These involve left-dislocation. Minor variants of this procedure are given in (107) (use of a deictic phrase rather than a copy pronoun) and (108) (double pronoun constructions, which also occur in other colloquial forms of English).

(105) My childrens, they don't let me down.
(106) All my brothers too, they never used to do anything.
(107) Oh, but this car, this one very good man. (is > 0)
(108) Me, I'm feeling lousy now.

4.4.4 Oblique NPs

It is less common to form topics from oblique NPs, apart from temporal NPs and locatives.

4.4.4.1 Temporals

Not all temporal NPs occurring in sentence initial position were considered to be instances of topicalisation, since many English sentences with initial temporal adverbs or NPs are unmarked. Thus sentences like (109) and (110) were not counted in this survey, since they are a regular feature of most English dialects.

(109) Just before Christmas they shifted. (shifted = 'moved away')
(110) Every Monday we go for service.

On the other hand, sentences like (111) and (112) were counted as special topicalisations, on account of their high degree of markedness vis-à-vis most other English varieties.
(111) You see, morning I was reading in the Post too. (= ‘I read it in the Post this morning’)

(112) Whole day she be alone, it’s so dangerous. (= ‘She’s usually alone for the whole day...’)

Since markedness is not an ‘either/or’ phenomenon but a matter of degree, it is not always easy to justify one’s intuitive judgements regarding the sentences with temporals and locatives that count as topicalisations, as against those that do not.

4.4.4.2 Locatives

Like temporals, some sentence-initial locative NPs would appear to be unmarked. Sentences (113) and (114) exemplify topicalised locative NPs in SAIE.

(113) Near to Margate that is. (= ‘That place is near Margate’)

(114) In Umkomaas you are? (= ‘Do you live in Umkomaas?’)

An example of promotion of a locative to the status of ‘proper’ topic is given in (115). Such promotion involves the optional deletion of the preposition of the fronted PP – rather like preposition chopping in relative clauses (see 3.3.4.4).

(115) Temple – they poison your mind. (= ‘They poison your mind in a temple’)

(116) And the primary school now, the teacher hasn't even got a degree. (= ‘Teachers in primary school don’t even have a degree’)

4.4.4.3 Genitives

The topicalisation of genitive NPs would appear to be rare in general English, where it is easier to topicalise a complex NP comprising both possessor and possessed rather than any of the subparts. Taking the permutations of a basic sentence like I love John’s book, we have the following options and impossibilities:


(119) *John’s – I love book.

(120) *John’s – I love his book.

Sentences like (117), with topicalisation of the whole complex NP, were not counted in this subsection. In analysing genitives the notion of promotion is particularly significant, since it applies to the majority of the sentences with possessive topics. ‘Promotion’ in this instance refers to the use of a
noun as topic without the genitive ending that it would have carried in a non-topicalised context. In (118)–(120) the topic is promoted to subject NP, which occupies a higher position on the Keenan–Comrie hierarchy.

(121) Because Frank now, his pet dog got knocked, y’know ...
(122) An’ my eldest boy, his aim was towards ministering ...

In (121) and (122) the genitival character of the topic NP can only be gauged from the form of the copy pronoun (his) in the main clause. These sentences are outnumbered in SAIE by a pattern which neutralises even the genitive form of the copy pronoun, resulting in sentences resembling the ‘proper’ topics of a topic-prominent language, as (123)–(126) show.

(123) That big tree, the roots were going right by the pool.
(124) Ey – the car, front tyre burst while we were travelling.
(125) Thereafter anybody that drowned, they never found the body up to today.
(126) But Tamil – I din’ know one word.

Sentence (126) shows a partitive genitive construction, rather than possession. Unlike possessive NPs, for which promotion is mandatory (but see sentence (129)), partitive genitives in SAIE make equal use of promotion and retention of a genitive morphology for topics. Sentence (127) shows a (partitive) genitive topic; (128) is another example of a genitive topic stripped of its morphology; (129) was uttered by an acrolectal speaker who seems to be uneasy with presenting a genitive topic with zero morphology and accordingly compensates by using with as announcer of a topic.

(127) Of that 65 per cent, 35 per cent of them are on the verge of bankruptcy.
(128) An’ the teachers today, some are a bit heavy today.
(129) With these two, it’s like, y’know, part of their expression.

In sentence (129) not only is the topic heralded by with, but two announcers of the comment (like and y’know) are used.

4.4.4.4 Comitative

In answer to one of the preliminary questions in each interview regarding speakers’ backgrounds (With who(m) do you speak Tamil/Hindi, etc?) many speakers used a topicalised pattern that took one of three forms: (a) use of the comitative preposition with in the topic position, as in sentence (130) (n = 17); (b) use of the preposition with in the main clause, as in sentence (131) (n = 4); (c) non-occurrence of the preposition (i.e. promotion to subject) as in sentence (132) (n = 3).

(130) Well, with my parents I speak English.
(131) My grandfather, I talk with him.
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(132) Well, mostly old people, we don’t talk vernacular. (= ‘We don’t usually use the vernacular, even with grandparents’)  

4.4.4.5 Instrument/means/cause

There was only one instance of an instrumental NP topic (sentence (133)); a few with NPs denoting ‘means’ (sentence (134) showing promotion) or ‘cause’ (sentence (135) with a preposition and sentence (136) showing promotion).

(133) With my power-saw... one shot I cut that thing. (= ‘I cut the tree easily with my power-saw’)  
(134) Ten rand, you can do your marketing.  
(135) Through us they learnt English. (= ‘Our parents learnt English because of us’)  
(136) The sugar cane juice, y’know, it spins more. (= ‘My tractor spins more on account of the sugar cane juice on the ground’)  

4.4.4.6 Comparatives

In basilectal speech topicalisation of the comparative form of NPs introduced by like or from is possible.

(137) From Tamil it’s a very different language that.  
(138) Like ordinary Telugu that one is.  
(139) Like a master we can talk Tamil. (= ‘We speak Tamil expertly’)  

4.4.4.7 Other

There were a few attestations of topics involving the following semantic roles: ‘beneficiary’/‘recipient’ (see (140)), ‘goal’ (141), ‘source’ ((142)–(144) showing three strategies), ‘dative of purpose’ or ‘cause’ with for (145)–(146) and ‘dative to’ as non-beneficiary indirect object (147).

(140) For Blind Society we collect and we give. (= ‘We collect money for the Blind Society and make a donation’)  
(141) This school I din’ go.  
(142) And then Durban, money used to come from there.  
(143) From Jo’burg he was.  
(144) The schoolyard at the back, water used to drain there. (= ‘Water used to drain from the schoolyard at the back’)  
(145) For diesel we paid ten rand.  
(146) For every little thing the parents want to jump down the teacher’s throat.  
(147) Elderly people I talk to.  
(148) I did [get confused] because to the children I was talking Tamil.
Table 4.1 *Relative frequencies of topic types in SAIE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locatives</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitives</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative <em>for</em></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument/means/cause</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary/recipient</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative <em>to</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 lists the percentage occurrence of each function in topicalisation (= fronting and left-dislocation) structures. The hierarchy for SAIE is accordingly:

Subject > Object > Temporal > Locative > Accompaniment > Genitive > Other oblique NPs > Comparative

However, taking the proportion of subjects etc. topicalised to the number of subjects, etc. actually available for topicalisation, results in a drastic change of picture:¹

Temporal > Accompaniment > Direct Object > Locative > Genitive > Subject > Other > Comparative.

4.4.5 Topics in embedded clauses

Givón’s claim (1979: 18) that topicalisation is rare in embedded clauses can be evaluated quantitatively from the SAIE data. Of the total of 1,256 topics, eighty-two (i.e. 6.5 per cent) occurred in sentences with embedding. Seventy-three of these involved ‘extraction’ of the topic from the embedded clause (as in (149)–(151)), while only a handful showed topics remaining within the subordinate clause (152)–(153).

(149) Because Hindu religion and culture, I feel it’s too beautiful.
(150) Indians, I donno why they like that. (= ‘I don’t know why Indians are like that’)
Beans-price, I told is high because nobody has got it. (= 'I've said that the price of beans is high because nobody has got them to sell')

You'll find most of our youngsters today, they in the discos.

You know somebody's got to prove that wrong way you are living.

Another feature, which occurs sporadically, is the 'stacking' of double (sentence (154)) or treble ((155)-(156)) topics.

Most of the children, English films they like.

You know with my power-saw, the gum tree, that size bark eh, that size bark eh, one shot it cut that thing. (= 'Do you know that in no time I cut the bark [= 'trunk'] of the gum tree with my power-saw')

My third litem, standard seven, this year he'll be. (= 'My third son will be in standard seven this year')

A few instances of extraction of a topic out of a wh-question also occur, as in (157).

That grant money, what can I do man? (= 'What can do with (such a small) grant?')

Your car where you parked? (= 'Where did you park your car?')

Finally, extraction of topics from relative clauses is also permitted. These involve all the relative clauses under 'topicalisation strategy' (3.3.4.3) and correlatives (3.3.3) and some of the prenominal external relative clauses (3.3.3).

4.4.6 Discourse perspectives on topics

In order to ascertain the pragmatic functions of fronting and left-dislocation in SAIE and the extent to which these accorded with those of mainstream English varieties, the speech of twenty-four individuals was examined. These were the same twenty-four chosen as representative of the three main lects of current-day SAIE in chapter 2. As far as fronting is concerned, all three types discussed by Prince (1981) occurred in their speech. The totals are: topicalisation proper – 103; focus movement – 32; 'Yiddish movement' – 33. The ratio is thus roughly 10:3:3. It will come as no surprise to learn that acrolectal speakers made no use of strategies that fall under Yiddish movement. This again relates to their speech being directed more by standard-English norms, rather than by strategies evolved in the basilect.

For left-dislocation, the functions outlined by Finegan and Besnier ('reintroducing given information' and 'contrast') are outnumbered by other functions ('given' and 'salience'), the totals being 55:76.² If we accept Prince's (1981) and Finegan and Besnier's (1989) analyses as
representative of mainstream English, we must conclude that for fronting and left-dislocation in SAIE non-mainstream pragmatic functions (i.e. simply marking an element as topic) loom fairly large, especially in the basilect and mesolect. How significant typologically is this difference?

Drawing on the work of Platt and Weber (1980), which reports informally on a wide variety of topic-comment structures, Ritchie (1986) makes some interesting hypotheses about the basilectal variety of Singapore and Malaysian English. He attempts to relate the formation of topics and a few related constructions to the substrate influence of Chinese, which we have seen to be a topic-prominent language. In particular, the dialect exhibits three of the four factors which Li and Thompson (1976) consider diagnostic of topic-prominent languages:

(a) topic-comment structures in which the topic is not understood to have a grammatical function within the comment clause;
(b) richness of the class of expressions that can serve as topics;
(c) zero pronouns that are understood to be co-referential with overt topics (a hypothetical example, based on Li and Thompson’s discussion of Chinese, is Q: Did she see you? A: Saw.
(d) Lack of pleonastic subjects (there, it).

Ritchie argues that the last three are characteristics of Singapore English and that there is currently insufficient information about the first. He suggests that basilectal Singapore English is typologically distinct from standard English, being topic-prominent rather than subject-prominent.

Using these arguments, SAIE (or, possibly, the basilect alone) might be said to have the same properties as Singapore English. At least three of Li and Thompson’s criteria would appear to be satisfied in SAIE. The dialect has been shown to have a large class of NP elements which may be used as topics. In many instances these are promoted to ‘proper’ topics, with no control over main-clause agreement.

With respect to criterion (c), basilectal SAIE does permit deletion of the subject (sentences (159)–(161)) and of the object (sentences (163)–(164)). Note further that sentences (165)–(166) have both subject and object deletions.

(159) Ey, so hot it was inside today. 0 can’t sit inside, 0 can’t sit by the tree too man. (Either I, you or one can be construed as subject)
(160) Small broom 0 haven’ got? (= ‘Don’t you have a smaller broom?’)
(161) 0 mustn’t comb you? (= ‘Mustn’t I comb you?’)
(162) 0 got mother? (= ‘Do you have a mother?’)
(163) Len, you are disturbing. (Us understood)
(164) I brought the banana plant, I planted 0 here. (= ‘I brought the banana plants and planted them here.’)
(165) 0 can’t give 0 one cup tea too. (= ‘You ... possibly he/she in other contexts ...
can’t even offer me a cup of tea’).

(166) What they want we can’t buy and give 0. Can you buy 0? 0 Can’t 0! (= ‘We can’t buy and give them whatever they want. Can you buy those things? You can’t buy them’)

There is also a tendency for the avoidance of pleonastic subjects in the basilect (as in sentence (167) – see further 6.5.1.1).

(167) Got one big dog there. (= ‘There is a big dog there’)

Whereas sentence (167) leaves the subject position unfilled, sentences (168) – (171) avoid pleonastic subjects, but fill the subject position with what would be the complement in standard English.

(168) Full people was. (= ‘It was full of people’)
(169) The carpet is no rush. (= ‘There’s no rush with the carpet’)
(170) No flood was in Phoenix. (= ‘There were no floods in Phoenix’)
(171) The banana was no price. (= ‘There wasn’t a good price for the bananas’)

SAIE does seem to have the properties of topic-prominent languages. I would, nevertheless, hesitate to present the basilect as typologically distinct from standard English for two reasons. Firstly, the capacity for topic formation in colloquial forms of all English varieties is probably greater than commonly believed (as the examples based on educated US English in Ward and Prince 1986 show). Secondly, even though the total number of topics in SAIE is high (1,256 in this survey), proportionally they are still a minority (8.1 per cent of a total of 15,530 sentences). That is, topics are easily outnumbered by grammatical subjects in SAIE. One needs to make a quantitative comparison between representative fragments of Singapore English and colloquial British or US speech to evaluate Ritchie’s claim.

However, a comparison with one variety of South African English – that of educated, upper-middle-class, White Cape Town speakers – is revealing. Of a total of 1,080 sentences used by ten speakers in the control group of Whites, the number of fronted and left-dislocated topicalisations was fifteen (or 1.8 per cent). This would seem to confirm my impression of SAIE making a high use of the phenomenon. (In the basilect alone the corresponding percentage is 11.0 per cent.)

Givon’s distinction (1979: 223) between the pragmatic and syntactic mode of communication would seem to be pertinent to SAIE, Singapore English and New Englishes generally. He posits the salient characteristics of each mode, listed in table 4.2.

The high use of topic-comment structures would seem to be characteristic of language-learning situations – pidgins, child language and adult second-language situations. Although use of the strategy might be reduced
Table 4.2 Syntactic and pragmatic mode (after Givón 1979: 223)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pragmatic mode</th>
<th>Syntactic mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Topic-comment structure</td>
<td>Subject-predicate structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Loose conjunction</td>
<td>Tight subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Slow rate of delivery (under several intonation contours)</td>
<td>Fast rate of delivery under a single intonation contour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Word order governed mostly by one pragmatic principle: old information goes first, new information follows</td>
<td>Word order is used to signal semantic case functions, though it may also be used to indicate pragmatic-topicality relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Roughly one-to-one ratio of verbs to nouns in discourse with the verbs being semantically simple</td>
<td>A large ratio of nouns over verbs in discourse, with the verbs being semantically complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) No use of grammatical morphology</td>
<td>Elaborate use of grammatical morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Prominent intonation-stress marks the focus of new information; topic intonation is less prominent</td>
<td>Very much the same, but perhaps not exhibiting as high a functional load and at least in some languages totally absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in formal discourse, it is manifested in informal speech. Ochs (1979) reminds us that as adults we never lose our first-acquired communicative skill – the pragmatic mode – and often revert to some aspects of it in highly relaxed situations.

Aspects of SAIE syntax and discourse will be treated in chapter 6 from an acquisitional perspective and I will confine myself here to possible reasons for the predilection for topics. Givón (1979: 153) gives an example of an instance where topicalisation would appear to be overused and inappropriate in many English dialects:

(172) a. Once there was a wizard.
      b. He lived in Africa.

(173) a. Once there was a wizard.
      b. Now the wizard he lived in Africa.

Whereas (172) shows an unmarked sequence of sentences, with the second introduced by an anaphoric subject pronoun, (173) is an instance of the overuse of the marked device of topicalisation. Sentence (173b) would be appropriate only if there were lengthy intervening material between it and (173a). The overuse of topicalisation can, according to Givón, be ‘wasteful’. His explanation for the persistence of such ‘wastefulness’ is relevant to earlier stages of SAIE: ‘The wasteful over-use of discourse machinery, via “unnecessary” repetition, may actually have a useful function: when the channel of communication is noisy, or when the
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communicative system is relatively frail, over-use may be just the right strategy to insure that the hearer knows what the speaker is talking about’ (1979: 153).

One modification to Givón’s explanation concerns the relative lack of topics in pre-basilectal usage. Pre-basilectal speakers make the least use of topics – the percentage for this group is 4.4 per cent in contrast to 11 per cent for basilectal speakers; and 8.1 per cent for the entire corpus. Only one of the six pre-basilectal speakers used it as a viable strategy. The lack of topic marking is one of the factors that makes pre-basilectal speech difficult to follow – it is, indeed, the most ‘frail’ part of the SAIE continuum.

In a subsequent study Givón (1984) acknowledged the paucity of topic-comment marking in early interlanguages. He attempts to explain this by the ‘referential distance’ principle. Briefly, of topics fully expressed as an independent word or pronoun, those that are the most continuous vis-à-vis the preceding discourse or the most predictable will display comment-topic order, while those that are less continuous or predictable will display topic-comment order. The hierarchy is:

- comment-zero topic > comment-topic > topic-comment > repeated topic.

Early interlanguages tend to occupy the leftmost rungs of the hierarchy, because the distance between an NP and the clause it last served as an argument is kept to a minimum. The discourse of the six pre-basilectal speakers in SAIE tends to support this principle.

4.4.7 Sociolinguistic patterns of topic usage

Appendix C gives a ranking of the 150 speakers according to the ratio of the number of topics to the total number of sentences per speaker. The range was from zero in a few cases to 20 per cent. Forty-one speakers scored 10 per cent or higher; seventy-eight scored between 4 and 10 per cent; while the remaining thirty-one scored below 4 per cent.

Instead of going through all the social correlations for topics it is simpler to make a comparison with the ranking of speakers for relative clauses. In order to make this comparison some scale for topics needs to be introduced. Rather than imposing arbitrary cut-off points for lectal groups (a 10 per cent dividing line between basilectal and the mesolect and 4 per cent between the mesolect and acrolect was one considered after a first analysis of the data), a simple division into three groups of fifty for topics proved useful for comparison with relative clauses. Position 1 indicated the highest use of topics (20.7 per cent in this instance), while position 150 denoted the least (0 per cent). Table 4.3 gives the correlations between the three groups for topics as against the three relative-clause groups. Two groups are listed
Table 4.3 *Correlation between use of topics and relative clauses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>First 50 positions</th>
<th>Mid-50 positions</th>
<th>Last 50 positions</th>
<th>n per lect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas-R</td>
<td>15 (68.2%)</td>
<td>4 (18.2%)</td>
<td>3 (13.6%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-R</td>
<td>22 (29.7%)</td>
<td>30 (40.5%)</td>
<td>22 (29.7%)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-R</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>6 (50.0%)</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-basilect</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>1 (16.6%)</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>11 (30.6%)</td>
<td>9 (25.0%)</td>
<td>16 (44.4%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 *Comparison of topic range with relative-clause usage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bas-R</th>
<th>Mes-R</th>
<th>Acr-R</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>135 (29.8%)</td>
<td>256 (37.0%)</td>
<td>28 (39.4%)</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>159 (35.0%)</td>
<td>216 (31.2%)</td>
<td>15 (21.1%)</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>73 (16.1%)</td>
<td>86 (12.4%)</td>
<td>14 (19.7%)</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>53 (11.7%)</td>
<td>53 (7.7%)</td>
<td>6 (8.5%)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>6 (1.3%)</td>
<td>12 (1.7%)</td>
<td>5 (7.0%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>5 (1.1%)</td>
<td>18 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal and source</td>
<td>8 (1.8%)</td>
<td>12 (1.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative <em>(to/for)</em></td>
<td>6 (1.3%)</td>
<td>12 (1.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td>9 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefactive/recipient</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td>8 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>4 (0.9%)</td>
<td>4 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (0.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

separately in the table: (a) speakers who produced only one relative clause per interview, since one relative clause alone was a poor indicator of the speaker's lectal level; (b) pre-basilectal speakers who do not make much use of topicalisation.

Table 4.3 shows that there is some correlation between those who make the highest use of topics and those falling into bas-R. Of the first fifty positions for topics, thirty-six either fell into bas-R or had a score of more than 66.7 per cent (placing them in the lower mesolectal range for relative clauses). For the middle and last fifty speakers the correlations are not so clear, they fall mostly into either mes-R or acr-R, without clear distinction. Generally, however, it can be concluded that those who fall into acr-R tend to use fewer topics, while those fall into mes-R are well spread through all positions for topics. The contrastive range per lectal group is given in table 4.4.

A few additional points emerge from the data:
(a) Positions low down on the hierarchy are possibly more frequently topicalised by bas-R and mes-R speakers. This is to be expected—that the speakers who use the most topics would also have the greatest range of strategies for topicalisation.

(b) Likewise, it is no surprise that promotions of the sort illustrated in 4.4.4 (especially sentences (121)–(122) should occur in mainly basilectal speech and to a lesser extent in the mesolect, but not in acrolectal speech.

(c) ‘Difficult subjects’, who could not be drawn into vernacular speech for any long period and who consequently produced no relative clauses (see 3.5), likewise produced few or no topics. I believe that in in-group speech (often involving a slangy style) these same speakers make significantly greater use of topics.

4.5 Conclusion

The word order of basilectal speech, which may at first sight, seem to be very free, if not ‘broken’, can be explained in terms of the processes outlined in this chapter: pragmatic topicalisation principles; influence from the OV substrates; a preference for parataxis over hypotaxis; and tolerance for adjacency violations. On account of these principles the basilect may well be a non-configurational dialect. Configurational languages are those in which dominance and linear order are overriding principles. They have rich hierarchical structure (Radford 1988: 277–8). Non-configurational languages, by contrast, have relatively ‘flat’ phrase structures and a tolerance for the free ordering of complements. Perhaps all interlanguages go through early stages of non-configurationality. That a fully fledged English dialect should retain its links with those early stages is worthy of further investigation.
5.1 Introduction

Having examined syntactic and syntactic-pragmatic variation in some detail, it is time to turn briefly to other areas of SAIE structure that exhibit significant social patterning: morphology, phonetics and lexis. This chapter will also offer a brief comparison between SAIE and other varieties of English in South Africa.

5.2 Morphology

Bughwan (1970) and Crossley (1988) describe some of the salient non-standard morphological features of SAIE. Bughwan provides a catalogue of ‘errors’ found in the writing of a sample of high-school students in Durban, but does not assess their extent intra- or inter-individually. Crossley attempts to determine the features of SAIE verb-phrase morphology by systematic comparison between SAIE-speaking university students and a control group of White English-speaking students, under test conditions. The test involved an adaptation of one devised by Greenbaum and Quirk (1970) that made deductions about non-standard usage from students’ responses to sentences which they were asked to change in certain ways. For example, students were asked to change they to he in the sentence They criticise everything I do.

The hypothesis was that students would be less tempted to go beyond the instructions and make additional changes, to render the new sentence fully standard, (criticise to criticises) if they had the non-standard form in their dialect. In this particular instance eight out of 122 students from the SAIE group did not make the additional change, while all members of the control group did. On the basis of a close statistical examination of the test results Crossley posits fourteen features of SAIE verb-phrase morphology, some of which are given below:
(a) zero endings on verbs which take [az] in standard English: for example, *The boy watch the game.*

(b) zero endings for *do* in its third singular form: for example, *The boy don't like it.*

(c) -s endings for *do* and *have* in the third plural: for example, *The boys doesn't like it; The boys hasn't finished.*

(d) [az] endings for the plural of verbs that have it in the singular in Standard Eng: for example, *The boys watches the game.*

Crossley's study is useful in showing the extent to which the putative features surface in a semi-formal test situation, and in recording educated SAIE speakers' beliefs and attitudes about non-standard usage. There are problems, however, in making inferences about the richness of natural speech from a test situation involving students. Whereas many of the features listed by Crossley – especially those regarding irregular verbs – do turn up in my data base, some would appear to be an artifact of the test procedure. In particular (c) and (d) above cannot really be claimed to be features of SAIE. They are virtually non-existent in my corpus, or in casual speech in my experience. (When they occur they are genuinely 'mistakes' rather than 'deviations' – for example, they might be instances of hypercorrection.) Given the kind of variation demonstrated for relative clauses (chapter 3) and for other features in chapter 2, one would expect that variation exists against a grid involving social class, age, education, style, etc., which is not optimally tapped in a test situation.

For the purposes of this study I examined the patterning exhibited by twelve morphological variables that seemed to be most prominent from a casual first inspection of the data. These were then correlated with the use of relative clauses and topics and according to speakers' social backgrounds. The twelve variables chiefly involved noun and verb endings subject to a great deal of variability within England (see Cheshire 1982), the United States (see Toon 1983), and in New Englishes generally (see Platt, Weber and Ho 1984: ch. 4). Irregular verbs (especially *be* and *do*) and nouns (especially *children*) which showed more evidence of variability were treated separately. Other features which were examined were the use of the demonstratives *this/these* and *that/those*, and a special preterite use of *should* for the past habitual indicative ( = 'used to'). This special use of *should*, which is unknown in other varieties of English, deserves exemplification (sentences (1)–(2)). It occurs mostly in the basilect and mesolect, and even then in alternation with the form *used to* and with standard use of *should.*

(1) The way we should fright, ba! (= 'We used to be terribly afraid'; *ba* – an exclamation)
Table 5.1 *Twelve variable morphological features of SAIE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% presence of std form</th>
<th>% absence of std form</th>
<th>No. of forms</th>
<th>% speakers using non-std form</th>
<th>No. of speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-s 3rd sg. pres. verbs</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s 3rd sg. pres. verbs</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he do vs he does</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we were vs we was</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they were vs they was</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used to vs should</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s noun pl.</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s after quantifiers</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-s for nouns</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children vs childrens</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these vs this for pl.</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those vs that for pl.</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) That time she should drink normal tea. (= 'She used to drink tea with sugar then')

*Should* is also used for the irrealis equivalent of 'used to' – i.e. to convey 'would have', as in sentence (3).

(3) Imagine if the other dog was here, how jealous he should get, ey! *(should get = 'would have got' or 'would get').*

Finally, the negative form *shouldn’t* is even more common than *should*, and surfaces even in the acrolect. Its usual sense in SAIE is 'never used to'. (Note that *didn’t use to* is not a native SAIE form, though it is entering the dialect on account of the influence of US English on television).

(4) That time we shouldn’t listen radio, nothing. (= 'We never used to listen to the radio then')

Table 5.1 gives the statistics for twelve morphological variables of SAIE in outline. It is based on the analysis of the entire set of 150 speakers. Figure 5.1 gives a graphic representation of the frequency of these variables. It is
not possible to order these variables on an implicational scale of the type popularised by de Camp (1971b) in his study of the Jamaican Creole continuum. That is to say, use of one of the non-standard features in table 5.1 by a particular speaker does not predict her/his behaviour with respect to the others. The data is more complex than that presented by de Camp (1971b).

Percentage figures for a variable do not, of course, tell the whole story of its use. While all of the above can be said to be SAIE features, the notion of feature has to be qualified by noting the infrequency of many of the forms (with the exclusion of plural *this*), their non-occurrence at the acrolectal end of the SAIE scale (apart from the occasional use of *should* and *shouldn't*), and their stylistic inappropriacy for many speakers in public contexts.

Table 5.2 gives an overview of non-standard usage according to the proportions shown by individual speakers. Although the number of tokens for most of the non-standard forms was high (for example, 569 for *should* and 285 for *childrens*), the number of speakers who used each was comparatively small: 33 out of 111 for *should*; 22 out of 106 for *childrens*. A further breakdown is provided in table 5.3 for two of the variables.

The social profile for the two features is given in table 5.4 (a–e), which reveals a number of trends. Age, social class and education correlate strongly with the use of the two variables. In the informal-interview situation people under twenty, people of high social class and people with
Table 5.2 Use of twelve non-standard forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of non-standard forms</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speakers using no non-standard forms</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers using 0.1–3% non-standard forms</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers using 3.1–10% non-standard forms</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers using 10.1–33.3% non-standard forms</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers using 33.3–50% non-standard forms</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers using 51–70% non-standard forms</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Use of should and childrens by individual speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Should</th>
<th>Childrens</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of speakers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No. of speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only the non-standard form</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both standard and non-standard form</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only the standard form</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 The social profile for the should and childrens variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Ancestral language</th>
<th>(b) Social class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhojpuri</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childrens</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Education</td>
<td>(d) Urban–rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12+ 10–12 7–9 4–6 1–3 0</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childrens</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60+ 50+ 40+ 30+ 20+ 20-</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childrens</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
college education use neither of the non-standard forms. *Should* and *children's* are most typical of people over thirty, with not much education and belonging to lower socio-economic groups. Of the two, *children's* would appear to be the one more likely to be eventually replaced by the standard equivalent, since its proportional use by speakers with more than nine years of education and/or under the age of thirty is very low. (In intimate — i.e. non-interview — speech, characterised by 'dropping back' to lower lectal levels, a few acrolectal speakers do use *should*, but not *children's*.)

Neither correlates strongly with the parameter urban–rural, or with gender. With respect to ancestral language *should* is most common among Bhojpuri speakers, though all other groups use it to some degree. The figures for Telugu are probably too high, because of the (accidental) non-occurrence of middle and high social-class speakers from this group, while the number of speakers from a Gujarati background is too small for reliability. A few Gujarati speakers have been observed to use habitual *should*, though none did in this sample.

*Children's* is most common among speakers of Tamil background, but used by all other speakers, except for those with Gujarati as ancestral language. The same provisos about the size of the different groups hold.

5.2.1 The social profile for morphology

This section presents an analysis of the total score per individual on the standard–non-standard scale. Individuals were classified as bas-M, mes-M or acr-M as follows: bas-M represents a ratio of 3:10 or higher for non-standard to standard features; mes-M a ratio between 0.1 and 2.9; and acr-M a ratio of zero (i.e. no use of any of the twelve non-standard features). The classification according to all the social variables is given in table 5.5 (a–g).

5.2.2 Comparing the syntactic and morphological variables

In this section the extent of the correlation of performance on relative clauses, topics and morphology is considered. It would seem a reasonable expectation that speakers who performed towards the standard end of the morphological scale would do likewise for relative clauses, and would make less use of topic formation than other speakers. Conversely, speakers rated bas-M (for morphology — see 5.2.1) would rate as bas-R for relative clauses, and would make the most use of topics. Broadly speaking, this expectation was confirmed, with a few provisos concerning pre-basilectal speakers, 'teenage style' and optimal topic-forming levels.
Table 5.5 *The social profile for SAIE morphology*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Sex</th>
<th>(b) Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas-M</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-M</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-M</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) Ancestral language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhojpur 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil 24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu 13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu 53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhojpur 71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil 62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu 60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu 30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati 25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhojpur 17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil 14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu 26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati 75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhojpur 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(d) Social class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e) Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ 52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ 30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+ 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ 65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ 29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhojpur 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(f) L1 vs L2 English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bas-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mes-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acr-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bas-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhojpur 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 *Correlations between rankings for three broad areas of variation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>% correlation</th>
<th>No. of speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses and topics</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses and morphology</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics and morphology</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ranking of each individual for each of these variables is given in appendix C. The idea behind the ranking was that a speaker ranked 1 on relative clauses (i.e. most deviant from standard English, most ‘creative’, etc.) ought to obtain a similar score for topics (where 1 indicates the speaker making the greatest percentage use of topics) and morphology.
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Table 5.7 Spearman rank correlations for three broad areas of variation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative clauses and morphology</th>
<th>0.5534</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative clauses and topics</td>
<td>0.3271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology and topics</td>
<td>0.3480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 Comparison of four morpho-syntactic groupings of speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By impression (n)</th>
<th>Pre-basilect</th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
<th>Pre-basilect</th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-basilect (6)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilect (31)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect (92)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect (21)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = (150)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(where 1 indicates the speaker making the highest proportional use of non-standard morphology). Ideally, a speaker ranked ‘x’ for one variable ought to be ranked ‘x or close to x’ for the other variables, if the correlation were as hypothesised. The three different rank orderings in appendix C show that the ideal was only partially realised.

Given three variables and 150 speakers, it was decided that a fair choice for ‘close to x’ would be a difference of fifty places on the ranking. Thus a ranking of 60 for a speaker on one variable was considered to correlate fairly well with her/his ranking on another variable if this fell between 10 and 110. Given this generous margin, the correlations were high, but not as high as expected (see table 5.6).1

The Spearman rank correlations between speakers’ performance on these three broad areas are given in table 5.7.

One last table (5.8) illustrates the extent to which the groups set up for each of the three areas of variation overlap with the impressionistic classification of speakers into the basilect, mesolect and acrolect.

A few trends are apparent from table 5.8:

(a) Relative clauses and morphology correlate strongly for all groups.
(b) Topic usage is a less clear indicator than the other two variables of lectal levels.
(c) The performance of pre-basilectal speakers on topicalisation differed from relative clauses and morphology. For a consideration of why pre-basilectal speech has little or no topicalisation see 4.4.6.
(d) Acrolectal speakers do not average as high on topics as on the other variables. This is a reflection of the fact that while non-use of topics
would earn the highest ranking (100) in the procedures adopted, this
does not accord with standard English norms, where some use of
topics is desirable. Zero or close-to-zero use of topics is thus evidence
of a stylistic failure (vide pre-basilectal speakers and most teenagers at
their ‘public’ level); high use of topics is indicative of basilectal
affiliation; frequency between these two extremes (i.e. moderate use
of topics) is perhaps unmarked.

5.3 Phonetic variation

SAIE speakers often make casual (and stereotypical) judgements like the
following: ‘speakers with a Tamil background drop their aitches’;
‘Gujaratis confuse r and w’; ‘the pronunciation of words like water and
fair needs correcting’. These features are above the level of social
consciousness for many speakers; i.e. they are readily noticed by those
SAIE speakers who do not use them. Before examining these stereotypes
and other phonetic features subject to variation it is necessary to outline
those SAIE features that are below the level of social consciousness, which
set off an SAIE accent from other South African English accents. These are
core features of the dialect, used by almost all speakers irrespective of
social background, and subject to minimal variation. In Labov’s ter-
miminology (1972) these are indicators as opposed to the stereotypes
mentioned earlier.2

5.3.1 Major phonetic characteristics of SAIE

(a) Perhaps the clearest marker of an SAIE accent is its speech rhythm.
Bughwan (1970: 308) observes that SAIE tends to be syllable-timed (like
French, Indian languages generally and Indian English), rather than stress-
timed. This is especially true of informal and in-group speech, which may
seem to outsiders to proceed at a bewilderingly fast pace.

(b) At the segmental level the most salient characteristic is probably the
wholesale correspondence of dental stops [t] and [d] to the dental
fricatives [θ], [ð] of most other Englishes, including L1 varieties of South
African English. Thus theme = [tiːm]; weather = [wedə] and then
= [ðɛn] in SAIE. An interesting set of substitutions of [t] for [t]
concerns words dealing with the mouth cavity: tooth, teeth, tongue, tonsil
all have an initial dental stop, making a set with throat. Only acrolectal
speakers in careful styles avoid this instance of (sub)merger.

(c) The striking replacement of alveolar stops [t] and [d] by retroflex
consonants [ʈ] and [ɖ] that one finds in Indian English is recessive in SAIE.
It is more characteristic of basilectal speakers, and occurs in unmonitored
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Table 5.9 Retroflex [t] and [d] used by six SAIE speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13/21</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>17/39</td>
<td>6/13</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>18/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>8/14</td>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>12/33</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>3/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>33/50</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>48/112</td>
<td>11/23</td>
<td>6/25</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>18/68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33/50</td>
<td>10/32</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>48/112</td>
<td>11/23</td>
<td>6/25</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>18/68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: Uncertain: t/t: 1; d/d: 1.
Flaps for medial /t/ or final /t/ before initial vowel of next word: 7.

Table 5.10 Front short-vowel reflexes in SAIE, South African English and RP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAIE</th>
<th>General SAE</th>
<th>Extreme SAE</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[i] ~ [e]</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>BIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e] ~ [ɛ]</td>
<td>[e] ~ [ɛ]</td>
<td>[e] ~ [ɛ]</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>BET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɛ] ~ [ɛ]</td>
<td>[ɛ] ~ [ɛ]</td>
<td>[ɛ] ~ [ɛ]</td>
<td>[ɛ]</td>
<td>BAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mesolectal speech, but does not approach 100 per cent occurrence for any individual. Furthermore, the degree of retroflection is not as strong as in Indian English, and the SAIE variant might be better characterised as post-alveolar rather than truly retroflexed. Figures for six speakers, two from each lectal level, are given in table 5.9 (a–b).

The total amount of retroflection in the speech of six speakers chosen to represent the SAIE continuum was 66/180, just over one-third. As we might expect by now, the proportion decreases from the basilect to the acrolect.

(d) /v/ and /f/ are realised as approximants [v], [f] rather than fricatives; i.e. contact between the lower lip and upper teeth is made without the audible friction that one finds in RP or SAE.

(e) In some respects SAIE is conservative, retaining features that have undergone change in SAE. For example, [uː] tends to retain its backness specification, whereas it has become centralised to [ʊː] in SAE (Lass 1990). Diphthongs do not share the glide-weakening that is a striking characteristic of South African English: for example, kite has [aʊ], not South African English [aʊ] or [aʊ]; may has [er], not South African English [ə] or [ə]; house has [au], not South African English [aʊ].

In other respects the vowel system is a recognisably South African one, since it participates in ‘indigenous raising’ of the front short-vowel series,
with accompanying centralising of /i/ (Lass and Wright 1986). The reflexes are summarised in table 5.10. Note that the raised vowel characteristics of extreme South African English are not found in SAIE: the bat vowel is never [bet], the bet vowel never [be't], nor the bit vowel [b3t].

5.3.2 Minor phonetic differences

5.3.2.1 Treatment of /ɒ/

There is an age-graded miscellaneous difference in the realisation of /ɒ:/ before nasal consonants in prefixes. Many older speakers have [a] here, while younger speakers tend to have [ə] [ɔ:]. Thus some older speakers have comment, connection, condemn, non-whites, tomato, etc. for comment, connection, condemn, non-whites, tomato. [ə] is generally not acceptable here in SAIE, except for a few post-acrolectal speakers.

5.3.2.2 Stress

Although word stress approximates to that of South African English there are instances of stress being postponed to a medial or final syllable, where South African English (like RP) has word-initial stress. The SAIE pattern is, accordingly, closer to that of Hiberno-English (Ó Sé 1986). Furthermore, it is a feature of all informal SAIE speech. The following representative list of SAIE words follows the IPA convention that the stress mark precede the main-stressed syllable:

accom'mdate immi'grate
corp(o)'ration immi'grating
criti'cise imi'tate
exagge'rate in'dustry
re'gister or'chestra

For further examples see Bughwan (1970: 256)

5.3.3 Variation according to home language

5.3.3.1 Variation in the reflexes of /h/

Although /h/ is popularly believed to be missing in some SAIE pronunciation of words like head, it would be more accurate to say that it is pronounced as a related sound rather than dropped altogether. The realisations of word-initial /h/ in SAIE are many:

(a) a voiced fricative [h];
(b) a murmured (breathy voiced) fricative [ɦ];
Table 5.11 Initial /h/ in SAIE, according to lectal groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basilect</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[fi]</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murmur</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of tokens</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of speakers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of hypercorrections</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) a glottal constriction [?] (i.e. a glottalised onset to a vowel, resulting in a discernible rise in pitch, in contrast to the pitch-lowering effect of breathy-voiced [fi]);

(d) a weak murmur on a following vowel.

The last two are misconceived as ‘dropped h’. The usual English realisation of /h/ as a voiceless approximant does not occur, even in the acrolect (except possibly in the speech of a few professionally trained speech and drama students).

One further property must be noted here: the occasional hypercorrective use of /h/ before initial vowels. Speakers are heard to pronounce an initial /h/ in occasional pronunciations of words like ant (as [hænt]); and to ‘reverse’ the /h/ in forms like out-house to get hout-ouse ([haut ?aus]). Once again, the matter is not as simple as popular stereotype has it. In the first place, all South African English words precede initial vowel phonemes under full prominence by a glottal stop, anyway. (Roger Lass: personal communication). Secondly, hypercorrective /h/ has realisations (b), (c) or (d) above, with (c) and (d) being fairly close to the usual glottal stop + vowel articulation in South African English.

Naidoo (1971) undertook a survey of the phonetics of SAIE-speaking schoolchildren in Durban with Tamil as ancestral language. Her figures (1971: 114) for ‘h-dropping’ were very high (86 per cent of 237 pupils), as were the figures for ‘h-insertion’ (62.5 per cent). In order to establish the representativeness of these figures for SAIE as a whole I examined the speech of twenty-four interviewees in my corpus. Table 5.11 charts out the realisations according to lectal group. It shows an increase in the proportionate use of breathy-voiced [fi] as one moves from the basilect to the acrolect, and a decline in the proportion of pronunciations perceived as ‘dropped h’.

Table 5.12 shows the correlation between particular realisations of /h/ and ancestral language. The stereotype is partly true, since attestations of /h/ as a glottalised onset or as a weak murmur on a vowel are limited
mainly to the speech of Tamil or Telugu speakers. This should not, of course, be taken to imply that all SAIE speakers of Tamil or Telugu background show this variation: more than 50 per cent of this group in fact use the 'normal' SAIE form (a breathy voiced fricative).

A few instances of [j] and [w] as reflexes of /h/ that were recorded are excluded from tables 5.11 and 5.12. These resulted in forms like yad, yill and liveliwood for had, hill and livelihood. These rare forms, found solely in fast speech, occurred in the speech of interviewees of Tamil and Telugu background. The realisation of /h/ as [j] and [w] does not seem to be as frequent as in Afrikaans-influenced varieties of South African English.

The twenty-four speakers studied showed no trace of the well-known phenomenon of 'Dravidian euphony' – i.e. the insertion of a glide [j] or [w] before words beginning with a vowel. Naidoo (1971: 115) gives anecdotal evidence that this exists among older speakers of Tamil background. Like glide-replacement of /h/, this would appear to be a recessive feature in SAIE.

5.3.3.2 Approximant [v] and [w]

A second stereotype regarding SAIE is what Bughwan (1970: 306) terms 'the confusion of v and w' among Indic speakers. This feature – also reported for Indian English – results in occasional forms like vould and advertising. Of the twenty-four interviewees selected for socio-phonetic analysis none showed any fluctuation with respect to these two approximants. However, this does not mean that the phenomenon does not occur, for there were some manifestations in the other 126 interviews. I have heard older Gujarati speakers produce approximant [u] for [w] in words like wife (= [uaif]). Nevertheless, the stereotype is misleading in two respects:

(a) It is not a feature of SAIE speech of those under the age of forty in Natal, and even in the over-forty age group it is rare.

(b) It possibly occurs more amongst older Gujarati speakers, but is not limited to this group. (Amongst my 150 interviewees were some older pre-basilectal and basilectal speakers of Dravidian background who also used it.)

5.3.3.3 Other internal phonetic variants

A broad distinction is discernible between speakers of Indic and Dravidian background, except in acrolectal speech where most differences tend to be ironed out. It is still possible for a trained ear to deduce the ancestral-
Table 5.12 Use of /h/ in SAIE, according to ancestral language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tamil</th>
<th>Bhojpuri</th>
<th>Urdu</th>
<th>Gujarati</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ɦ]</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɺ]</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murmur</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of tokens</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of speakers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The language background of most basilectal and mesolectal speakers. (It is not possible to make finer distinctions between Tamil and Telugu background, and divisions within the Indic grouping into Bhojpuri, Gujarati and Urdu are possible but less easily specifiable.) Among the distinguishing factors in the basilect and mesolect are the following:

(a) Bhojpuri and Urdu speakers use an ‘a-coloured’ schwa ([ə]), (as in the final syllable of servant, wanted, etc.)
(b) /ɔː/ occurs as [e] or [e:\] among many speakers of Bhojpuri and Urdu background (as in the initial syllable of servant, bird, etc.)
(c) Indic speakers occasionally use strong aspiration with initial voiceless stops (as in occasional pronunciations of car (= [kʰəː], peas (= [phiːz]), etc.), whereas the degree of aspiration used by speakers of Dravidian background tends to be closer to that of English English.
(d) Older Indic speakers tend to use [e] for final schwa (as in [ʃuːge] ‘sugar’, whereas Dravidian speakers tend to use [æ] or [ɛ]. In younger peoples’ speech the difference is being ironed out in favour of [æ] or [ɛ] in the basilect and mesolect, and in favour of [a] in the acrolect. There is thus the shift: basilectal [e] ~ [æ] ~ [ɛ] → mesolectal [æ] ~ [ɛ] → acrolectal [a] ~ [ɛ]. (My impressions of which are the most common forms are given first.)

Verification of these tendencies discernible from a first inspection of the data is left for future quantitative studies.

5.4 Sociolexical variation

One area in which sub-ethnic and religious affiliations do play an important role is that of lexis. Before characterising the variation, an overview of the characteristics of the SAIE vocabulary is desirable. In this twilight period of language shift the distinction between what is an SAIE word and what belongs solely to the substrate languages is not always clear. Witness the following shopping list, which was dictated to me by a basilectal speaker (characteristic SAIE pronunciations and spellings used).
A Lexicon of SAIE (Mesthrie: 1992) contains about 1,200 entries pertaining to the following:

(a) words carried over from the Indian languages;
(b) borrowings from other languages of South Africa not generally occurring in South African English (chiefly Zulu via Fanagalo);
(c) English words having special import in SAIE;
(d) characteristic phrases, idioms, pronunciations of individual words and selected points of grammatical usage.

The total of about 1,200 words excludes those of Indian origin that are listed in the Concise Oxford Dictionary arising out of the British experience in India – for example, bangle, sari. It also excludes general South African English words that occur in SAIE (for example, robot as the usual term for ‘traffic lights’).

Two major subdivisions are necessary in characterising SAIE lexis:

(a) words used by most speakers in informal situations, irrespective of their ancestral language;
(b) words which are still restricted to some subgroups, depending upon the ancestral language.

This distinction reflects the relatively complex case of language shift involved in the rise of SAIE. To category (a) belong words like the following:

- agarbathi ‘incense stick’
- methi ‘fenugreek’
- thanni (a popular card game)
- isel ‘a winged termite’

These words are now pan-SAIE, though originally from different source languages (the first two from Hindi and Urdu, the third from Tamil, the last from Tamil and Telugu). English words which have undergone semantic shifts in SAIE also fall under category (a) rather than (b): for example, healthy ‘fat’. (Further examples are given later.) A few items in category (a) have entered the South African English vocabulary at large:

- dhania ‘coriander leaves’;
- masala ‘curry-spices’,
samoosa ‘a small triangular pie’

biryani ‘a dish of rice, vegetables and/or meat cooked together’.

Although many of the terms in category (b) are not intelligible to all SAIE speakers, they qualify as SAIE words because they have no precise English English or South African English equivalents, and are employed as normal SAIE terms by young and old alike, within certain subgroups. A woman from a Bhojpuri-speaking background requests of a shop assistant to see the achra of a sari (the part of a sari, including the border, which is draped over the shoulder), while another from a Tamil-speaking background asks to see the mundhani. The astute shopkeeper knows both terms, even though his wife might use the term palav, pallu or chedo, if she is of a Gujarati background, as is often the case. Similar principles operate across a vast repertoire of words, chiefly from the domestic sphere, covering the registers of cooking (vegetables, seasonings, grains, meals), kinship, religion, marriage, clothing, slang and abuse.

A few examples might illustrate the need for a separate category (b), and the lexical overlap operative in a language shift that involves several languages. All SAIE speakers differentiate between food that is particularly spicy, as opposed to merely ‘hot’ (in terms of its temperature). In the family domain one of the following words is used for the former, depending on the ancestral language: karo (Tamil), karum (Telugu), thitha (Bhojpuri), thikku (Gujarati), thikka (Urdu). As these terms rarely surface in non-family interactions, they are not intelligible to all SAIE speakers. Two attempts to find a neutral English synonym are pungent (encouraged by schoolteachers, but which sounds incongruously learned for informal situations) and the more recent acrolectal form chilli-hot.5

Other variants in category (b) follow the Indic/Dravidian sociogloss:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tamil/Telugu term</th>
<th>Bhojpuri/Gujarati/Urdu term</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pati</td>
<td>nani</td>
<td>‘maternal grandmother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kire</td>
<td>bhaji</td>
<td>‘edible herbs, spinach’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akka</td>
<td>mami</td>
<td>‘maternal uncle’s wife’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious variants in category (b) override the language family distinction, the chief determinants this time being Islam and Hinduism. Terms pertaining to Islam which are not always known to non-Islamic SAIE speakers include salath ‘prayers’ and fard ‘that which is compulsory within Islamic tenets’. This part of the SAIE lexicon is, of course, not specific to the dialect, but shared by other Islamic speakers of English in South Africa and beyond. On the other hand, a few terms like namaz ‘prayers’ and nika ‘wedding ceremony’ are known to sufficiently many SAIE speakers to fall into category (a) rather than (b).
Hindu religious terms are often drawn from English because of the spectrum of languages involved (Tamil, Telugu, Hindi, Gujarati). Where special terms exist (for example, *murthi* ‘idol, religious image’, *sami* ‘God, prayers’, *havan-kund* ‘receptacle in which offerings are made during prayer’) they run the risk of not being understood by all Hindus. A few terms of Hinduism are known widely enough to fall into category (a): *puja* ‘prayers’, *hawan/havan* ‘prayer involving symbolic offerings into a fire’ and *prasad* ‘sweetmeats and fruit distributed after prayers’.

Many of the items in category (b) will, in all probability, become obsolete with the passing of the last generation of fluent bilinguals in English and an Indian language, and with the accompanying weakening of sub-ethnic differences. It would be no surprise if terms like the following, which are favoured by older speakers mainly, are not retained in SAIE beyond the current twilight period of language shift.

- *supru* ‘winnowing basket’ (from Gujarati)
- *chulha* ‘open fire-place’ (from Bhojpuri, Gujarati, Urdu)
- *paiye* ‘small pouch carried by women’ (from Tamil)
- *nanadh* ‘husband’s sister’ (from Bhojpuri)
- *thalki* ‘a show off’ (from Tamil)

Equally many terms from category (b), however, seem destined to remain in the cultural life of SAIE speakers for some time, despite being restricted to particular subgroups, for they denote important items with no direct English English equivalent:

- *mung* ‘small green lentils’ (from Bhojpuri, Urdu)
- *bhai* ‘brother – respectful’ (from Bhojpuri, Gujarati)
- *akka* ‘sister – respectful’ (from Tamil, Telugu)
- *haram* ‘that which is taboo in Islam’ (from Urdu)
- *dhiya* ‘clay lamps lit during religious occasions by Hindus’ (from Bhojpuri)

5.4.1 Lexical innovations in language shift

In this section I will briefly characterise the adaptation of words from English to fulfil new meanings within the social and cultural context in which SAIE is embedded. In some instances SAIE carries over innovations begun in Indian English. Among these are the following:

- *cut* ‘to slaughter’
- *shift* ‘to move house’ (not necessarily temporarily)
- *knickers* ‘men’s or boys’ underpants’
Sociolexical variation

\[\text{head bath} \quad \text{a bath during which one washes one’s hair}\]

\[\text{body bath} \quad \text{a bath during which one does not wash one’s hair}\]

Two other kinship terms originating in Indian English, \textit{cousin-brother} and \textit{cousin-sister} are described under kinship terms below. The majority of SAIE innovations, however, have developed on South African soil. Four categories are described below. The first concerns kinship terms. I have already indicated that many terms from this sphere have been carried over from the Indian languages into SAIE. None of these terms are used by all speakers, however, since specific subgroups retain terms from their own ancestral language. Terms based on adaptations from English sources are more widespread. They tend to cut across ancestral language groups, but are more characteristic of the basilect and mesolect. One set of terms uses \textit{cousin} as the first element of compounds:

\[\text{cousin-brother} \quad \text{a male first-cousin}\]

\[\text{cousin-sister} \quad \text{a female first-cousin}\]

\[\text{cousin-father} \quad \text{one’s father’s first-cousin} \quad \text{(rare)}\]

These compounds denote a relationship not adequately described in English English kinship vocabulary: a \textit{cousin-sister} is more than just a cousin (but perhaps less than a sister). Some of these terms can become exercises in semantic logic: one’s \textit{cousin-father} is really one’s father’s \textit{cousin-brother}. I have also heard the term \textit{cousin-brother-in-law}, which must denote one’s \textit{cousin-sister’s} husband – that is, the husband of one’s female first-cousin. Although \textit{cousin-brother} and \textit{cousin-sister} originate in Indian English, the pattern using \textit{cousin} as first element of a compound seems to have been generalised in SAIE.

Another area within kinship semantics where the traditional English vocabulary is fleshed out pertains to the term \textit{brother-in-law}. The reciprocal relationship this term denotes in English English is felt to be too wide. Many males use the following equivalents in informal speech:

\[\text{swar} \quad \text{‘wife’s younger brother’ (from Afrikaans)}\]

\[\text{sarhu-bhai} \quad \text{‘husband of one’s wife’s sister’ (from Gujarati, Bhojpuri)}\]

\[\text{brethern-law} \quad \text{‘wife’s elder brother’, ‘sister’s husband’}\]

The traditional Indian joint family system (now in decline – Jithoo 1978) spawned a number of terms:

\[\text{big-house} \quad \text{‘house in which a joint family resides’}\]

\[\text{big-father} \quad \text{‘father’s elder brother’}\]

\[\text{big-mother} \quad \text{‘father’s elder brother’s wife’}\]

\[\text{big-brother} \quad \text{‘elder brother’}\]
big-sister ‘elder sister’
house-people ‘members of extended family’

Customs concerned with naming of children vary within the SAIE speech community. Terms like the following are recognised throughout the community, though they are not necessarily used by all speakers.

house-name ‘first-name by which one is known at home’
school-name ‘official first-name registered at birth’
calling-name ‘nickname by which one is generally known’ or ‘house-name’

One adult basilectal interviewee, when asked for his name responded You want my house-name or my factory-name? His factory name was apparently an Anglicised name bestowed at work. Speakers with Gujarati and Bhojpuri as ancestral language also use the term ras name or rasi, denoting a name bestowed on a child according to traditional practice after consulting a priest regarding an acceptable first syllable.

Innovations in the basilect and mesolect regarding love and marriage hint at the circumspect way in which these matters were once alluded to. Most acrolectal speakers consider them quaint or amusing today:

future (n.) ‘husband or wife-to-be’
interested in ‘in love with’
get in touch ‘have a romantic involvement’
proposed ‘affianced, engaged’
disappointed ‘jilted in love’
spoilt ‘carrying a child out of wedlock’
marry out ‘to marry outside one’s traditional sub-ethnic group’
love-marriage ‘a marriage that has not been arranged by elders’

Terms for particular wedding customs and ceremonies and terms of respect for relatives, which are frequently drawn from the ancestral languages pass as English, since they are used by young children who may have no command of an Indian language. These are described in Mesthrie (1992). Our final illustration concerns English words which have undergone semantic shift in the basilect and mesolect.

lazy ‘unintelligent’
interfere ‘to molest’
hint ‘to speak ill of’ (not necessarily obliquely)
independent ‘stand-offish, haughty’
raw ‘uncouth, vulgar’
healthy ‘fat, overweight’ (no longer a conscious euphemism)
wish (v.) ‘to greet’ (also other varieties of South African English)
goodwill ‘compulsory bribe to landlord to secure accommodation’

5.4.2 SAIE slang

A work on SAIE would be incomplete without some discussion of its slang register. Indeed, many speakers mistakenly equate SAIE with slang alone. That slang is very much audience-tailored in SAIE (as in all dialects) can be gauged from its use by males among themselves, less commonly with females, seldom with their sisters and never with their parents and elder relatives. (Female interviewees of school-going age reported the use of slang amongst themselves, but to a lesser extent compared to schoolboys.)

In the interview situation only one of 150 speakers used slang extensively (unsolicited). Accordingly, this section and 5.4 generally is based on a separate lexicographical project reported on in Mesthrie (1988, 1992). The reason for the non-appearance of slang is that its use would be inappropriate with a stranger engaged in a research project. The one exceptional interviewee turned out to be inebriated, and – interestingly – claimed not to be a user of slang: Me, I don't use slang akse' (= ‘I don’t use slang’). Generally, using slang carries connotations of being ‘young’, ‘with-it’ and ‘male’, though there are older male, and some young female, users as well.

If anything, the subconscious aim of slang is to break out of the confines of traditional kinship, class and sub-ethnic links, rather than to reinforce an SAIE identity. A few tendencies would seem to support this idea.

(a) The paucity of words from Indian languages in the slang vocabulary. Among the few are mota ‘rich’ (from Hindi for ‘fat’), balli ‘old man, father’ (probably from Hindi bali ‘strong, powerful’ or bālīg ‘adult’ (adj.), dhada ‘an expert, an old hand’ (from Hindi, Urdu, Gujarati for ‘paternal grandfather’, though an alternative etymology from Xhosa tata ‘father’ is possible).

(b) The large number of words from other languages of South Africa, chiefly Afrikaans and Zulu. Examples from Afrikaans are: dek ‘fat, full, satisfied, fed-up of’ (Afrikaans dik = ‘thick, fat’), lank ‘plenty of, lots’ (Afrikaans lank ‘tall’), skraal ‘hungry’ (Afrikaans skraal ‘lean’), etc. From Zulu come mache ‘money’ (Zulu amatshe ‘stones’), gane ‘child’ (Zulu ingane), skatul ‘shoe’ (Zulu isicathulo).

(c) The fairly large number of words from early twentieth-century British or US slang (via general South African English): pozi ‘house’ (British army slang for ‘dug-out, shelter’, based on position); doss ‘sleep’, on ‘tipsy’.
(d) The use of kinship terms for wider ties of friendship (for example, *bru* ‘friend’ (from Afrikaans *broer* ‘brother’), and the use of non-traditional, referential terms for ‘father’ (for example, *karel* (from Afrikaans *kerel* ‘fellow, chap’), *balli* (see above), etc.).

Furthermore, the large number of items shared with British, US and general South African English slang, plus the large number of items deriving from Afrikaans suggests that ‘SAIE slang’ did not originate within this group.

Although the lexis speaks of supra-ethnic links or interests, the syntax in which SAIE slang is embedded is akin to that of the basilect. It would be inept to mix slang with an acrolectal syntax. Sentences (5)–(11) contain some examples of ‘correct’ slang syntax in terms of basilectal rules outlined in chapter 2, alongside hypothetical, inappropriate usage involving acrolectal syntax (signalled by ?).

(a) *Lack of do-support:*

(5) You smaak her’ (= ‘Do you like her?’) vs ?*Do you smaak her?*

(6) What he chuned you? (= ‘What did he tell you?’) vs ?*What did he chune you?*

(b) *Lack of perfective have:*

(7) I klaared the chow. (= ‘I’ve eaten the food’) vs ?*I’ve klaared the chow.*

(c) *Lack of aux-inversion:*

(8) You’ll chow by us tonight, eh? (= ‘Will you eat with us tonight?’) vs ?*Will you chow with us tonight?*

(d) *Rhetorical where:*

(9) Where he’ll vie? (= ‘He won’t go’ – emphatic usage). Alternate acrolectal equivalent He won’t vie also possible, but not ?*He will not vie.*

(e) *Reduplication and historical present in -ing:*

(10) I’m chuning, chuning one way (= ‘I was talking at length’). vs ?*I was chuning at length.*

(f) *Copula deletion:*

(11) My swaar-litee this (= ‘This is my (younger) brother-in-law’) vs ?*This is my swaar-litee.*

Although further analysis involving quantification is required before one can conclude that slang lexis goes best with basilectal syntax, it does seem as if male youth peer groups are, in fact, maintaining vernacular syntax (as Labov (1972: 304–5) observed for US Black English). Interestingly, they do
so without identifying with older speakers’ speech, since the prolific use of slang tends to ‘background’ the (basilectal) syntax it is embedded in. This should warn us against thinking that basilectal syntax is disvalued within SAIE. Though it might be overtly denigrated (as when basilectal speakers occasionally interviewed on radio or television are ridiculed by some SAIE speakers), it has some covert subconscious prestige. We have seen in 2.4 that some acrolectal speakers veer towards certain basilectal constructions at their most informal moments.

5.5 SAIE and other varieties of South African English

It has not been possible to make detailed comparisons with other L1 or L2 varieties in South Africa, since sociosyntactic research that lends itself to comparison has yet to be undertaken for other varieties of South African English. It is not a controversial claim, however, that no other L1 variety of English in South Africa exhibits as much syntactic variation as SAIE.

In this section I will make some brief comparisons with Cape ‘Coloured’ English, as described by Malan (1981) and McCormick (1989). The latter deals with Afrikaans–English code-switching amongst ‘Coloured’ people in District Six, Cape Town, based on taped conversations in various natural settings. There are some similarities with points of SAIE usage relating to strategies of L2 learning in two geographically and historically separate varieties. Of the constructions that McCormick reports to be in use among her interviewees (for whom English was formerly an L2, but now seems to have equal L1 status with Afrikaans) the following also occur in SAIE:

(a) Lack of modal 'd with rather and like. Like the SAIE resulting forms McCormick’s examples suggest that rather and like have immediate indicative force, unlike their hypothetical sense in standard English. See 2.3.1.8.

(b) Possessive get (again showing the absence of an unstressed auxiliary – have – in colloquial English). See 2.5.1(c).

(c) Finish as a perfective marker. See 6.6.1.2 and 6.6.2.1

(d) The use of go as an auxiliary as in go bring (= ‘fetch’) to a greater extent than in English English (where a pause between the two words suggests that they are both full verbs). See further 7.4.

(e) The use of by as a cover preposition for ‘at, in’. See 7.3.2.3 and the use of with for by in the idioms by bus, by car, etc.

(f) The use of double negation – see 7.4(f).

(g) Demonstrative that for both singular and plural. See 5.2 and table 5.1.
(h) Use of time adverbials (and other material) before direct objects (for example, *I'm going to buy now bread*). See further 4.2.8 on adjacency violations in SAIE.

Malan (1981) also considers auxiliary and copula deletion to operate at significantly different levels from South African English usage in Cape 'Coloured' speech.

Some features of at least the lower sociolects of this dialect that are not found in SAIE are given below (examples are drawn from my own observations in Cape Town).

(a) non-use of future *will* (or *-ll*) if clear in context: for example, *I take it tomorrow*;
(b) non-use of past endings (*-ed*, etc.) if clear from context: for example, *I drink brandy last night*;
(c) unemphatic *did* in past tense verb groups: for example, *Who did throw that?*;
(d) use of a dative of advantage *me* with verbs like *buy*, *get*, etc.: for example, *I'm gonna buy me another car*;
(e) overlap in semantic space between *borrow* and *lend*: for example, *Borrow me your pen, Lend me a pen*;
(f) occasional use of *me* as nominative form: for example, *Me told him so.*

The syntax of the emerging (L2-)English of Africans (of mainly Zulu descent) and of the L1-English of 'Coloureds' in Natal would make for interesting comparisons, since these varieties are in contact both with the English of Whites in Natal and with informal SAIE. In a few rural areas in Natal SAIE itself is the main 'natural' model to young African L2 learners, and is replacing Fanagalo as the medium used by Indian and Zulu children at play. Comparisons with the emerging Black English of South Africa (see Magura 1984) will have to keep in mind the different functions of the two varieties: whereas SAIE is a vernacularised L1, Black English – like many of the New Englishes – is a language of education, work and the marketplace. The role of intimate vernacular is played by an African language. My impression of the English of African university students as used at a university sports field is that it is fairly close syntactically to standard English, compared to SAIE spoken in a similar situation. (Compare Mawasha's (1984) claim that South African Black English is fairly close to English English as compared to other New English varieties.)

The syntax of general South African English (i.e. the L1 spoken largely by people of European, mainly British, descent) carries few traces of divergence from English English. Lanham (1978: 21) remarks that 'South
African English is primarily an accent. Those differences that do occur (for example, *just now* meaning 'shortly', *busy* as progressive marker – see Lass and Wright 1986) have passed into SAIE. The L2 varieties of Afrikaans English have not, to my knowledge, been closely studied. We may note in passing that the few features outlined in Lanham (1982: 341) and Branford (1987) suggest that it is quite different from SAIE syntax. The differences are due to the divergent conditions under which the two varieties have been acquired, and to the fact that SAIE carries a heavier stylistic load, since it is both intimate vernacular and 'public' language.
6

Perspectives from second-language acquisition

6.1 Introduction

My aim in the final two chapters is to develop two perspectives which will assist in an understanding of many of the characteristics of SAIE. The dialect will be viewed not as a reified finished product, but as an evolving dynamic system. This chapter will examine the nature of second-language acquisition, while the next will explore the SAIE continuum in terms of notions fruitfully developed within the field of pidgin and creole studies. The two views overlap to some extent, and the applicability of models constructed within creolistics is still a live issue in second-language acquisition (SLA) studies.

6.2 The view from language acquisition

We will be examining four themes within the field of second-language acquisition that have particular relevance to the development of SAIE: (a) transfer, (b) universals, (c) strategies of second-language learning, (d) parameter setting.

Recent linguistic studies have emphasised that the acquisition of a second language is not the piecemeal hit-or-miss affair that it often appears to be. Learners seem to go through stages in acquiring the rules of the target language. Learning a new language (especially in natural settings outside the classroom) is not done through imitations of surface structures alone, but through deducing (sometimes incorrectly) the rules that underlie the output. Many errors made by the adult language learner are indications of this process of deduction or hypothesis formation: errors may be – paradoxically – evidence of learning.

There are significant similarities between second-language acquisition and the way a first language is learned by children. Like adults learning a second language, children making deductions about the rules of the target
language, often overgeneralise some of them (resulting in forms like *comed*, *doed*). Children appear to learn linguistic subsystems in stages that have little basis in the actual input they receive from adults.

Though L1 and L2 acquisition share more psycholinguistic similarities than commonly believed, there are some significant differences. In the first place, the L2 learner rarely attains the mastery of the target language that the young L1 learner develops. For many an L2 learner the process of acquisition stops at an intermediate stage. Selinker (1972) set up a model of an interlanguage continuum which an L2 learner progresses along – the continuum comprising a series of interlocking systems. Nemser (1971, cited in Ellis 1985:47) mentions the following assumptions in interlanguage theory: at any given time the approximative system is distinct from L1 and target language; the approximative systems form an evolving series; in a given contact situation the approximative systems of learners at the same stage of proficiency roughly coincide.

Two reasons for the non-mastery of the target language by adults are often given: (a) a psycholinguistic one – that neural structures operative in childhood language learning are no longer available to an adult learning an L2; and (b) a social explanation – that an adult seldom requires perfect mastery of an L2, i.e. there is a cut-off point at which the effort required for further development gives diminishing returns with respect to intelligibility in the L2.

The second difference between first- and second-language acquisition concerns the possibility of transfer of patterns of one’s native language into the target language. Although traditional scholarship has probably given too much weight to the phenomenon in explaining second-language acquisition, some modern studies (e.g. Dulay and Burt 1973) err in denying it any significance. Ellis (1985: 40) puts the middle view succinctly:

> The learner’s L1 is an important determinant of SLA [second-language acquisition]. It is not the only determinant, however, and may not be the most important ... The L1 is a resource of knowledge which learners will use both consciously and subconsciously to help them sift the L2 data in the input and to perform as best as they can in the L2.

As Ellis suggests, the influence of the L1 should not be assumed to be a negative one; there is both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ transfer. Positive transfer of structures of the L1 which are identical to those of the target language is a strategy whose effect is usually unnoticed. It is the negative transfer of elements which are not identical to surface patterns in the target language that elicit the attention of target-language speakers and analysts. However, even ‘negative’ transfer can be useful in the process of communicating meaning.
A third feature of L2 performance not generally found in first-language use is the phenomenon of fossilisation. Selinker (1972) characterises fossilisable linguistic phenomena as those items, rules and subsystems which an L2 user keeps in her/his interlanguage in spite of the amount of explanation and instruction (s)he receives in the target language. These remain as potential performance features, and often reappear when the learner's attention is focussed upon new or difficult subject matter or when (s)he is in a state of excitement, anxiety or even extreme relaxation. As an example, Selinker cites the use of complementiser that with verbs like want in Indian English by speakers who, in other circumstances, appear to have learnt the right selectional rule. However, Sridhar and Sridhar (1986) call into question the characterisation of such an item as an instance of fossilisation in a New English variety like Indian English, since it has become the regular feature for most speakers of Indian English – the rule, rather than irregular vacillation. The problem arises when one fails to draw a distinction between process (of language learning) and state (a new, but relatively stable, dialect). For many New English speakers backsliding becomes a stylistic feature, rather than the re-emergence of an error. It is part of the competence of the speaker that enables her/him to choose between variables, rather than an aspect of (imperfect) performance.

It is time to bring the discussion closer to the process of language shift in SAIE. In such a situation the same language is acquired as L2 by some speakers and as L1 by others. Most older speakers of today learnt English as an L2 in their childhood; and a few have learnt English as adults from their children or grandchildren. Almost all children today acquire it as an L1. For many older speakers the social and psychological motivation for acquiring a variety close to standard English was never strong (except for the 'new elites' described in 1.4.2 and 1.5). The notions of transfer and interlanguage fossilisation must therefore form part of the description of early SAIE. We must also enquire about the nature of other psycho-linguistic processes involved.

6.3 Transfer in SAIE

The opinion of many teachers and educated speakers would have it that almost all differences between SAIE norms and those of standard English are attributable to the influence of the Indian languages. Bughwan (1970) also attributes much significance to the phenomenon (in respect of features such as variability of article usage, plural endings, etc.). Counting against transfer as an all-embracing explanation is the fact that the same non-
standard features recur in variety after variety of the New Englishes, irrespective of the structure of the substrate languages involved (see Ellis 1985: 55n.).

6.3.1 Syntactic transfer

Among the syntactic similarities with New Englishes that SAIE exhibits are the following:

(a) Similar word-order patterns for statements and questions (2.3.1.1; 7.4(c))
(b) Variable presence of articles (7.4(b))
(c) Occasional copula deletion (2.3.1.4)
(d) Reduplication (2.3.1.6)
(e) High degree of topicalisation and left-dislocation (4.4)
(f) Greater emphasis on aspect than in English English (6.6)
(g) Variable marking of number for nouns and verbs (5.2)

Of these only the first two are characteristic of Indian English, Indic and Dravidian languages. The third property is found in Indian English and Dravidian (but not Indic) languages, while (d) is widespread in Indian English and Indic (but not Dravidian) languages. We can at best attribute these four properties to a convergence of L2 strategies and substrate influence. The last three properties are best explained by other processes than transfer (see 6.6).

On the other hand, there are syntactic patterns in the basilect and pre-basilect which accord with Indic and/or Dravidian language structures, but are not reported for other New Englishes (apart from Indian English). It would be futile to try and explain these by any other process than transfer. These are:

(a) OV relative clauses (3.3.3)
(b) OV patterns generally (4.3)
(c) Conjunctive constructions involving patterns like to run and come (= 'to come running' – 4.3.2)

Some of the transferred structures are limited to particular lects, and will be considered in detail under the appropriate lect and strategy they embody in 7.3–7.5. Very seldom are these structures dominant in SAIE; they usually co-vary with the structures of the target language (except in pre-basilectal speech).

Since these transfer effects are described in various places without quantification (see especially chapter 7), it is more appropriate here to
consider the role of transfer in the two areas of SAIE syntax that have been subjected to a quantitative scrutiny.

With respect to relative clauses we have seen evidence of some transfer of un-English patterns (3.3.3). The percentage influence is, however, quite small (4.5 per cent) for the dialect as a whole, under interview conditions. The number of non-standard relative clauses which are not attributable to transfer (and probably not found in the Natal English input into SAIE) is significantly higher, (possibly up to 45 per cent). These include discourse-governed relative clauses and most of the near-standard relative clauses of table 3.1. These figures give strong support for Ellis’s assertion that the learner’s L1 is an important determinant of L2 learning, but not the most important one. Small though the percentage of substrate-influenced relative clauses in SAIE is, it is not insignificant for various reasons.

Firstly, if we exclude acrolectal speakers, whose relative clauses are of the ‘inherited’ rather than ‘created’ variety, then the percentage becomes slightly higher: 5.3 per cent. Among basilectal speakers alone, the group most actively involved in ‘creation’ strategies, the percentage of substrate influence is 18.75 per cent.

Secondly, these OV-influenced relative clauses are quite different from anything in the target language, so different that two authors believe such influence to be impossible. In their important textbook on language contact and bilingualism, Appel and Muysken (1987: 89) make the following observation:

It is evident that there must be some resemblance between the first language and (a transitional structure in) the second language before transfer can take place. When languages differ too much with respect to a certain structure, transfer even seems improbable. Speakers of Chinese and Japanese, for instance, will certainly not produce utterances in English with relative clauses preceding the head noun, as they do in their first language. The structure of English doesn’t give rise anywhere to the idea that pre-noun relative clauses would be possible. The second-language learner does not have data to build such a hypothesis on.

By Appel and Muysken’s standards the transfer of OV-like patterns, especially for relative clauses, does take SAIE beyond the limits of most second- and foreign-language varieties of English. In this vein we shall be examining the possibilities of creolisation in the genesis of SAIE in chapter 7. Appel and Muysken are not entirely off the mark in their conjecture about the transfer of forms that would count as highly marked in the target language. In 3.4 we identified a small group of L2 learners (excluding those from the pre-basilect), who do not use relative clauses at all. They appear to be showing the unseen influence of the Indian language systems. For
them at least, the great disparity between the L1 and target-language strategies of relativisation does impede rather than promote transfer. Schachter (1974) reports a similar finding for adult L2 learners from varying backgrounds. Chinese and Japanese learners made fewer errors than Persian and Arabic students even though their L1s differed the most from English. The apparent anomaly is resolved by noting that the former group attempted fewer relative clauses, opting for an 'avoidance' strategy.

The second area of syntax which we have systematically examined is that involving topicalisation. The predilection for topicalisation illustrated in 4.4 is not substrate-induced. The Indic and Dravidian languages do not appear to use a particularly striking proportion of topicalised sentences (no more than standard English, say). Once again we see universals of discourse structure playing a greater role than transfer.

6.3.2 Syntactic preferences according to ancestral language

A strong confirmation that transfer has been operative in the basilect is the fact that certain features are characteristic of speakers belonging to a particular ancestral-language grouping only. That is, there is evidence of a finer patterning of certain basilectal rules than indicated in chapter 2.

6.3.2.1 Copula deletion

Table 6.1 shows the preferences for copula deletion among ten basilectal speakers, divided into two groups: Tamil/Telugu and Bhojpuri/Urdu. It appears that the former group do, indeed, delete the copula in a wider range of environments and more frequently than other basilectal speakers. If we were to include pre-basilectal speakers the figure under Tamil/Telugu would be much higher. This is so since the proportion of copula absence among four pre-basilectal speakers (drawn mostly, if not entirely, from Tamil and Telugu homes) is very high. Table 2.20 shows the rate of copula absence within this group to be 14 out of 20 in the present tense – i.e. 70 per cent). Substrate influence is surely operative here, since the copula is not used in the present tense in Dravidian languages, but is mandatory in Indic.

6.3.2.2 Only and too as focus markers

Two further constructions which follow the broad Dravidian/Indic divide in SAIE are only and too as focus markers (see 2.3.1.7 and 7.3.2.4(e) respectively). Other functions of too (see 7.3.2.4(e)) do not correlate with
Table 6.1  *Copula deletion in the present tense by ten speakers, according to ancestral language*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tamil/Telugu</th>
<th>Bhojpuri/Urdu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(Adj) N</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adj/adv</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PP</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- V + ing</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2  *Use of focus only and too by ten speakers, according to ancestral language*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tamil/Telugu</th>
<th>Bhojpuri/Urdu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus too</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ancestral language. Table 6.2 has the details for the two variables as used by five speakers of Dravidian language background and five of Indic background.

6.3.2.3  *Relative clauses*

Table 3.10 showed that for a small set of relative clauses there is finer patterning according to speakers' ancestral languages. To repeat: 'pure' correlatives and participial relative clauses were used by speakers of Indic background only; prenominal-external relative clauses were used by speakers of Dravidian background only; place and indefinite correlatives were used by speakers from both groups (corresponding to the fact that these are the only types of correlatives that are common to Indic and Dravidian). See further 3.5.7.

6.3.2.4  *Articles before adjectives*

The impetus for this construction must come from Dravidian languages where adjectives are not always treated as distinct from nouns (see further 7.4(i)). The feature surfaces in some pre-basilectal and basilectal speech, though rarely. Of the seven speakers in our corpus who used sentences like *He's a good*, six were of Dravidian language background.
It is perhaps worth noting that there are no syntactic stereotypes among SAIE speakers of the sort outlined for phonetic features like /h/ (see 5.3 and 5.3.2.1). It is not surprising that where significant differences in syntactic usage occur, they are limited to basilectal constructions. This makes sense in terms of Milroy’s concept of networks (2.1.2) since there was greater interaction in the past among people belonging to the same language or language grouping (including choice of marriage partner). The effect of common schooling and the change from L2 to L1 for SAIE has worked towards the reduction of sub-ethnic differences in language, as in other aspects of social interaction and cultural experience. In terms of syntax, there has been a percolation of some features from one ancestral-language grouping to all speakers of SAIE. For example, reduplication, which is limited in Dravidian languages but widespread in the Indic family, is a salient feature of all basilectal and mesolectal SAIE speakers.

6.3.3 Morphological transfer

The case for morphological transfer (either negative or positive) from the substrata to SAIE is not strong. As the substrata are morphologically richer than English we cannot look to them for convincing explanations regarding the occasional absence of endings in both noun and verb. Bughwan (1970: 188–93) suggests that substrate influence is responsible for the occasional absence of the article and noun endings in her corpus. She claims that Hindi and Tamil have no articles and that pluralisation in Hindi is done by vocalic rather than consonantal endings. The argument is less than convincing for several reasons. If substrate comparisons are to be made, one should turn to Bhojpuri, rather than Hindi (see 1.3). Bhojpuri, admittedly, does not express the indefinite article overtly; however, emphatic or focused definite noun phrases are expressed by the form -wā (for example, chokrā ‘boy’; chokarwā ‘the boy’). In addition, several Bhojpuri texts of India use the demonstrative form u + noun for definiteness in NPs. In Dravidian languages definiteness is (optionally) marked by deictic particles.

Regarding the plural of nouns, Bhojpuri has a host of strategies:

(a) zero plurals after numerals (for example, chokrā ‘boy’; tin chokrā ‘three boys’);
(b) periphrastic plurals (with log, literally ‘people’: for example, bandar ‘monkey’; bandar log ‘monkeys’);
(c) the consonantal suffix -n after vowel stems (for example, baccā ‘baby’; baccan ‘children’);
Table 6.3 Comparison of five features of SAIE and substrate morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>SAIE</th>
<th>Indic</th>
<th>Dravidian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of verb endings for 3rd singular pres</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of noun plural endings</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(rare)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>was</em> as plural verb form</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(rare)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>should</em> = 'used to'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*this/<em>that</em> for plural</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) occasional double marking of plurals (i.e. quantifier plus noun ending: for example, *tin baccan* 'three children').

Clearly, appeals to substrate 'interference' need to be made with greater caution. Likewise, variation in the use of *-ing* (as both simple and progressive present for some speakers – see 2.3.1.5(d)), is not attributable to Indic or Dravidian as commonly supposed, since they have clear ways of differentiating these categories (Bhojpuri, for example, has two separate paradigms for these). A contrastive summary of some of the morphological features discussed in 5.2 is given in table 6.3.

Table 6.3 shows that of these five prominent features of SAIE morphology transfer may have been influential for only one. It would appear that the characteristics of the substrates are not influential in SAIE morphology. Where similarities occur they are negative (the absence of endings) rather than positive (showing a feature not found in general English that is clearly calqued on an Indic and/or Dravidian source). The greatest amount of transfer occurs in syntax and phonology; transfer in morphology is less significant.

6.4 Universals of second-language acquisition: negation

In this section we will examine an area of syntax – negation – that has not been subject to transfer from the substrate languages, but which shows a strong parallel to universal patterns of development in first- and second-language acquisition.

6.4.1 Negation in child language

Hyams (1986: 80–1) summarises a representative study of negation in L1 child language – a dissertation by Bellugi (1967). Bellugi traces the development of negation through three phases, which she labels periods A,
B and C. In period A the negative markers *no* and *not* appear in sentence-initial position. In the subsequent period (B) negation is located between the subject NP and the VP. Examples from these two periods follow:

**Period A:**
- Oh no raining.
- Not the sun shining.
- No want stand head.
- Not have coffee.
- No Fraser drink all tea.

**Period B:**
- No, that not a circus train.
- That no blast off.
- He not bite you.
- I not bending them.

Period C marks the emergence of the modals (and *be*) in declarative, negative and interrogative sentences. As in adult speech, the negative form may be contracted and attracted to the auxiliary or occur in full form after it.

**Period C:**
- He won't come.
- I can't see it.
- The sun is not too bright.

6.4.2 Negation in second-language acquisition

Ellis (1985: 59n.) discusses the general pattern of negatives in second-language acquisition, drawing upon studies of learners of English from varying backgrounds (Japanese, Spanish, German, Norwegian), ages (children, adolescents, adults) and types of acquisition (natural, by instruction, mixed). The stages for the acquisition of negatives are as follows:

**Stage I:** External negation with a negative particle (usually *no* attached to a declarative nucleus): for example, *No very good, No you playing here.*

**Stage II:** The development of internal negation, with negative particle *not* and/or *don't* (unanalysed, i.e. not treated as the negative of *do*): for example, *Marianna not coming today; I no can swim; I don't see nothing mop.*

**Stage III:** Negative attachment to modal verbs, often as unanalysed units: for example, *I can't play this one; I won't go.*

**Stage IV:** The final stage in which the rules of the target language are reached. The learner develops auxiliary elements fully and uses *not* as a negative particle. Some related problems regarding tense and number
assignment might remain: for example, *I didn’t said it* might co-occur with target-language structures like *He doesn’t know anything* and *She didn’t believe me*.

Ellis emphasises that the transition from stage I to IV is a gradual one, with intermediate overlapping stages. There is a gradual loss of earlier rules in favour of later ones. Minor differences might occur according to a speaker’s language background (Norwegian and German learners have an additional stage involving postverbal main-verb negation, Spanish learners seem to spend longer on the external negation stage).

6.4.3 Negation in Indic and Dravidian languages

The SAIE data can be fruitfully analysed in terms of the four lectal groups set up in chapter 2. We shall see that they offer strong parallels to the four stages described by Ellis for second-language acquisition. It is significant that substrate influence is not discernible at any stage of the lectal continua. Tamil and Telugu have a synthetic negative, with the negative particle following the verb and other tense and aspect markers:

(1) Pōkale. (Tamil)
    go.inf.neg
    ‘I didn’t go’ (literally ‘I go not’)

(2) Neenu veḷḷaledu (Telugu)
    I go.past.neg
    ‘I didn’t go’

In Indic languages the order varies. Urdu and Bhojpuri have preverbal negation, but may reverse the order for emphasis.

(3) Mai nahi gayā (Urdu)
    I not go.past
    ‘I didn’t go’

Gujarati, on the other hand, has post-verbal negation and reverses the order for special emphasis.

(4) Hū gayo nahi.
    I go.past not
    ‘I didn’t go’

The following analysis of negation in SAIE is based on the speech of thirty speakers – i.e. those twenty-four discussed in chapter 2, plus the six pre-basilectal speakers.
6.4.4 Negation in the pre-basilect

The pre-basilect is the only lect that gives evidence of stage I negation (i.e. external negation with *no* or *not*). It is also the only lect to use *no* as verbal negator.

(5) Not my family got. (= 'I don't have a family')
(6) No talkating, no talkating. (= 'He couldn't talk')

However, stage II with negative particle *not* or *no* and partially analysed *din'* or *don'* are more characteristic of the pre-basilect:

(7) One boy no talk. (= 'One boy couldn't talk')
(8) We not fighting. (= 'We don't fight')
(9) I not working in the mill. (= 'I wasn't working ... ')
(10) Why don' take chair? (= 'Why don't you pull up a chair?')
(11) Don' talk me. (= 'They didn't talk to me')
(12) I din' married. (= 'I didn't marry/ I didn't get married')

*Donno* occurs as a chunk, as does the form *haven' got*. The form *can't* appears as an unaanalysed form with past or present meaning.

(13) I donno nothing.
(14) My father too donno read.
(15) That time haven' got jobs. (= 'There weren't any jobs then')
(16) I can't read that one. (present tense)
(17) I can't go walk, y'know the pressure. (past tense)

*Haven't* does not occur with any other verb than *got* at this stage. In fact, neither *have* nor *do* exist as positive auxiliaries in the pre-basilect. *Can* occurred only once in the entire pre-basilectal corpus. (In child L1 English *can't* and *don't* emerge before other negative modals and before all the non-negative modals – Hyams 1986: 84).

An important negator in the pre-basilect is *never*. It is usually followed by the infinitive form of the verb. In this usage it carries unemphatic simple-past meaning (equivalent to standard English *didn't*).

(18) My husband never do it. (= 'My husband didn't do it')

Less commonly, it is followed by the past form of the verb, with semantics 'not ever'.

(19) I never went there, not a one time.

The only other negative form that occurred in the pre-basilectal corpus was *mustn't*, used in a non-standard sense of 'weren't allowed to'.
6.4.5 Basilectal negation

The basilect shows no trace of stage I (external) negation, nor does it use no as verb negator. The use of not and don' goes beyond stage II. That is, not occurs after auxiliary verbs, don' elsewhere. Don' and din' become analysed as present and past forms respectively, though there are occasional lapses. Sentences (20)—(21) show the correct use of din' and don', while (22)—(23) show occasional problems with tense marking:

(20) We din' have one fight yet.
(21) You don' wanna have nothing to eat?
(22) That time we don' know so much.
(23) He din' wanted to go.

At this stage the form doesn't emerges. It is used optionally for third person singular (and once incorrectly for third plural). The chunk haven' got is now very frequent and still the only collocation involving haven'. (Perfective have is not used in the basilect).

Never continues to be a salient negator. Among the eight basilectal speakers analysed never was used thirteen times with the infinitive form of the verb; twice with a past form of the verb; and twice with the semi-auxiliary used to. Fourteen of these instances involved non-standard semantics ('didn't' or 'haven't' — see (24)—(26) below) and two the standard semantics of 'not ever' — see, for example (27).

(24) I never go there to find out. (= 'didn't')
(25) They never play with those crooks. (= 'didn't')
(26) We never write yet. (= 'haven't written')
(27) He never finish his matric. (= 'never finished matric')

As far as the rest of the negative auxiliaries go, mustn't is now frequently (and correctly) used. Can't is on the increase, but occurs in an array of (non-standard) functions:

(28) We can't get a neighbours like that (= 'won't')
(29) They can't understand. (= 'don't')
(30) My mother had a stroke and she can't talk and she can't walk an' all. (= 'couldn't', twice)

Couldn't emerges as a marker of the past tense, but may overlap with can't:

(31) We couldn't sleep (= 'couldn't')
(32) I couldn't remember nothing. (= 'can't')

Finally, won't (or, more appropriately [oun]) emerges, but has a wide range of semantics initially, though its standard meaning 'will not' is the most common:
(33) I won't go to hospital and die. (= ‘won’t’, possibly ‘don’t want to’)
(34) At home we won’t learn. (= ‘didn’t’)
(35) No, he won’t fright. (= ‘wasn’t afraid/wouldn’t be afraid’)

Some speakers have fossilised at a double-modal stage involving won’t:

(36) I might won’t go. (= ‘I might not go’)

6.4.6 Mesolectal negation

There are no traces of stage I or II negation in the mesolect. *Not* occurs after auxiliaries and is usually contracted except with present forms of *be*. *Din’* and *don’* are clearly differentiated, with no overlap in the tenses they mark. Nor are there occurrences of *din’* + past verb, showing that *din’* is fully analysed as negative form of *did*. *Doesn’t* increases as third person singular form, though some speakers also use *don’t* here.

*Haven’ got* is still treated as a chunk; *haven’t* is not found with any other verb. (As with basilectal usage, the real explanation lies in the rare use of perfective *have.*) *Never* and *din’* continue to supply the equivalent meaning of ‘haven’t’.

In contrast to basilectal usage, *never* + past-tense forms now outnumber *never* + infinitive forms (the figures for the eight mesolectal speakers analysed are 12:4).

(37) But I never made it to the end. (= ‘didn’t’)
(38) I never seen that car. (= ‘didn’t’)
(39) So far I never experienced anything like that. (= ‘haven’t’)
(40) I never got involved in any accident. (= ‘I’ve never been’)
(41) I never ever get into trouble. (= ‘I’ve never got ... ’)

Interestingly, mesolectal usage sometimes shows a change of form (from *never* + infinitive to *never* + past verb) without changing the function of *never*. The figures for standard to non-standard semantics of the form are 10:6, showing four constructions with *never* + past form retaining the meaning associated with *never* + infinitive (i.e. ‘didn’t’ or ‘haven’t, not ‘not ever’). See 7.5.1 for parallels in the mesolect, with respect to the restructuring of other basilectal constructions.

The mesolect has none of the fossilised double modals found in the basilect. The range of the remaining modals is close to that of the acrolect apart from certain past tense forms. These include *couldn’t* for the present tense in the idiom *I couldn’t tell you* (= ‘I am unable to say’); *wouldn’t* for the present tense in the idiom *I wouldn’t know* (= ‘I don’t know’) and *shouldn’t* for standard English *wouldn’t*. 
The use of *should* as exact equivalent of 'used to' is characteristic of the basilect and mesolect – see 5.2. Clearly, the mesolect exhibits fuzzy boundaries with regard to irrealis marking in the modals.

6.4.7 Acrolectal negation

At this stage the full range of standard English marking appears. However, *shall* and *shan’t* are not found in colloquial SAIE, not even in the acrolect. Several developments from mesolectal forms can be seen.

*Haven’t got* is infrequently used, being replaced in most instances by the more normative *don’t have*. For the first time in the samples examined *haven’t* occurs with other verbs. (Put more generally, perfective aspect in the acrolect coincides with that of standard English.) *Hadn’t* occurs for the first time and *hasn’t* is noticeably higher in the acrolect than in the mesolect.

It will be of little surprise, given what we have learnt of the acrolect generally, that where *never* occurs it is with the same emphatic semantics of standard English (‘not ever’) and accompanied by the past tense of the verb. It is also a negator of the semi-auxiliary *used to*. (As mentioned previously, *didn’t use to* is not a form used in SAIE, except possibly under very recent US English influence from television.)

*Weren’t* and *wasn’t* frequently occur in contracted form (as they do in the mesolect). *Aren’t* and *isn’t* which do not occur in contracted form in the mesolect (except for the generalised tag *isn’t*) now do so frequently. *May not* appears in the acrolect for the first time. The use of the overlapping forms *won’t, wouldn’t, couldn’t* and *shouldn’t* is realigned in accordance with standard English.

We can conclude from this that negation in SAIE broadly follows Ellis’s four stages. However, the four lects identified in SAIE do not correspond to the four stages of negation (and there is no reason why they should). The pre-basilect exhibits stages I and II; the basilect exhibits stages II (apart from not using *no* as negator) as well as III and part of IV; the mesolect exhibits stages III and IV; while the acrolect goes beyond stage IV (in not having fossilised variants from earlier stages).

Furthermore, the negation patterns of individual ancestral languages do not appear to exert any influence on negation. There are no postverbal negatives in the speech of speakers of Tamil, Telugu or Gujarati background. Not even pre-basilectal speakers show this type of transfer.
Conversely, speakers of Bhojpuri and Urdu, whose ancestral languages favour a simple preverbal negator resembling English *not*, do not appear to spend a longer time at stage II than other speakers. Negation may thus be an area of second-language acquisition that is relatively impervious to transfer (unlike relative clauses), showing instead a truly universal route of development.

On the basis of data from four Spanish and six Japanese learners of English, Stauble (1981), reported in Klein (1986: 98–9) sets up five lects: basilang, lower mesolang, mid mesolang, upper mesolang, acrolang. Without going into details of her classification – but see Klein (1986: 98–9) for a summary – we can make the following equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SAIE pre-basilect} & = \text{basilang and lower mesolang} \\
\text{SAIE basilect} & = \text{mid and upper mesolang} \\
\text{SAIE mesolect} & = \text{upper mesolang and acrolang (in part)} \\
\text{SAIE acrolect} & = \text{acrolang and beyond}
\end{align*}
\]

That is to say, being involved in the late stages of language shift, the SAIE lects are well in advance of the continua commonly reported for developing L2 systems.

### 6.5 Parameter setting in second-language acquisition

Much recent work in the field of second-language acquisition has attempted to characterise interlanguage systems in terms of developments within Chomsky's Universal Grammar. Studies like those of Schachter (1989), Flynn (1989) and White (1989) rely on experimental data involving second-language learners in a test situation. In this section I will attempt an assessment of the degree to which the Universal Grammar approach illuminates the process of acquisition in a natural setting as evidenced by speakers situated along the different lects. Our findings for negation in the previous section suggest that equating developments within the apparent time evinced in the current SAIE continuum of lects with real-time acquisition of the dialect since its beginnings is a reliable procedure. We will examine the parameter-setting model proposed by Flynn (1989), with respect to the pro-drop phenomenon in SAIE and briefly compare claims about principle branching direction in second-language acquisition with our findings in chapter 4 on word order.

In recent Chomskyan linguistics first-language acquisition is seen not so much as a process of acquiring specific grammatical rules, as a procedure whereby the child sets the parameters of the principles of Universal Grammar. Chomsky (1986) hypothesises that Universal Grammar consists
of various subsystems of principles, many of which are associated with parameters that are fixed by experience of relatively simple data. Parameters involve certain limited options associated with various principles of linguistic organisation. Once the values of the parameters are set, the whole system is fully operative. As Chomsky (1986: 146) points out, a useful analogy is to conceive of language as an intricate system associated with a finite set of switches – each of which has a finite number of positions (possibly as low as two).

6.5.1 The pro-drop parameter

Hyams (1986) studied the emergence of the following phenomena in child language as guided by a single parameter known as pro-drop:

(a) absence of empty pronoun subjects;
(b) presence of lexical material in AUX (for example, uninflected modals);
(c) presence of pleonastic subjects (i.e. dummy *it* and *there*).

Adult languages can be characterised as $[-PD]$ if they exhibit all three characteristics of the parameter (as do English and German). $[+PD]$ languages like Italian favour zero pronoun subjects, do not use dummy elements equivalent to *it* and *there* (as in *There is a woman outside* and *It is hot today*) and do not have a group of uninflected modals (i.e. modals behave like full verbs rather than specifically AUX elements).

In her study of child language in English and Italian Hyams (1986) posits that $[+PD]$ is the initial setting. With continued exposure to the target language children work out whether its setting is the same or whether it is $[-PD]$. Hyams hypothesises that pleonastic *it* and *there* act as triggers to suggest to the learner that the target language English is $[-PD]$.

Experimental second-language acquisition studies (for example, Flynn and Espinal 1985; Flynn 1989) have tended to support Hyam's findings. Furthermore, in examining the second-language acquisition patterns of Jorge, a twelve-year-old Spanish speaker who had moved from Columbia to the United States, Hilles (1987) found support for Hyam's hypotheses within a more natural second-language acquisition setting. She concludes that an interlanguage is a natural language subject to Universal Grammar.

A first examination of the SAIE data involved thirty speakers – the same thirty whose negation patterns were studied. (These include the twenty-four speakers characterised in chapter 2, plus the six pre-basilectal speakers). Although all facets of the pro-drop parameter were studied, for clarity we will examine only the third-person pronouns, pleonastic subjects
and the development of AUX. AUX will not be characterised in great detail, since the section on negation (6.4) already gives an account of its development for these thirty speakers. See Hilles (1987) for the possibility that negative AUX elements give a more reliable picture of the semantics and syntax of AUX than the positive elements.

6.5.1.1 Pre-basilectal settings

It will not be surprising to learn that the six pre-basilectal speakers can be said to follow a [+PD] setting unambiguously. That is, they exhibit the following characteristics:

(a) *Absence of subject pronouns*: For the third person singular and plural the figures are: presence 5; absence 24.

(45) \( \theta \) was working in the hospital. (‘he’ understood)

(b) *Lexical material in AUX*: AUX does not exist as a major category. Only once did a positive modal auxiliary *(can)* occur in the pre-basilectal data. For examples of negative unanalysed modals in the pre-basilect see 6.4.4. Sentences (46)–(47) give an indication of the non-existence of lexical elements in pre-basilectal AUX:

(46) What time go back Durban? (= ‘When will you go back to Durban?’)
(47) Not mark be. (= ‘There musn’t be a mark’)

(c) *Absence of pleonastic subjects*: Presence of pleonastic *it* and *there* 0; absence 17.

(48) One girl Hindustani there. (= ‘There’s a Hindustani girl there’)
(49) Thundering, raining. (= ‘It was thundering and raining’)

We cannot be sure whether pre-basilectal speakers are making an assumption about the initial setting of the parameter on universal grounds or whether they are relying on substrate knowledge, since the Indic (and possibly, Dravidian) languages are [+PD]. Sentences (50)–(52) give some examples from South African Bhojpuri: (50) shows the (frequent) absence of subject pronouns; (51) shows the lack of dummy subjects; (52) shows that modals are inflected as verbs:

(50) aspatal geil.
    hospital go.past.3rd sg.
    ‘He/she/it went to the hospital’

(51) Ḍuāṛi par adml he.
    door at man be.pres.3rd sg.
    ‘There’s a man at the door’
Table 6.4 *Presence of subject pronouns and pleonastic subjects in SAIE, by lectal group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>3rd person pronouns</th>
<th>Pleonastic pronouns</th>
<th>AUX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-basilectal</td>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>no lexical material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speakers</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>no lexical material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-basilect total</td>
<td>1/11</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>no lexical material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilectal speakers</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>no lexical material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29</td>
<td>0/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilect totals</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24/26</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26/27</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16/20</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38/38</td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20/25</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38/39</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17/19</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45/47</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29/29</td>
<td>14/19</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42/51</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>fairly to well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilect totals</td>
<td>339/376</td>
<td>56/131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolectal speakers</td>
<td>18/22</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>fairly well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17/17</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29/30</td>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>fairly well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20/23</td>
<td>9/13</td>
<td>highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>highly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolect tots</td>
<td>127/137</td>
<td>42/54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolectal speakers</td>
<td>13/15</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>fully developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>fully developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>fully developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18/18</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>fully developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrolect totals</td>
<td>63/66</td>
<td>19/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(52) *Bihan ja sak-ì*
tomorrow go.inf can-fut.3rd sg.
‘She’ll be able to go tomorrow’

6.5.1.2 Basilectal settings

The totals for the basilectal speakers analysed suggest that the pro-drop parameter is well on the way to being set.
Parameter setting in SLA

(a) **Subject pronouns**: Although pronoun absence is noticeable in the basilect, it is an infrequent occurrence (7.5 per cent in the present sample). The figures were: presence of subject pronouns 196; absence 16. Some basilectal deletions are exemplified in (53)–(54).

(53) Mus' buy a own house. (= 'We have to buy a house of our own')
(54) Put fire to the tea-room an' all. (= 'They set fire to the tea rooms and so forth')

(b) **Lexical material in AUX**: The AUX node in the basilect is fairly well developed. There is little evidence of sentence-external auxiliary usage (see 6.4.5). For the most part the modals behave differently from inflected verbs. Among the modals that are frequently used by the eight speakers are, in descending order of frequency: *can*; *will* (mainly in its contracted form); *must* and *should* (= 'used to' see 5.2). The negative forms that occur in the basilect are given in 6.4.5. Semi-auxiliaries like *used to* also occur in the basilect, as well as the auxiliary *do*. (The fluctuations in tense and semantics that we have noted for negation in the basilect are also relevant here.)

(c) **Pleonastic pronouns**: These are now present, but not for all basilectal speakers. The percentage occurrence was 33.3 (24 pleonastic pronouns, as against 48 absences among the eight basilectal speakers studied). Sentences (55)–(57) illustrate this variability.

(55) In the house nobody. (= 'There's nobody in the house')
(56) It's very hard to maintain those children.
(57) No damage was in Phoenix. (= 'There was no damage in Phoenix')

6.5.1.2 **Mesolectal settings**

In the mesolect the value of the parameter setting gets even closer to standard English. Subject-pronoun deletions are rare (7.3 per cent for the eight mesolectal speakers analysed) and the AUX node is well developed. In addition to the basilectal modals, *might*, *would* and *could* are prominent in the mesolect. There is some fluctuation in their semantics, however. Pleonastic pronouns are now frequently used. The rate of deletion for the eight speakers is 22.2 per cent (of a total of 54).

6.5.1.3 **Acrolectal settings**

The acrolectal setting is essentially that of standard English. Subject-pronoun deletion is very rare (4.8 per cent for the eight speakers). AUX concurs with its standard counterpart. For the first time the auxiliary *may* and contracted forms of *would* appear. The semantics of the modals is essentially 'standard'.
The SAIE data thus seems to support other studies of parametric unity and the switching of the parameter value from [+PD] (in the pre-basilect) to [−PD] (in the basilect). However, for two reasons we cannot claim to be conclusive about this. Firstly, we have not proved that what we are dealing with are three separate developments from the pre-basilect to the acrolect. That is, rather than dealing with parametric unity, are we not dealing with a general restructuring continuum as we have demonstrated for negation? Secondly, is there evidence for Hyam’s (1986) conjecture that the emergence of pleonastic elements triggers a resetting of the parameter? For the basilect as a whole we might say that the emergence of dummy *it* and *there* coincides with the presence of lexical material in AUX and a drastic reduction in subject-pronoun deletion. The problem is that there are basilectal speakers who exhibit the latter two qualities without producing any pleonastic *it* or *there*. Among the eight speakers initially studied there were three whose figures for pleonastic subjects were 0/7, 0/6 and 0/2 respectively. To establish whether these were three isolated cases or not, analysis of another seven basilectal interviews was undertaken. (For this reason the basilect is better represented than the other lects in table 6.4.) Once again, there were three individuals who do not seem to have pleonastic subjects in their repertoire. The figures were 0/5, 0/2 and 0/5 respectively. Since these six speakers fall on the pre-basilectal (or [+PD]) side of the parameter for pleonasms and on the basilectal side (or [−PD]) for the rest, we should make conclusions about parametric unity with caution. The case that the emergence of pleonasms triggers a resetting of the pro-drop parameter remains unproven for SAIE.

6.5.2 Word order and the parameter-setting model

Flynn and Espinal (1985) and Flynn (1989) have undertaken some innovative work on principal branching direction (PBD) typology and the head-initial/head-final parameter in second-language acquisition. This work is of great interest here, since we have been concerned with word-order principles in SAIE in chapter 4. I shall summarise the position reflected in Flynn (1989). In this study she examined the use of English relative-clause structures by Spanish and Japanese adult learners in a test situation. These learners were evaluated on their ability to repeat English sentences having (head-initial) relative clauses with all four possibilities regarding focussing and embedding:

(58) The student who called the gentleman answered the policeman. (subject focus, subject embedding)
The tests, which required imitation of sentences like these, were administered with due regard to controlling other variables like different levels of L2 ability, students’ ability to imitate sentences generally, their knowledge of lexical items, the experimenter, etc. (see Flynn 1989: 95-7).

The results showed significant differences between the Spanish and Japanese learners, which were not due to their English abilities alone. The Spanish group was more successful in imitating the sentence types tested. The Japanese speakers showed more errors and a qualitative difference in the type of modification their imitations showed. More specifically, the intermediate and advanced Japanese groups tended to convert the test sentences into co-ordinate sentence structures. Flynn argues that this conversion strategy corresponds to English developmental patterns rather than Japanese co-ordination structures. She concludes that these speakers are not simply translating from their L1s.

At early stages L2 learners recognise a match or mismatch in the values of the parameters of the L1 and the L2. Acquisition is facilitated when the parameters in question match (as does the head direction parameter for Spanish speakers learning English). When the L1 and L2 do not match acquisition is disrupted as learners have to assign a new value to the parameter. Flynn believes that once a parameter is set (or reset) a series of complex deductions follow. In this case, if a language is head-initial, forward anaphora will be productively licensed (Flynn and Espinal 1985). That is, the structural parameter is now available as a guiding principle in the acquisition of other aspects of the L2 grammar.

The value of the parametric approach is that it adopts a unified approach to different facets of the grammar. Acquisition is not presented as a piecemeal process. Within this theory SAIE learners must have had to reset the parameters of their L1s (essentially OV languages, with head-final parameters) to cohere with the L2 (English) grammar. This is certainly true of acrolectal speakers, who have moved all the way to SVO order and head-initial settings (with right-branching). But this is a relatively small group within the SAIE spectrum, prominent only after a hundred years since the first stages of second-language acquisition. For the rest (basilectal and mesolectal speakers) the idea that parameter resetting involves a switch from one value to another is not without problems. We have seen
in chapter 4 that a wide range of features associated with an OV typology
and/or a head-final setting do persist. More significantly, in 3.3.3 we have
seen just those relative clauses ruled out by the parameter-setting model
emerge in the speech of basilectal speakers, whose repertoire includes both
head-final and head-initial relative clauses.

In SAIE (and the New Englishes generally) the parameters do not stay
‘set’. To take up Chomsky’s metaphor, it is as if we are dealing with a box
with a faulty switch, which reverts (‘slips’) to earlier settings under certain
conditions. That is to say, in informal and intimate styles speakers
backslide towards earlier norms of the interlanguage, much influenced by
L1 settings. At this stage a reminder is in place that in SAIE we are dealing
with a case of ‘successful’ acquisition. All but the six pre-basilectal
speakers are fully fluent in some style or other within the SAIE continuum.

While Flynn’s Universal-Grammar approach has a great deal of merit
(and makes many correct predictions) it has to be tempered by data from
more natural acquisition settings. The New English data suggest that we
are not dealing with discrete settings (‘off’ and ‘on’; ‘plus’ or ‘minus’,
etc.), but with a continuum of settings. This makes the acquisition process
more fuzzy and susceptible to social conditions than Universal Gram-
marians would allow.

6.6 Strategies of second-language learning

In addition to transfer and recourse to developmental universals, the SAIE
data give evidence of other strategies and principles that are operative in
second-language acquisition. These will be considered in the light of the
overwhelming similarities among New Englishes of widely divergent L1
backgrounds. For convenience some of the salient non-phonological
similarities illustrated by Platt, Weber and Ho (1984) are repeated here:

(a) an avoidance of overt marking of plurality for nouns;
(b) a tendency not to distinguish between male and female for third
   person pronouns;
(c) marking of articles and other determiners by a system which gives
   priority to the distinction specific/non-specific rather than definite/
   indefinite;
(d) emphasis on aspect over tense;
(e) extension of the use of progressive aspect to stative verbs;
(f) different use of certain prepositions and phrasal verbs;
(g) omission of pronouns if recoverable from context;
(h) invariable tag questions;
(i) pronoun copying of subjects.
It should be clear by now that almost all of these features occur in basilectal and mesolectal SAIE. The only one that can be said to be uncharacteristic of SAIE is property (b), since gender distinctions in SAIE pronouns accord with those of standard English. All the others exist as strong tendencies in SAIE, especially in the basilect, but cannot be said to be the rule. In attempting to characterise the New Englishes in an acquisitional framework, Williams (1987: 163) makes the following remarks:

One of the most important features of NIVEs [non-native institutionalised varieties of English] for second-language acquisition research is their stability. Certain forms... which are found in NIVEs, strongly resemble forms which are found in learner languages and at one time may, in fact have been the result of individual language acquisition. However, these varieties, which contain many such modifications, have spread throughout the population and become institutionalized and as a result, can no longer be considered learner varieties of their NS [native speaker] counterparts. NIVEs have become regional standards and are now themselves the targets of second-language acquisition. In the production of fluent NIVE speakers, it is possible to observe these frozen 'interlanguage' (Selinker 1972) features, even though the developmental process is complete and the target, that is NIVE status, has been reached.

Williams attempts to account for the similarities across NIVEs in terms of production principles – i.e. a broad set of psycholinguistic strategies involved in learning and using an L2. She points to overlaps with Slobin’s work (1973) for L1 acquisition by children. Williams claims that the following ‘operating principles’ for L1 acquisition posited by Slobin are also applicable in NIVE research (I have added illustrative examples from SAIE):

(a) Pay attention to ends of words (note that even for basilectal SAIE the presence of endings far overweighs their absence – see 5.2).
(b) The phonological forms of words can be systematically modified. (cf. the replacement of [θ] and [ð] by [t] and [d]).
(c) Pay attention to the order of words and morphemes (possibly a problem area for early SAIE, since the OV influence of the substrates and the topic-comment patterns result in a fair amount of deviation from English English).
(d) Avoid interruption and rearrangement of linguistic units (the invariant order for questions in the basilect: for example, *Who he is? You'll do it?*).
(e) Underlying semantic relations should be marked clearly and overtly (for example, *go bring* = ‘fetch’; *reverse back* = ‘reverse’; *sick patient* = ‘patient’).
(f) Avoid exceptions (hence *childrens* – see 5.2)
(g) The use of grammatical markers should make semantic sense (for example, *all* for plurals – see 7.3.3.2(b), *already* and *finish* for perfective aspect – see 6.6.1.2).

It should be emphasised that these principles account for many of the features of NIVEs not found in standard English and of features of child language that are overridden in later speech. They will not account for features that are common to standard English and NIVEs. Slobin (1977: 186) later posits four more general ‘charges to language’ made by a child learner:

(a) be clear;
(b) be humanly processible in ongoing time;
(c) be quick and easy;
(d) be expressive.

Like some of the earlier principles, these are contradictory pressures which form a set of flexible (and unconscious) guidelines which a speaker may rely on for successful (L2 or L1) communication.

### 6.6.1 Economy of production

Under this heading Williams points to features typical of early second-language development and lower sociolects in the New Englishes: omission of pronouns, lack of verb and noun endings, deletion of the copula, of articles, etc. While making production more efficient and economical, these make processing more difficult since it becomes more reliant upon contextual factors. This speaker-oriented economy follows two general paths which will be explored next: (a) regularisation or reduction of irregularities; (b) selective production of redundant markers.

#### 6.6.1.1 Regularisation

This may be defined as the effect of linguistic changes which result in surface forms which are less diverse or contain fewer exceptions than patterns found in the target language (Long 1982, cited in Williams 1987). Three areas common across New Englishes are illustrated below.

(a) *The use of invariant tags:* Tag questions in standard English assume a variety of forms like the following:

(62) Jomo will stay, won’t he?
(63) Nomusa has arrived, hasn’t she?
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(64) Mariam ate, didn't she?
(65) I don't work hard, do I?

The rule has several requirements:

(i) a copy of the auxiliary verb of the main clause in the tag, with reversed polarity;
(ii) appropriate tense and person endings;
(iii) a copy of the subject NP of the main clause in the form of a pronoun of the appropriate gender.

Platt, Weber and Ho (1984: 128–30) note that the New Englishes usually (and very sensibly) avoid this 'maze of constructions' by using one or two tags only. The most common ones are no!, not so!, is it? and isn't it?

(66) He got married, not so? (Cameroon English)
(67) You are going tomorrow, isn't it? (Indian English)
(68) You want Mary, is it? (Singapore English)
(69) He loves you isn't it/not so? (West African English)

In SAIE several invariant tags are in use: no (phonetically [noː], from English no; eh (phonetically [e h], corresponding to White South African English hey); and isn't it, which is more usually reduced to isn't.

(b) Mass and count nouns: There is a tendency in New Englishes to use a plural morphological marker for nouns that are treated as mass nouns in standard English. Forms like the following are common in New English varieties: damages, equipments, fruits, furnitures, machineries, staffs, works (Platt, Weber and Ho 1984: 50–1). All of these, except the last, are frequently heard in basilectal SAIE. Genuinely uncountable nouns like gold, petrol, mud and nonsense do not take -s plurals, even in New Englishes. There is thus evidence of a true dichotomy between semantically uncountable and countable entities – illustrating Slobin's (1973) principles (e) and (g). The reverse side of the coin is to treat anomalies of standard English like scissors and trousers as if they were grammatically singular (a tendency towards regularity that occurs in many other L1 varieties of English).

(c) Constant word order for statements and questions and indirect questions and statements: There is a tendency in the basilect to keep variation in word order for questions and statements to a minimum. The difference between declaratives and interrogatives is often signalled by intonation (as in much informal English).

(70) She's staying.
(71) She's staying? (neutral question)
As sentence (71) suggests, auxiliary inversion is not favoured in interroga-
tives. Sentences (72)–(74) illustrate basilectal usage without do-support
and auxiliary inversion for wh-questions:

(72) What she’ll do?
(73) What he said? (= ‘What did he say?’)
(74) Who it is? (= ‘Who is it?’)

From the point of view of regularisation, (72)–(74) show an economy of
inversion rules, the surface pattern being: (wh-word)–subject–verb. (This
parallels the OSV order of topic structures discussed in 4.4.) The economy
can be gauged by comparison with indirect questions, where the same
pattern is operative in the subordinate clause:

(75) You know what’s roti? (= ‘Do you know what roti is?’)
(76) You saw where’s the car? (‘Have you seen where the car is?’)

This is one of the rare constructions that is found in all SAIE lects.

6.6.1.2 Selective production of redundant markers

By redundancy is meant the double marking of a category, as in standard
English all the books, where plurality is deducible from the -s ending, as
well as the quantifier all. Williams (1987: 175) claims that in such an
instance the L2 learner focusses on, and produces, a single marker –
possibly the one that is perceptually more salient. The alternative markers
may not be noticed or processed at all. She argues that the omission of
grammatical items like the copula, pronouns, noun and verb endings can
be viewed more appropriately as attempts to keep the redundancy of
marking material to a minimum, rather than as simplification of language
per se.

This explanation would account for the neutralisation of tense or aspect
markers in many New Englishes when past time reference or completion of
action is apparent from sentential adverbs, or if it has previously been
established in context. For the basilect finish – one of the grammatical
markers of perfective aspect – is usually followed by the stem form of the
verb:

(77) I finish eat. (= ‘I have eaten’)

The have + -en of standard English goes against two of Slobin’s tenets,
since it involves discontinuous constituents and a violation of the one-to-
one mapping between form and function. Likewise, there is a parallel
replacement of progressive be + -ing by 0 + -ing in the pre-basilect and
basilect (see 2.3.1.5).
On the whole, however, the SAIE data does not give strong support for the redundancy-reduction strategy. A second look at the relevant portion of table 5.1 will remind us that the percentage of plural noun endings used in the dialect as a whole is over 90 per cent. For speakers impressionistically rated basilectal the proportions are lower: presence of -s plurals for nouns: 82.8 per cent; presence of -s for 3rd singular present verbs: 75 per cent.

6.6.2 Hyper-clarity: reduction of ambiguity

Williams claims that this principle follows from Slobin's 'charge', be clear. It involves two subprinciples: maximum transparency and maximum salience. Whereas the previous principles (in 6.6.1) refer to speech production, hyper-clarity takes into account the needs of the listener: that is, it mediates between over-economy and over-redundancy. It is not entirely listener-oriented, however, for it may also help speakers keep track of their own production (Williams 1987: 179).

6.6.2.1 Transparency

Slobin (1980) defines this as the one-to-one mapping of form and meaning. The principle involves movement from opaque markers of meaning to more transparent ones within the user's knowledge. A simple illustration is the preference for a lexical item over a bound morpheme. An example already cited is the choice of an adverb (already, finish) as marker of perfective aspect in many New Englishes (Platt, Weber and Ho 1984: 70-1). These would appear to have been more transparent than the standard English form have + past participle where the have (usually [əv]) has a tenuous link with the lexical verb have.

Fossilised examples in the basilect are fairly common:

(a) The use of side, time, part and way in place of the usually unstressed prepositions in, at, near has been discussed in 4.3.1. For the current exposition it is necessary to note that these lexical items are more explicit in fleshing out the different senses of a preposition like in or at. Thus 'temporal in' = time, 'spatial in' = side or inside, 'manner in' = way.

(b) The use of never as unemphatic negator as in sentence (78) is also motivated by the transparency principle:

(78) He never go there. (= 'He didn't go there')

In the basilect the usual markers of negation for past verbs are never and din', which appear to be more transparent than haven't, hasn't and hadn't. Never counts as an example of transparency in terms of L2 learners'
knowledge, since it is invariant (unlike forms with *have*) and carries emphatic negation in the target language. It therefore contrasts with the forms in *have* and *do*, whose stems fulfil a host of non-negative functions as well.

(c) The use of *all* as an incipient (pregrammatical) indicator of plurality for nouns or other NP elements, is shown by (79):

(79) That-all she's too good. (= 'She's very good at those things')

Further discussion and exemplification of this form is postponed till 7.3.3.2(a).

6.6.2.2 Maximising salience

Salience is indicated by, *inter alia*, an increase in stress or duration of some linguistic form, or by use of an extra morpheme. It has the effect of creating redundancy which is not there in the target language, in the process of clarifying meaning. The redundancy is typically different from the double-plural-marking type we have discussed, however, for it usually operates across clauses. Another difference is that salience involves word forms rather than grammatical suffixes. Some examples from Williams (1987: 189) are given below.

(80) Though the farmer works hard, but he cannot produce enough. (Indian English)

(81) Although you are away, but you do not forget. (West African English)

(82) Supposing if we were to bring it back to the shop ... (Singapore English)

SAIE equivalents to this phenomenon are many – see 7.3.3.1, where they are viewed within another framework. How is salience different from transparency? Examples (80)–(81) show that neither ‘redundant’ form is relatable to a more ‘meaningful’ lexical item – rather, they are close grammatical equivalents (*although/though = but*).

In SAIE the process is not restricted to cross-clausal syntax. It is manifested lexically in forms like *sick patient, reverse back, repeat again, discuss about, mention about*, etc. For many speakers the meaning of the head of the phrase has to be ‘strengthened’: the redundancy is functional.

Such strengthening is also manifest in some *wh*-words and conjunctions, with speakers producing maximally salient forms to clarify grammatical words with meanings that are not easily specifiable. The process is not obligatory, however.

*what thing* = ‘*what*’

*because why* = ‘*because*’

*supposing if* = ‘*if/supposing*’
Exemplification of these is left till 7.3.3.3; for further cross-clausal examples from SAIE see 7.3.3.1. Another prominent set involves the ‘strengthening’ of pronouns:

- that thing/that one = ‘it’ – see sentence (83)
- daffale = ‘he, him’ (< that fellow); sentence (86)
- my one = ‘mine’ – see (84)–(88)
- your one = ‘yours’ (sg.)
- her one = ‘hers’
- his one = ‘his’
- our one = ‘ours’
- y’all’s one = ‘yours’ (pl.)

There is also the salient set for animal terms in the basilect: he-one = ‘male’ and she-one = ‘female’.

(83) Then I took the money and went and banked that thing.
(84) Q: Do you know your age?
   A: I know, I still remember that one.
(85) Present that one. (= ‘That was a present’)
(86) That’s the fellow who came in the night; when I was gone to market daffale came in the night and banged the door.
(87) Is it a he-one or a she-one?
(88) Y’all’s one is better than our t.v.

Principles like economy of production and reduction of ambiguity are useful in accounting for the occurrence of particular sets of features in new varieties of English, but they do not tell the whole story. Some of the principles are in opposition to each other: even the broad dichotomy between economy of production and hyper-clarity are at a tension which reduces their explanatory power. Within a New English variety we find inconsistent application of the same principle. For example, regularisation of the plural of some nouns is a feature of SAIE: damages, slangs, sports, furnitures, polices, fish roes. At the same time, pluralisation of a singular noun also occurs in an apparently ad hoc manner. The following can all be used as singular: peaches, lichis, naartjies (a fruit similar to a mandarine), chillies.

(89) He bought one peaches for ten cents. (peaches = [pi:ʃəs]; singular form peach not used in the basilect or the mesolect.)

The explanation for the fruit and vegetable forms is probably due to their being borrowed in at least one South African Indian language in this way.
In Bhojpuri the borrowings *peaches*, *lichis* and *naartjies* are used as singular and together with other borrowings like *lettuce* and *radish* (both having last syllable [is] in Bhojpuri) almost result in a morpheme /is/ for ‘English fruit or vegetable’. The new forms in SAIE can thus be attributed to the cycle of influence: English → Bhojpuri → SAIE.

One of the weak points of the principles as explanation concerns their restricted application. In the basilect prepositions are variably strengthened (via replacement by salient forms like *side*, etc.); at other times the usual target language form occurs, or the preposition is deleted entirely (for example, *We went beach*). Likewise, the selective restriction of redundancy is of limited occurrence in SAIE (for example, see 5.2 on plural endings after quantifiers). A complementary (and possibly more fruitful) approach would be to identify and characterise the different processes that operate in the basilect, mesolect and acrolect respectively. This will be done in the next chapter, guided by findings in pidgin and creole linguistics.
7.1 Pidginisation, creolisation, second-language acquisition

Whereas many students of second-language acquisition (for example, Valdman 1980; Andersen 1980) and some psycholinguists (for example, Slobin 1983) have been amenable to viewing it in terms of processes of pidginisation and creolisation, creolists generally have not. Sankoff (1983: 242), for example, has warned that 'we have about reached the limit of the usefulness of the terms "pidginization" and "creolization"'. While Bickerton (1977a: 49) had once characterised pidginisation as second-language learning with restricted input and creolisation as first-language learning with restricted input, in a subsequent study (1983: 238) he was to paint them as widely divergent processes:

No real connection exists between SLA [Second Language Acquisition] and creolization: they differ in almost every particular. SLA is done alone, creolization is done in groups; SLA has a target, creolization hasn't; SLA is done mainly by adults, creolization mainly by kids ... SLA gives you a second language, creolization gives you a first; SLA is done by people with a 'normal' language background, creolization with an 'abnormal' language background.

Slobin (1983: 252) holds the opposite view:

Wherever language users or language learners are pushed to devise a linguistic means of expression which is lacking or not evident in the language or languages at hand, the only source of materials lies within. These materials consist of prototypical notions of specifiable form and content and preferred ways of mapping those notions onto linguistic expressions, striving for mapping that is maximally transparent and direct – again in specifiable ways.

Among the proposals to be found within this tradition is the possibility of viewing aspects of second-language acquisition in terms of pidginisation
(Schumann 1974), in terms of creolisation (Andersen 1980; Schumann 1974), and in terms of decreolisation (Stauble 1978).

Schumann (1974) suggests that a number of processes involving simplification that are reminiscent of pidginisation occur in second-language acquisition. In both word order tends to do the work of inflections, certain grammatical transformations like the passive tend to be eliminated and the lexicon is reduced (though more so for pidgins). He speculates that the early stages of free second-language acquisition involve pidginisation, and that there may be a universal simplification process that operates in the acquisition of a second language. A speaker may get away with such drastic reduction only if (s)he is using her/his interlanguage for the communication of information at a rudimentary level (the referential function alone). Such a level is not feasible if the communication is intended to be integrative (with part or subpart of the target-language community) or expressive (of emotions or aesthetic uses of language, etc.). For these two purposes the interlanguage has to expand in ways analogous to the complication and extension of linguistic structure that occurs when a pidgin creolises. Schumann (1974: 147) makes the claim that in such circumstances 'Redundancy will increase, obligatory tense markers will tend to develop, speed in speech will increase as a result of morphophonemic reductions and reductions in primary stress, and finally the lexicon will usually undergo extensive development.'

Schumann and Stauble (1983a) and Andersen (1980) discuss the possibility of equating the later stages of second-language acquisition with decreolisation. Stauble (1978) reports on a longitudinal study of the negation system of two L2 learners who acculturated well in the United States and who ultimately produced utterances showing standard English negation. She claims that a series of developmental stages exhibited by the two learners was very similar to that produced in decreolisation of Guyanese Creole negation as reported in Bickerton (1975).

Schumann (1978) draws attention to the parallels between social integration/acculturation and linguistic stages in second-language acquisition. In the early stages potential providers of input may be physically but not socially accessible to the learner, rather like the prototypical pidgin-creating situation. Later on, social relations may be established to provide new access to target-language material, as in decreolisation.

Commenting on Schumann's position, Rickford (1983) points out three crucial differences between second-language acquisition and the creolisation model:
(a) the degree of 'nativisation' is greater in creolisation. A basilang (Schumann's term for the interlanguage variety furthest from the target language) is a first approximation to the target language, whereas a creole basilect is a native language.

(b) Creoles have a stylistic flexibility which is not found in L2s (this is open to question, as Schumann and Stauble (1983b: 320–3) point out).

(c) Decreolisation operates by extension of one's linguistic repertoire, second-language acquisition development normally involves replacements of earlier stages.

SAIE would appear to be even closer to the creolisation model of development, since it has been not just nativised but adopted as a first language at a relatively early stage. That is, around the late 1950s and early 1960s SAIE became a first language for many children while adults had varying competence in it, ranging from nil to the pre-basilectal and basilectal varieties. If we view creolisation as the acquisition of a second language as a first language, then there is much to be gained from studying SAIE within the framework of creolistics, even if it did not technically originate as a pidgin. SAIE is closer to the creolisation cycle than Bickerton's characterisation of second-language acquisition allows, as a re-examination of his criteria with respect to SAIE acquisition shows:

(a) **Second-language acquisition gives you a second language, creolisation a first**: In many families there was a jump from an Indian language as the L1 of parents to SAIE as the L1 of children without an intermediate stage of equilingualism. SAIE stabilised as an L1 relatively early, within fifty years of the last immigrations.

(b) **Second-language acquisition is done alone, creolisation in groups**: The stabilisation of SAIE as an L1 is a group phenomenon, and only individualistic to the extent that all language learning involves individual mastery of a system. While still an L2, SAIE was used to a fair extent to communicate with other non-native speakers of English. (See 1.4.2, however, for the role of Fanagalo, and the extent of bilingualism in Indian languages, which made communication possible among speakers with no knowledge of English.)

(c) **Second-language acquisition has a target, creolisation does not**: This is the only one of Bickerton's dicta which can be accepted, with minor modifications, in this study. SAIE was always targeted towards Natal English, a process aided by a few years of schooling for some speakers. (It is possible that Bickerton overstates the case for creolisation always being targetless.)
Second-language acquisition is done by adults, creolisation by children: While SAIE as L2 was initiated by adults, many children also learnt it as an L2. Its development as an L1 is attributable to the influence of children who brought back the language of the classroom to the home (in modified form). (Recent studies of Tok Pisin have, anyway, weakened the Bickertonian position that adults are excluded from the creolisation process.)

Second-language acquisition involves a 'normal' linguistic background, unlike creolisation: This is questionable for SAIE since there was a large number of languages from two unrelated families involved in the process of language shift. Furthermore, migration, indentureship and plantation life were socially traumatic (see 1.3). There is also the question of the pidgin Fanagalo existing side by side with early forms of SAIE.

7.2 Pidginisation in the pre-basilect

The pre-basilect is an interlanguage arrested at an early stage of development. In 6.4 we have seen that at least for negation, it does indeed fall into place as the earliest stage in the acquisition process. Yet in 2.5 we have seen the enormous extent to which it differs from the rest of SAIE, including the basilect. In this section the question of whether it can be said to be a pidgin is treated from three perspectives. From the viewpoint of structure we will adduce more features that are suggestive of the pidginisation process. In terms of historical origins we will consider the links between the pre-basilect and a rudimentary pidgin of South India - Butler English. Finally, we will examine the possibility of pidginisation in terms of socially based definitions of pidgins.

7.2.1 Pidgin-like structures in the pre-basilect

I will not repeat features discussed elsewhere in the text that, taken together, are indeed suggestive of pidginisation (reduplication, variable copula absence, simple external negation, low occurrence of prepositions and other function words, etc.). Many of these features are also present in the basilect, albeit to a smaller extent. Instead, I will outline other features that are strikingly present in the pre-basilect, but hardly ever in the basilect.

(a) The use of *it* as a synthetic particle with verbs as in *got-it, put-it, learnt-it, left-it*:
(1) Joan too, big mouth she got-it. (= 'Joan has a big mouth')
(2) There only learnt-it English. (= 'I learnt English')
(3) He put-it the banana there. (= 'He put the bananas into the shed')

(b) Use of *iz* (most probably derived from *his*) as an invariant free possessive element:

(4) You donno my grandfather - my mother iz father ...? (= 'Don’t you know my grandfather - my mother’s father')
(5) Joseph iz aunty me. (= 'I am Joseph’s aunty')

However, possessive *'s* does have a high frequency of occurrence in the pre-basilect (see 7.2.2.2(a)(iii)). In this respect it differs from most pidgin Englishes.

(c) Use of fossilised chunks like *I think so* (= 'I think, I thought'); *I hope so* (= 'I hope, I hoped').

(d) Use of expletives as unmarked lexical items:

(6) Helluva lot water coming out. (= 'A lot of water came into the house')
(7) Mill got bugged up. (= 'The mill experienced financial hardship')
(8) He went India, he see there all bloody old, he died. (= 'After going to India he found that all the people had got old and many had died')

Sentence (6) was uttered by a 72-year-old woman speaking politely; sentences (7) and (8) were used by a 70-year-old male also speaking politely. (According to his son, the latter also used swear-words in stylistically more appropriate contexts.)

7.2.2 The pre-basilect and Butler English

Butler English is defined as the ‘broken’ English spoken by native servants in the Madras Presidency (Yule and Burnell 1903: 133). The butler was the head servant of any English or quasi-English household in pre-independence India. This variety of English has been characterised as a ‘rudimentary pidgin’ (Hancock 1977: 377) and as a ‘marginal pidgin’ (though Hosali and Aitchison (1986) show the problems associated with this characterisation). A now-famous example of the variety is given in Schuchardt (1891, reproduced in 1980: 47), concerning the speech of an *ayah* (nurse) describing the butler’s practice of secretly appropriating small quantities of milk from his master’s household: ‘Butler’s yevery day taking one ollock for own-self, and giving servants all half half ollock; when I telling that shame for him, he is telling, Master’s strictly order all servants for the little milk give it – what can I say mam, I poor ayah woman?’
From this and other fragments the following characteristics of nineteenth-century Butler English can be deduced (Hosali and Aitchison 1986: 55):

(a) Dravidian influence on pronunciation, especially [ye] for [e] and [wo] for [o];
(b) omission of auxiliaries and verbal inflections;
(c) overuse of verbs in -ing, including its use for the future;
(d) use of *done* to denote past tense of verbs;
(e) simple SVO structure;
(f) ‘scanty’ lexicon with ‘peculiar meanings’.

All of these except *done* as marker of past verbs are to be found in pre-basilectal SAIE today. However, the characterisation of SVO structure must be modified to admit certain OV variants. Hosali and Aitchison (1986) give evidence of the survival of Butler English into the twentieth century. The following fragment is from the speech of a 33-year-old male (but probably older) discussing an invitation to go to England: ‘One master call for come India... eh England. I say not coming. That master very liking me. I not come. That is like for India - that hot and cold. That England for very cold.’

7.2.2.1 Similarities

A great deal of similarity between simplifications in pre-basilectal SAIE and Butler English can be discerned.

(a) Verbs in -ing: Schuchardt (1891, reproduced in 1980: 49) reports this to be ‘the most characteristic feature of Butler English’, and Hosali and Aitchison (1986: 61) concur that it is also a present-day feature of Butler English. The average occurrence in their corpus (the speech of seven speakers) was 49 per cent; for the five SAIE speakers analysed the average was 40 per cent.

(b) *Got* with the meaning ‘have’ was used by five of their seven informants; in the pre-basilect it was used by four out of five speakers.

(c) Omission of *be* as copula and auxiliary (see 2.5.1(d) for SAIE).

(d) Plural ending -s for nouns: both varieties show significant variation here, with occurrences of -s outnumbering its absence.

(e) Hosali and Aitchison’s observation that apart from *I* pronouns were used variably and were more frequently omitted’ does not hold for SAIE, where pronoun deletion is common but occurs at less than 50 per cent frequency.
(f) The use of prepositions is variable in both varieties. In the pre-basilect it is noticeably high, reaching a deletion level of 53/66 or 80.3 per cent. (No figures given for Butler English.)

(g) Lexical similarities include *died* for ‘dead’.

(h) Neither the pre-basilect nor present-day Butler English contain the marker *done* for perfective aspect, cited as a feature of nineteenth-century usage by Yule and Burnell (1903: 133–4). This raises doubts about the accuracy of their characterisation.

7.2.2.2 Dissimilarities

Among the differences between the pre-basilect and Butler English are the following:

(a) *Features of Butler English not found in pre-basilect:*

(i) Use of *been* as auxiliary (*I been working lots of memsahib*).

(ii) Initial *is* (*Is giving curry and rice* = ‘She gives me curry and rice’).

(iii) Whereas ‘there are no clear examples of possessive -s’ (Hosali and Aitchison 1986: 72) in Butler English, their occurrence in the pre-basilect is near categorical: 15/17 or 88.2 per cent. If we exclude the three *iz* constructions outlined in 7.2.1(b) the number of tokens becomes 12/17 or 70.5 per cent.

(iv) The occasional use of the pronoun form *me* as subject in Butler English is uncharacteristic of the pre-basilect.

(b) *Features of the pre-basilect not reported for Butler English:*

(i) *only* as focus marker – see 2.5.1(j);

(ii) *got* as existential – see 2.5.1(c);

(iii) Lexical forms *hawa, dawa, look-aterring, no madder, no fadder* – see 2.5.1(k);

(iv) Occasional OV order (for example, *Four children got* = ‘I have four children’; *Only one girl I am for my mother* = ‘I am my mother’s only child’). Hosali and Aitchinson report this to be rare for Butler English. Note that the passage quoted by Schuchardt has one instance of OV ordering (*little milk give it*).

7.2.3 The social context of the pre-basilect

The striking similarities between the pre-basilect and Butler English raises the question of their historical relationship. I believe that the variety of English spoken by some South Indian immigrants entering Natal must have been of the Butler variety. SAIE, however, did not originate solely (or
mainly) on the basis of input from Butler English, for it was not numerically strong or socially prestigious. It must be considered as one of the many possible inputs to SAIE in the nineteenth century. That is, English was not simply handed down in Natal by those few migrants who could speak it; it was created anew by different groups under varying circumstances, including classroom and plantation.

The six pre-basilectal speakers did not learn their brand of English from a pre-existing stable variety. Their speech form shows simplification based on their own resources, on near-universal tendencies in reduction and simplification and on common substrates. That all six speakers are from a Dravidian background might account for the similarities between their speech and Butler English.

To put it in another way, the pre-basilect is not a social entity; its speakers exist in isolation from each other. In this respect it differs from the basilect which is a focused, socially defined entity. Although pre-basilectal speakers show similar individual-learner solutions to the acquisition of a second or third language, there are differences in their strategies. Thus, one pre-basilectal speaker used no prepositions (though occasions for their use presented themselves); another used prepositions 50 per cent of the time that standard English required them. With respect to variation in verb morphology speaker 30 used 7 present stems for the past, as against 22 ‘normal’ pasts – a ratio of approximately 3:1; while speaker 95’s ratio of present stem for the past to ‘normal’ pasts was in the ratio of 16:1. I report similar fluctuation in verb morphology among semi-speakers of Bhojpuri in Natal in Mesthrie (1991: ch. 5).

My claim that the pre-basilect did not exist as a social entity, even in nineteenth-century Natal, disqualifies it as a pidgin, if we accept Mühlhäuser’s (1986: 5) comprehensive definition:

Pidgins are examples of partially targeted or non-targeted second-language learning, developing from simpler to more complex systems as communicative requirements become more demanding. Pidgin languages by definition have no native speakers, they are social rather than individual solutions, and hence are characterized by norms of acceptability.

The pre-basilect is a pidgin-like, learners’ approximative system that does not appear to have been used between Indians who had no common ancestral language or between masters and servants. For these two purposes Fanagalo was probably more important.
7.3 The basilect as creoloid

Creoles are widely held to be languages that developed out of pidgins (though there are some difficulties with this simple formulation – see Mühlhäusler 1986: 7–9). Valdman (1977: 155) claims the following processes to be operative in the process of creolisation as a pidgin becomes the first language of a new generation of (child) speakers: relative stabilisation of variation; expansion of inner form; complexification of outer form. Mühlhäusler identifies three sources of structural expansion: substrate languages (i.e. transfer), superstrate languages and linguistic universals. Bickerton (1981) has emphasised the naturalness of creole grammars, claiming that children develop them along the blueprint of a putative Universal Grammar.

In estimating basilectal SAIE’s position along what Schneider (1990) calls a cline of creoleness we first note that it is a fluent and fully fledged system, capable of expressing anything that its speakers wish to. It departs significantly from the rules of English English and is not entirely intelligible to speakers of other dialects of English not in contact with it.¹

7.3.1 Stabilisation of variation

We have seen (in 2.5.1 and 7.2.2) that to a large measure the pre-basilect is characterised by individual learner solutions to the need for communication. The basilect is characterised by a greater degree of homogeneity; it is a relatively focussed variety in comparison with the pre-basilect (and the other lects as well).

7.3.2 Expansion of inner form

This is an important process that takes SAIE away from its pidgin-like pre-basilectal stage to the creole-like basilect. In this section we will first examine processes pertaining to relative clauses, topicalisation and prepositions; we will subsequently examine complementation and coordination in greater detail.

7.3.2.1 Relative clauses

We have seen that there is no rule for relative clauses in the pre-basilect. Of six speakers only one used relative clauses and in a pregrammatical fashion at that, showing evidence of transfer. The basilect, on the other hand, shows the development of a variety of relativisation strategies. Since many
of these are ‘created’ rather than ‘inherited’ (see 3.3) they count as an instance of expansion via recourse to substrate, superstrate and universals of discourse structure.

7.3.2.2 Topicalisation

As we have seen in 4.4, there are few instances of topicalisation in the pre-basilect as compared to the basilect, which makes use of the rule par excellence. A strategy has evolved in the basilect for marking out a topic and following it up with a comment. Since the topic-fronting rule obeys a hierarchy (see 4.4.4) but veers away from rules of the superstrate and substrates in certain respects (for example, in its special rules of promotion), we have further evidence of the role of general discourse universals.

7.3.2.3 Prepositions

The pre-basilect has almost no prepositions (13 occurrences in six interviews as against 53 absences – see 2.5.1(g)). In the basilect, preposition deletion (or non-appearance) is possible but outweighed by actual occurrences (see table 2.20). There is some evidence that their occurrence is not always a straightforward ‘inheritance’ from standard English. The creation of quasi-postpositions time, side, part and way has already been discussed in 4.3.1. A similar use of the first two has been reported for Hawaiian English (Glissmeyer 1973: 208), itself based on an earlier pidgin. Other prepositional characteristics that do not seem to be derived from the input include the following.

(a) the use of by as a cover preposition for ‘near’, ‘at’, ‘in’, ‘from’, ‘along’, ‘via’, ‘under’ and ‘to’ as in the following sentences:

(9) We stayed by the Fynn Barracks. \((by = \text{‘in’})\)
(10) Suddenly by the eyes it start poking. \((by = \text{‘near’})\)
(11) I learnt by uncle only. \((by = \text{‘from’})\)
(12) I went by Dr Govender. \((by = \text{‘to’})\)
(13) I told by uncle. \((by = 0 \text{ or ‘to’})\)
(14) Can’t sit by the tree too, man. \((by = \text{‘under, near’})\)
(15) I ordered shampoo by Leela, she din’ get it yet. \((by = \text{‘from, via’})\)
(16) I went an’ took oath by police station. \((by = \text{‘at’})\)

Although by has a wide range of application in other varieties of South African English (Branford 1987: 60) these are nowhere as numerous as in basilectal SAIE. In particular, it does not carry the meanings ‘from’, ‘in’, ‘via’, or 0 in South African English.

(b) The occasional use of on for standard English in (inessive):
(17) I was trusting on him.
(18) I was born on Esperanza

The pre-basilectal equivalent to (18) would be *I born Esperanza*. Possible alternatives in the basilect are *I born Esperanza-side* or *I was born Esperanza-side*.

(c) In several instances the adverbial *there* was used in place of a locational preposition:

(19) Lets jump off there the gum tree. (*there* = ‘at, near’)
(20) This faller, he’s a big shot there Tongaat. (*there* = ‘in’)

One speaker showed a variety of strategies within the same sentence:

(21) I tell my brother to take you top, my brother’s place, y’know, by supermarket, there Hull Valley. (= ‘I’ll tell my brother to take you to the top, to my brother’s place, near the supermarket, in Hull Valley’)

There are two equivalents of *there* as a locational preposition in Natal’s plantation languages. In Fanagalo the demonstrative *lapha* doubles as a locational preposition (‘in, near, at’):

(22) Mina hamba lapha lo doktela.
    I go there/to the doctor
    ‘I’m going to the doctor’

The construction also occurs in the South African variety of Bhojpuri:

(23) Okar mā kāi... hwa aspatal.
    her mother go past there hospital
    ‘Her mother went to hospital’

Since Bhojpuri does not generally have prepositions we are probably dealing with a syntactic borrowing here. That is, the origin of the form is most likely to have been a universal of pidginisation in Fanagalo (using superstrate Zulu lexis), that then spread to SAIE and Bhojpuri.

(d) The use of *say* for ‘at’: Although this is probably derived from informal standard English usage, the (rare) use of a serial verb as preposition substitute is worth mentioning.

(24) Say five-past-one he went, three-a’-clock I got message he’s spot dead. (= ‘He went at five-past-one; at three-o’-clock I received a message that he had died’)
(25) From New Hanover to Dalton is say nother half-an-hour. (= ‘From New Hanover to Dalton is about another half-an-hour’)

The primary meaning of *say* in this sense in general South African English is ‘about, approximately’. The basilectal SAIE speaker seems to have intended the more definite meaning ‘at’ in sentence (24), judging from the precise time mentioned.
7.3.2.4 Complementation

That pre-basilectal speakers are poor at chaining clauses together in English can be gauged from (26)–(28).

(26) Full water – ayyo – can’t go. (= ‘One couldn’t go out there because the place was full of water’. ayyo – Tamil exclamation for ‘O Lord, gosh’, etc.)
(27) Feel sleepy, sleep. (= ‘When I feel sleepy, I sleep’)
(28) You got, you give, I’ll take. (= ‘If you have (extra newspapers) and can spare them, then I’ll accept them’)

Complementation strategies in the basilect are much more developed, though not always in the direction of standard English. Among the more striking differences are the following:

(a) Sentence-external placement of modal-like modifiers.

(29) Lucky, they never come. (= ‘We were lucky that they didn’t come’)
(30) Must be, they coming now. (= ‘It must be that they’re coming now/they must be on their way’)
(31) Isn’t, he’s your brother? (Isn’t it true that he’s your brother?)

Although it may also occur clause-finally, isn’t in this construction is not so much a tag marker (equivalent to Indian English isn’t it), as an introducer of a complement clause. This can be seen from its being used with both positive (31) and negative (32) subordinate clauses:

(32) Isn’t Shanta never get married? (= ‘Isn’t it true that Shanta never married?’, not ‘Shanta never married, didn’t she?’)

(b) This pattern is extended to constructions that would require raising and the use of infinitives in standard English:

(33) They told I must come an’ stay that side. (= ‘They asked me to come and live there’)
(34) I like children must learn our mother tongue. (= ‘I’d like our children to learn our mother tongue’)
(35) Then Ram told Devi’s mother must tell I must come. (= ‘Then Ram asked Devi’s mother to ask me to come’)

Like (29)–(31) these show the pattern modal-like element + S, with the structure of S unchanged. Although the usual English pattern with to infinitives and raising does occur in the basilect, they are not as frequent as patterns exhibited in sentences like (33)–(35).

(c) A related pattern occurs with some questions introduced by what about, which is then followed by a full S containing a finite verb:

(36) What about he let the rogue into the house? (= ‘What about him letting the thief into the house?’)
Table 7.1 Complementation patterns in the basilect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wh-form or modal element</th>
<th>Main clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucky</td>
<td>they never come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isn't</td>
<td>he's your brother?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They told</td>
<td>I must come an’ stay that side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like</td>
<td>children must learn our mother tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus’ be</td>
<td>they coming now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about</td>
<td>he let the rogue into the house?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>she can go like that?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(37) What about people all coming in and out of the temple? (= 'What about those who come in and out of the temple?')

Superficially at least, wh-questions with uninverted auxiliaries follow the same pattern:

(38) How he can go like that?
(39) Why I must do it?

To summarise, the basilect has a great deal of modal and question constructions with the surface form: external modal or wh-word + S. These are exemplified in table 7.1.

(d) Special markers of COMP: Although the most common marking of COMP in the basilect accords with standard English (i.e. that or zero), two occasional strategies hint at speakers falling back upon their own resources. The first involves the use of serial verbs like say:

(40) Then, eh, y’know, my wife’s father told my father said there’s farm inUmkomaas, you must come ‘way. (= ‘Then my wife’s father told my father that there was a farm in Umkomaas and that he should go there’)

This usage is related to, but not the same as, the use of say as a preposition (see 7.3.2.3(d)). Another example (a one-off occurrence) involved the serial verb went or sold, depending on how we interpret it:

(41) It was went two cent line sold that. (= ‘It went for two cents’ or ‘It was sold for two cents’)

Under the first interpretation, we have a serial verb sold acting like a postposition (‘for two cents’); the second interpretation involves went as an emphatic serial verb whose meaning is equivalent to completive ‘done’.

For a final example, involving the phrase I donno in the sense of (uncertainty) ‘or’, see sentence (61) under 7.3.2.5(c) below. Note that when the phrase is reduced to donno (as it is occasionally) we have the equivalent of a serial verb.
The second strategy is a much more regular one in SAIE, though there were few attestations in my corpus. It involves the use of a complement-like element *oh* (= [o:] < English *oh*).

(42) It’s not that you’ll be scared oh you going to die there. (= ‘It’s not as if you’re scared that you’ll die there’)
(43) Nothing to boast that you think oh we live in a castle! (= ‘It’s not something to boast about so that you’d think that we live in luxury’)

In this function *oh* seems to have intermediate status between the interjection it is in standard English and a marker of COMP. More specifically, *oh* seems to signal that direct (or semi-direct) speech is to follow. *Oh* is not part of the quote itself, since it would not be used as an (effusive) interjection in main clauses. Thus *Oh, I’m going to die! and Oh, we live in a castle!* are not found in SAIE. (Nor are forms like *Oh, how terrible; Oh, do come*, etc.) As an interjection in SAIE *oh* may occasionally signal disapproval, and it is this sense which is carried over into sentences like (42) and (43) above. Finally, a possible signal of its COMP-like status is the fact that *oh* does not co-occur with other COMP elements like *that*: I do not think that sentences like *He thinks that oh we live in a castle* occur in the basilect.

(e) Conditional-clause marking: The frequent use of parataxis in conditional sentences was mentioned in 4.2.2. While this construction does occur in informal English, it would appear to be less frequent there than in basilectal SAIE.

(44) We gonna keep servant, we must pay the servant. (= ‘If we want to hire a servant we will have to pay her/him well’)
(45) Wind blows, then only its nice for us. (= ‘If/when/only when the wind blows do we get some relief’)

When conjunctions are used in the basilect they are not always chosen in accordance with the input material. Witness the use of *like* as hypothetical marker:

(46) Yah, like my son or somebody working, I can stay how long I want to stay I can stay. (= ‘If my son were to work for the company I could remain in this house.’)
(47) Like two of them they’ll take the bus fare, lot now. (= ‘If both the children were to ask for bus fare, it would be too much for us’)
(48) Like my father-mother living they go there. (= ‘When my parents were alive they used to go to visit them’)

Even more common is the use of clause-final *too* as hypothetical marker. (See further 4.3.5.)

(49) It can be a terrible house too, you have to stay in a terrible house. (= ‘Even if it’s a terrible house, you have to live in it’)

(50) Very sick an' all too, they take them to R.K. Khan's. (= 'If they're very sick, they are taken to R.K. Khan Hospital')

There is a similar use of *too* (= 'even') with NPs:

(51) They donno Hindi too these ones. (= 'These children don't even know Hindi')
(52) One twenty rand note too, you can't get anything. (= 'You can't buy much even with a twenty rand note')

7.3.2.5 Co-ordination

Both the basilect and pre-basilect often favour the paratactic stringing of clauses instead of overt co-ordination markers:

(53) She was calling, she was telling ... (= 'She called and said ... ')
(54) Born over there, I'm brought up over there. (= 'I was born and brought up over there')

When co-ordination is marked, a variety of strategies arise. The ones that are 'created' rather than 'inherited' are exemplified below.

(a) Use of *too* clause-finally: There were a few instances of these in the corpus.

(55) I made rice too, I made roti too. (= 'I made both rice and roti')
(56) You walk into town too it's difficult, you wanna do shopping too, it's difficult. (= 'If you want to walk in town and do your shopping, it's difficult')

Substrate similarities are discussed in 4.3.2.

(b) Use of salient clause-final quantifiers:

(57) I speak English, Tamil, both. (= 'both X and Y ...')
(58) ... rose-water, vicks, coconut oil, nothing. (= 'neither X nor Y nor Z ...')
(59) We had to take out our shirt, tie, vest, everything. (= 'all of X, Y, Z ...')
(60) They must have one cup porridge, water, anything. (= 'one of X, Y ... ')

(c) *I donno* as equivalent of 'or': In its 'uncertainty' function, *or* may be replaced by *I donno*, as in sentence (61):

(61) They sent a statement for hundred rand, I donno two hundred rand. (= 'They sent a statement for a hundred rand or two hundred rand')

7.3.3 Complexification of outer form

Whereas I have previously focussed on the development of essential core structures ('inner form') in the basilect, in this section I will exemplify the fleshing out of syntax by psycholinguistic processes which do not always derive from the English input. Such 'fleshing out' may lead to an increase in redundancy, making the interlanguage more like a native language.
7.3.3.1 Double marking of clause relations

In shifting from parataxis to a less paratactic state the same conjunction may be repeated before each clause.

(62) But I’m sickly asthma, but see what happened. (= ‘I’m sick with asthma, yet some other ailment has struck me’)
(63) But it’ll come, but too late. (= ‘It’ll come but too late’)
(64) So when I was a baby, so my father-an’-them shifted here to Sezela. (= ‘When I was a baby my father’s family moved here to Sezela’)

Occasionally, the repeated conjunction occurs in clause-final position:

(65) We go Howick now, we feel different now. (= ‘When/if we go to Howick today we feel that it has changed’)
(66) But if I tell somebody now, they’ll say he’s bluffing now.

More usually, different conjunctions occur in each clause:

(67) Though I visit very often to Durban, but I don’t like it.
(68) Although they could speak fluently, but they were not so good.
(69) Once I started going school now, therefore I didn’t worry about it. (= ‘Once I started going to school, I neglected the home language’)
(70) But sincing the weather wasn’t promising too, then we decided to come today. (= ‘Since the weather was also not very good, we decided to come today’)

Sentences (66), (69) and (70) show that an initial conjunction may co-occur with a final one within the same clause. See 6.6.2.2 for similarities with other New Englishes, and for discussion within the second-language acquisition perspective developed by Williams (1987).

7.3.3.2 Use of target language forms with non-target meaning, function and distribution

This is an often-remarked upon characteristic of creole expansion that would appear to have some relevance in second-language acquisition (Andersen 1983: 31–2). It is a pervasive feature of basilectal syntax and morphology.

(a) Aspect marking: The verbs stay and leave are used in non-target language ways to convey aspectual distinctions. An’ stay after a verb signals a habitual sense; an’ leave him/her/it is a completive marker.

(71) We’ll fright an’ stay. (= ‘We used to be afraid (for a long while)’)
(72) When mother-all here, we’ll talk mother, and laugh an’ stay. (= ‘When my mother and others were alive we used to talk merrily (at length)’)
(73) She filled the bottle an’ left it. (= ‘She filled the bottle completely’)
(74) We whacked him an’ left him. (= ‘We beat him up thoroughly’)

The basilect as creoloid

This construction, not very commonly used, might be part of a larger tendency to replace adverbs by verbs in sentences denoting habitual action:

(75) He’ll run an’ come. (= ‘He’ll come running’)
(76) They only laugh and talk. (= ‘They always speak gaily/in a laughing manner’)

See further 4.3.2. Sentences (71) and (72) show another aspectual difference from standard English: the use of the reduced form of will to denote past habitual action (equivalent to standard English would). The most striking difference in aspect marking, should for standard English used to, has been discussed in 5.2 For the use of finish as perfective marker see 6.6.1.2.

(b) Plural marking: Janson (1984: 318) summarises the three possibilities for plural formation in pidgins and creoles:

(i) pronouns
(ii) nouns denoting multitude
(iii) an affix inherited or reintroduced from the source language.

As we have seen in 5.2, the third option is the most common one for SAIE (-s plurals from English). All three possibilities are exercised in the basilect, however.

The use of them as associative plural marker with [+ human] nouns is fairly common in the basilect and mesolect. It has a genitive form them’s.

(77) Johnny-them going ‘way tomorow. (= ‘Johnny and others (friends/family) are leaving tomorrow’)
(78) I saw Saras-them’s cat by the road. (= ‘I saw the cat belonging to Saras’s family on the road’)

Them is a well-known marker of plurality in Caribbean creoles and in Hawaiian Creole English. General South African English has a related form an’ them, used as associative plural marker with proper names, probably calqued on the Afrikaans form hulle. Though this form also occurs in SAIE, it is probably not derived from the South African English (see table 7.2 for a justification). In general, Afrikaans influence in SAIE is much lower than in other varieties of South African English (excluding Lanham’s (1982) ‘Conservative South African English’).

The third type of pluraliser makes use of all, one of whose functions is as an equivalent associative plural to them. It occurs after singular nouns, but unlike them is not restricted to [+ human] nouns.

(79) How’s mother-all? (= ‘How are your mother and the others at home?’)
(80) That-all they must pay. (= ‘They must pay for those things’)
(81) My chest-all paining. (= ‘My chest and the organs in it are sore’)
(82) Injection-all they gave me. (= ‘They gave me injections and things’)


A second function is to denote plurality – redundantly, since *all* occurs after noun + plural *s*:

(83) After he died his books-all was at home.
(84) Yah, ladies-all coming. (= ‘Many women came’)

*All* in (83) and (84) seems to be primarily an emphatic plural marker. In (83) a secondary connotation is associative plurality (implying ‘books, papers, etc.’). In (84) neither such associative meaning nor totaliser *all* (‘all the ladies’) seems to have been intended. That ‘totaliser’ *all* (of standard English) and (emphatic) plural marker *all* are different can be seen from sentences in which both occur:

(85) All the big-big shots-all was sitting in the verandah.
(86) Then all the children-all ran an’ came.

In these sentences the intonation pattern links the second *all* with the noun that precedes it, rather than with the following verb. Thus we are dealing with a bracketing off of the NP, rather than with some kind of subject-copying topicalisation involving *all*. A possible impetus for pluraliser *all* comes from Fanagalo *zonke* (where the Zulu form -*onke* is harnessed to denote plurality):

(87) Lo komo zonke (yena) hambile.
    the cow all they go past
    ‘The cows have gone’

There is the crucial difference that Fanagalo *zonke* is not a redundant marker, since the noun always occurs in stem form. It is, of course, possible that both Fanagalo and SAIE are using some universal principle of plural marking in the absence of adequate target-language input. *All* occurs as plural marker in several pidgins and creoles. Its use in SAIE is relatively sporadic, unlike – say – in Tok Pisin, where it is reported to occur in a majority of semantic environments (Mühlhäusler 1986: 214).

One instance of *all* is fully grammaticalised in SAIE – the second person plural pronoun *y’all* (from *you all*) is used in all lects, including informal acrolect. It has a genitive equivalent *yall*’s. (On the related form *an’ all* see table 7.3.)

*Wh-forms in rhetorical constructions:* The use of *where*, *what*, *when* and *how* as markers of rhetorical questions expecting the answer *no*, or as rhetorical statements was described in 2.3.1.3. A few other points have to be noted here. Firstly, there are two different uses of *where* and *how*, which we shall call *where*₁, *where*₂, *how*₁ and *how*₂ respectively. *Where*₁ functions in the manner outlined in 2.3.1: that is, it is a rhetorical form which occurs in positive questions or statements and ultimately proposes a negative answer. Thus *where*₁ *he’ll do it* proposes the obvious answer ‘He won’t do it’.
Where₂ may occur on its own as an exclamation of surprise or denial. When it occurs as part of a sentence it expresses emphasis, rather than a rhetorical position. Unlike where₁, it may occur with negative or positive clauses. Furthermore, it does not reverse the polarity of the main clause.

(88) Where₂ I'm so sick, hawa servant doing the work. (= 'I'm very sick, can't you see that a servant has to do the work?')
(89) That time where₂ the teachers din' take interest to teach them the mother tongue. (= 'At that time the teachers truly took no interest in teaching in the mother tongue')

How₁ and how₂ are more straightforward. How₁ functions as a rhetorical marker with positive clauses, suggesting a disapproving stance on the part of the speaker. Thus How₁ they were doing! implies 'they were behaving badly'. (See further 2.3.1.3.) How₂ is simply an isolated exclamation of surprise.

It is clear that these exemplify the property of the use of target-language forms in non-target language functions, meanings and distribution. Moreover, they are drawn from more than one source language:

(i) In 2.3.1.3 it was shown that these forms can have (semantically restricted) rhetorical import in standard English, and that their use in SAIE is a generalisation of this.
(ii) Substrate influence from Tamil cannot be ruled out since there is a system of marking 'universal negation' by wh-forms with the suffix -um (Asher 1985: 79).
(iii) In Bhojpuri the form  kahā (cognate with English where) may be used for negative rhetorical effect. This does not seem to be a South African innovation, since the construction occurs in a folk-narrative in Tiwari (1960). Another form belonging to this set is kā (cognate with what).
(iv) Where₂ and how₂ are based on the Zulu ideophones we and hau, which are exclamations of surprise. Ideophones are particles with some onomatopoeic properties, which carry a wide range of context-dependent meanings. Their occurrence in SAIE (via Fanagalo) is enhanced by their status as free interjections which are easily transferred in languages, and their superficial similarity to English where and how. Creolists are in agreement that in the process of stabilising a creole, words which have similar phonological forms in more than one source language have a good chance of survival. A well-known example is the probable derivation of the Caribbean Creole complementiser se from both English say and Akan se (see further Holm 1989: 185–8).
Finally, we note the use of *hammani* (from *how many*), which involves a slight extension of its standard English rhetorical sense.

(90) Hammani people live here. (= 'Very many people live here').
(91) Hammani times I told him. (= 'I told him many times')

(d) *Change of part of speech*: The use of *time, side, part* and to a lesser extent *way* as quasi-postpositions will by now be familiar to the reader (see 4.3.1). There is no need for further exemplification, except to mention a set of lexicalised phrases using *time*: Kavady-time 'during the Kavady festival'; *girimit-time* 'during the period of indenture' (*girimit* < agreement); going-time = 'on an onward journey'; coming-time = 'on a return journey'. (The last two phrases may also be used as NPs.)

An interesting change is shown by the use of *here* ([hje]) as a sentence-final exclamatory tag, as in (92) and (93):

(92) I don't like it, here!
(93) He's troubling me, here!

The most plausible etymology for the tag is *do you hear/ you hear*?, which must have been reduced to *hear* and reinterpreted as *here*. Native-speaker intuitions – including my own – suggest a current identification with *here* rather than *hear*. The two forms are also phonetically distinct: *here* = [hje]; *hear* = [hje]. Furthermore, the syntactic contexts in which the form may occur has been extended to include declaratives (indicating disapproval, a complaint or anger) instead of the predominantly imperatives of the target language.

A less radical change is manifested by the use of the question particle *why* as conjunction 'because':

(94) Proper Zulu he can talk why he stayed in Tongaat. (= 'He can speak fluent Zulu because he once lived in Tongaat')

There are substrate parallels in Tamil (Asher 1985: 44), though what appears to be transferred is a marked pattern in Tamil (corresponding to (94)). There is a related pattern in Bhojpuri, where *kahe ke* may function as question word ('why') or as a loose complementiser. In sentence (95), taken from a speaker whose ancestral language is Bhojpuri, *why* retains this dual identity as marker of an indirect question as well as a loose complementiser.

(95) I'm cross why y'all not eating. (= 'I'm upset that you (pl.) are not eating')

Sometimes the intermediate form *y'know why* fulfils the same function as *because*:
They never go y’know why last year they din get holidays one time. ( = ‘They couldn’t go together because they all didn’t get their holidays at the same time’).

On the form because-why see 6.6.2.2.

We have already seen the adverb too in a variety of functions. Three of these functions have been described already: as clause-final hypothetical marker, as phrase-final equivalent of standard English even (see 7.3.2.4(e) for these two functions) and as occasional marker of co-ordination (4.3.2). Yet another function is as focus marker:

This weather too, it’s terrible. (no other terrible thing mentioned)

Whereas the focus falls on the NP in sentence (97), it is on the main clause in (98):

We were very small when they died too. (no other dead – or small – persons mentioned)

The basilect also uses a marker of verbal aspect as occasional adpositional substitute:

I stayed here six years finished. (= ‘I’ve stayed here for six years’)

From there we shifted here, now six years finished. (= ‘We’ve moved here from there six years ago’)

In the basilect (and to a lesser extent, the pre-basilect) some words have changed (or extended) their word-class affiliation, without a significant change in semantics:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(101)} & \quad \text{We from born we staying here.} & \quad \text{born n.} \\
\text{(102)} & \quad \text{We very unity people this side.} & \quad \text{unity adj.} \\
\text{(103)} & \quad \text{From small he’s like that.} & \quad \text{small n.} \\
\text{(104)} & \quad \text{Very sin to see that thing.} & \quad \text{sin adj.} \\
\text{(105)} & \quad \text{He’s a very fit. (rare)} & \quad \text{fit n.} \\
\text{(106)} & \quad \text{Don’t fright. (= ‘Don’t be afraid’)} & \quad \text{fright v.} \\
\text{(107)} & \quad \text{On the t.v.! (= ‘Put the t.v. on’)} & \quad \text{on v.} \\
\text{(108)} & \quad \text{He offed it! (= ‘He put it off’)} & \quad \text{off v.} \\
\text{(109)} & \quad \text{Who’s look-aftering the baby?} & \quad \text{look-after v.} \\
\text{(110)} & \quad \text{He’s a very good. (rare)} & \quad \text{good n.} \\
\text{(111)} & \quad \text{It was very difficulties for us.} & \quad \text{difficulties adj.} \\
\text{(112)} & \quad \text{He was cheeking with me.} & \quad \text{cheek v. (‘to be insolent’)} \\
\text{(113)} & \quad \text{He was bushing by the hill.} & \quad \text{bush v. (‘to clear a bush’)} \\
\text{(114)} & \quad \text{Don’t by-heart your schoolwork.} & \quad \text{by-heart v.}
\end{align*}\]

(= ‘Don’t learn your work by heart’ – also Indian English)
(115) You must tension the childrens.
(tension v.

(cf. army usage tension up)

(116) We don' like to eat boils.
(boils n.

(= ‘boiled food’ – (cf. US English (French-)fries).

Finally, other striking changes of word-class affiliation or semantic function that have been cited in various parts of the text are summarised here:

(i) There as preposition (see 7.3.2.3).
(ii) Get as existential or locative verb (2.5.1(c)).
(iii) Hawa and dawa as single lexical items (2.3.1.9).
(iv) Only as NP focus marker (2.3.1.7).
(v) Oh as marker of direct quotes (7.3.2.4(d)).
(vi) Say as preposition (7.3.2.3); said as complementiser (7.3.2.4(d)).

7.3.3.3 Bimorphemic function words

As bimorphemic function words are a characteristic of many creoles (Romaine 1988: 52), their use in SAIE, although somewhat restricted, is worthy of note. They involve the use of items that are more salient to the learner than grammatical words like when, what, etc.

(117) What-time you saw him (= ‘When did you see him?’ – precise time not required).
(118) And for-what you filling that form, bhai? (= ‘Why are you filling in that form, brother?’)
(119) What thing she said? (= ‘What did she say?’)

In addition, reduplication of morphemes gives new meanings to some wh-words: who-who = ‘who of several people, whoever’, where-where = ‘where of several places, wherever’, what-what = ‘what of several things, whatever’. Reduplication of other wh-words is not attested in SAIE.

(120) Who-who’s coming today? (= ‘Who (of several people) are coming today?’)
(121) Where-where they sent you? (= ‘Where (pl.) did they send you?’)
(122) What-what she told me I listened nicely. (= ‘I listened carefully to whatever she told me’)

Reduplication of wh-words is permissible in Indic languages (for example, k-forms like kaha ‘where’, ke ‘who’, etc.). In Dravidian languages interrogative pronouns are marked for number, and the plural for ‘who’ is sometimes glossed ‘who-all’ in grammars. The form who-all does not, however, occur in SAIE.
7.4 A comparison with creole grammars

The discussion has so far suggested that the parallels between processes involved in the stabilisation of the basilect and those reported to be operative in creolisation are not superficial. A closer comparison of twelve archetypal features of creole grammars outlined by Bickerton (1981: 51–75) shows that creolisation involves deeper and more far-reaching changes. Limitations on space will not permit more than the sketchiest outlines, and the reader is referred to Bickerton (1981) and Romaine (1988: 47–70) for further discussion. The features Bickerton discusses are as follows:

(a) **Movement rules**: By this Bickerton points to the special focussing devices prevalent in many creoles – for example, copula *a* + focussed element (NP, verb or adverb) in Guyanese Creole. Sentence (123) involves focussing (with copying) of the verb *sii*.

(123) A sii Jan bin sii wan uman

\[\text{FOCUS see John ANTERIOR see a woman}\]

‘John had seen a woman’ (Bickerton 1981: 52)

Whether this is really a creole universal or attributable to West African substrate influence on the Caribbean creoles is in dispute. The construction is noticeably absent in Tok Pisin, which does not involve African substrates.

We have already noted a wide range of topicalisation phenomena in SAIE (4.4), and focussing phenomena of NP with elements like *too* (7.3.2.4(e)) and *only* (2.3.1.7). The closest SAIE comes to the creole prototype is in a relatively rare basilectal construction, in which a verb may be focussed by placement in initial position, and a copy occurs in the main clause. There is no special focussing particle, however. The focussed verb usually occurs in gerund form – see sentence (124).

(124) Q: So, can you read?
A: Reading, I can read.

(125) Q: What language do you talk at home?
A: Talk, well mostly we talk in our Muslim way.

(b) **Articles**: Bickerton claims that there is a crucial difference between article usage in standard English where the main parameter is definite–indefinite, and the prototypical creole system. The latter distinguishes between *presupposed* (i.e. known to hearer) and *specific* (in which case the definite article is used); *asserted* (i.e. unknown to hearer) and *specific* (in
which case the indefinite article is used); and *non-specific* (in which case we get the zero article). Platt, Weber and Ho (1984: 53–9) claim that a similar subsystem is operative in the New Englishes. Sporadic SAIE usage is suggestive of an analogous subsystem:

(126) I was feeling thirsty, so I bought one soda water. (asserted and specific)
(127) Food is lovely. (*the* > 0 – presupposed and specific)
(128) Because if they give us chance,… a’ right. (*a* > 0 – non-specific)

However, in SAIE (and Singapore English – Williams 1987) the English English marking along the parameter definite–indefinite also applies. It is possible that Platt, Weber and Ho overstate the case for the use of the specific–non-specific distinction in the New Englishes.

(c) **Tense, modality, aspect**:

Bickerton suggests that in the development of creoles the auxiliary system is built around three main components with clear functions. **Tense** expresses [+ anterior] where ‘anterior’ refers to ‘past before past’ for action verbs and ‘past’ for statives. **Modality** expresses [+ irrealis], covering conditionals, hypotheticals and unrealised events including the future. **Aspect** expresses [+ non-punctual], covering duration, frequency, etc. Despite some interesting aspectual marking, SAIE cannot be said to approach anything as systematic as the creole prototype. For convenience, the more special features of SAIE auxiliaries, discussed elsewhere in the text, are outlined here.

(i) *Stay and leave* as aspect markers (7.3.3.2(a))
(ii) Invariant habitual be (see, for example, sentences (101) and (112) in chapter 4)
(iii) Perfective aspect marker *finish* (6.6.1.2)
(iv) *Should* as past habitual marker (5.2)
(v) Sentence external position of presumptive *must be* (7.3.2.4(a))

(d) **Realised and unrealised complements**:

Creole languages typically select complementisers according to the semantics of the verb, their form depending upon whether the action expressed by the verb is realised or not. Thus Guyanese Creole distinguishes between *fi* (for unrealised complements) and *tu* (for realised complements). Such marking is not attested in any of the New Englishes, including SAIE (or in any non-creole language – Bickerton 1981: 61). We note in passing that basilectal speakers of SAIE have developed the complementiser *oh* for certain types of direct quotes – see 7.3.2.4(d).

(e) **Relativisation and subject copying**:

Bickerton discusses the emergence of relative clauses in creoles according to the following route: a zero strategy resembling contact relative clauses (see sentence (26) in 3.3.4); a
strategy that uses a personal pronoun as an emergent relative-clause marker; and finally the development of relative pronouns. This schema closely resembles the SAIE strategies discussed in 3.3.4.  

(f) *Negation*: Creoles favour the phenomenon of negative spread: the attraction of the negative to as many elements (NPs, verbs, adverbs) as possible within the sentence, as in 129.

(129) *It ain't no cat can't get in no coop.* (= ‘There isn't a cat which can get into a coop’ (Labov 1972: 234))

Basilectal SAIE has the rule of double negation common in many informal varieties of English, but rarely shows evidence of further ‘spread’. Some examples follow:

(130) *They can't find no fault.*
(131) *So far nobody broke into nobody's place here.*
(132) *I din' have no chance to do anything.*
(133) *We had just one room, no lounge, nothing.* *(nothing = ‘or anything’)*

(g) *Existential and possessive*: Unlike their superstrate colonial languages, many creoles use the same verb to denote existentials and possessives. The basilect uses *get* to mean both ‘to have, own’ (sentence 134), as a locational verb (sentence 135 – see further 2.5.1(c)), and as an existential verb (sentence 136).

(134) *Small broom haven' got?* (= ‘Don't you have a small broom?’)
(135) *'Nother room got there.* (= ‘There’s another room there’)
(136) *One girl got there, Tamil girl.* (= ‘There is a (certain) girl there, a Tamil girl’)

(h) *Copula*: The copula does not generally occur in creoles, not even before adjectives, which function like verbs (for example, US Black English forms like *He sick*). The discussion in 2.3.1.4 suggests that the copula is part of the core of SAIE morphology, since its presence outweighs its absence. However, we have also seen that its absence cannot be accounted for entirely on phonological grounds. Thus, while acknowledging the presence of the copula as a structural element in the basilect, we need to note the frequency of copula deletion.

(i) *Adjectives as verbs*: In many creoles the adjective is analysed as forming a subcategory of stative verbs, since stative verbs and adjectives exhibit identical behaviour under a number of rules. There are no examples of this phenomenon in SAIE. However, it is again not clear whether we are dealing with a genuine creole universal or a feature that happens to be widespread in African languages. What is worthy of note is that the pre-basilectal and some basilectal speakers treat adjectives not as verbs, but as
nouns! That is, they occasionally use an indefinite or definite article with adjectives:

(137) I'm a strong, but now I'm gone a thin.
(138) Farm life – it was a better.
(139) I'm a fit. (= 'I'm fit/I'm a fit person')
(140) English is the main; English is the most important!' (no ellipsis involved).

Furthermore there are two idioms, used even in the upper mesolect, which show adjectives as nouns. One is preceded by a preposition (from small = 'from the time one was young'), the other is the object of the verb make (to make naughty = 'to make mischief/to be naughty'). The impetus for the adjective-as-noun phenomenon probably comes from Dravidian languages. In Tamil, for example, in copular sentences in which the equivalent of be is not expressed (as is often the case in the present tense), adjectives can only occur in nominalised form. Furthermore, there is number and gender concord between this nominalised form and the subject (Asher 1985: 50-1). (If the be form is expressed, then the adverbial suffix -à is added to the nominal form of the adjective.)

(j) **Questions**: The distinction between interrogatives and declaratives is marked mainly by intonation in creole languages. Special question particles are optional and sentence-final, if they occur. In the basilect we have seen that the word order is the same for declaratives and interrogatives (2.3.1.1); and in 4.3.4 we have noted the occasional appearance of sentence-final emphatic question particles (under the influence of OV substrata).

(k) **Bimorphemic question words**: Creoles frequently derive question words from more salient lexical items of the superstrate: for example, Guyanese Creole *wisaid* = 'where' (< *which side*), and *wetin* = 'what' (< *what thing*). We have already discussed similar usage in SAIE in 7.3.3.3. It must be emphasised that the forms given there are not as frequently used as their standard counterparts, however.

(l) **Passives**: These are rare constructions in creole languages, occurring only marginally. It is a moot point how common the passive is in colloquial English English. As far as the basilect is concerned, passives are indeed infrequent, and full passives with *by* + agent rare to non-existent. Examples showing the recasting of a passive into an active form were not uncommon in the basilectal corpus:

(141) I born La Mercy. (= ‘I was born in La Mercy’)
(142) In t.v. that sees. (= ‘That can be seen on t.v.’)
(143) I donno where he educated. (= ‘... was educated’)
(144) We brought up here. (= ‘were brought up here’)
(145) Pather saved. (= ‘Pather was saved’)

A comparison with creole grammars

Table 7.2 A comparison of SAIE usage with twelve features of creole grammars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creole feature</th>
<th>SAIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement rules</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense-modality-aspect</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realised vs unrealised complements</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativisation and subject copying</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential and possession</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copula</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective as verb</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bimorphemic questions words</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive equivalents</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This brief comparison is summarised in table 7.2 (where * denotes a partial similarity). There are three non-similarities, three definite similarities, and six weak-to-mild similarities. The allotment of ticks and crosses, which suggests a ‘tie’, does not tell the full story, however. Of the three similarities, two (the criteria pertaining to passives and questions) are not greatly significant since they probably apply to much informal English ‘performance’. On the other hand, the three differences (tense-aspect-modality; unrealised complements; adjective as verb) are crucial, and would appear to be the most compelling distinguishing features between creoles and ‘other’ languages. (However, there is the issue of whether these are a result of restructuring based on substrate African-language influences. If so, then the evidence of the adjective-as-verb feature would be cancelled out by SAIE’s adjective-as-noun phenomenon, leaving only two dissimilarities.)

Some other features that do not seem to be considered criterial by Bickerton concern serial verbs, reduplication and pluraliser them. Reduplication is an important feature of SAIE grammar, as we have seen in 2.3.1.6. The status of the associative-plural form them in SAIE has been discussed in 7.3.3.2. It is limited to [+ human] nouns, unlike the Caribbean creoles where it may occasionally attach onto [− human] nouns as well.

Serial verbs in SAIE are limited to sequences of two (for example, go bring = ‘fetch’, go take = ‘go and take’, come sit = ‘sit down’). Sentences (146) and (147) show verb serialisation not characteristic of English English.
He never go stay with my brothers. (= 'He never stayed with my brothers')

Don't go take him to the house.

Although some serialisation is possible in informal English, it occurs as a consequence of contractions of Verb₁ and Verb₂ constructions. In SAIE we do not appear to be dealing with the deletion of and. Rather, serialisation parallels Indic and Dravidian substrate usage – the so-called compound verbs or operator verbs (see 4.3.2). In 7.3.2.4(c) we have seen other (rare) examples of serial verbs functioning as complementisers and postpositions.

We must conclude that the basilect has strong affinities with creole languages, without going all the way. (To pursue the sporting metaphor, SAIE might creep into the creole second division, but won’t make the big league.) The term creoloid (Platt 1975) is used to describe languages which have many features reminiscent of creole grammars without ‘going all the way’ (and without going through an earlier pidgin stage). To the list of putative creoloids (Afrikaans – Valkhoff 1966; Roberge 1990; Singapore English – Platt 1975; Norwegian – Trudgill 1983b; Reunion French – Corne 1982) we can add SAIE.

7.5 Analogies with decreolisation

A fully developed creole in contact with its superstrate lexifier language may begin to decreolise – i.e. lose some of its features in favour of those from the colonial language. This situation gives rise to what DeCamp (1971b) has called a post-creole continuum, along which speakers are located depending on the degree to which their speech approximates the older creole (basilect) or moves towards the colonial standard language (the acrolect). For decreolisation to be viable two preconditions must be met (DeCamp 1971a: 29): the dominant official language must be the same as that which provides the core vocabulary of the creole; and the social system must allow greater social mobility, making it necessary for creole speakers to come under the influence of the standard language.

In much writing about the creole continuum it is assumed that the mesolect is a product of decreolisation: i.e. mesolectal varieties arise as intermediaries when the prior-existing basilect and acrolect come into contact. On the basis of nineteenth-century Guyanese Creole texts Alleyne (1980), however, suggests that in the case of Atlantic creoles the full range may have existed from the beginnings of African-European contact. In this view decreolisation would involve the increase in use (rather than the creation) of already-existing mesolectal forms. In chapter 1 I attempted to establish that Indians in Natal displayed varying degrees of acquaintance with English from the early period of immigration. It is not possible to
make a case for two primary lects, the basilect and standard English, with the mesolect arising out of later contact between the two. More plausibly, we would be able to string out speakers along a continuum from the beginning, although the number of basilectal and pre-basilectal speakers would probably be proportionally much greater than today. One might expect that, with the shift from Indian languages to SAIE as vernacular and with improvements in education, there might be a progressive dropping of features associated with the basilect in favour of standard ones. As with decreolisation, we shall see that this has not always been the case.

Bickerton’s study (1975) of the copula in Guyanese Creole illustrates the complexities of decreolisation. Basilectal varieties have the following system, which is quite different from standard (acrolectal) usage: de before locatives; a before NPs; θ before adjectives. In the process of decreolisation an intermediate system develops. Firstly, iz/waz starts to occur before adjectives, resulting in the alternation iz/waz ~ θ before adjectives, a before NPs, de before locatives – a system still different from the acrolect. Later, iz/waz spreads to all syntactic environments, and may be contracted as in colloquial acrolect. Whereas a dependency relation holds between the copula and its following predicate in the basilect, in the acrolect it is between subject and copula. In this case decreolisation involves a shift from one type of dependency relation to another.

7.5.1 Replacement of form, without change of meaning

One characteristic of decreolisation that has some relevance to change in SAIE is the manner in which restructuring takes place. Bickerton suggests that when new forms in the mesolect are acquired from the acrolect they at first retain the ‘old’ meaning, function and distribution of the forms they are replacing. Slobin (1973: 184) suggests that this is in fact a general principle of L1 acquisition – ‘a far reaching principle [for L1 acquisition] which could be phrased as follows: new forms first express old functions, and new functions are first expressed by old forms’ (emphasis in original). The process is noticeable in mesolectal SAIE.

(a) A few mesolectal speakers expressed emphatic co-ordination on the lines of (148):

(148) My dad was a soccerite as well, he was a musician as well. (= ‘My dad was both a soccerite and a musician’)

This appears to be based on the basilectal pattern of OV co-ordination with too occurring at the end of each clause (see 4.3.2). Speakers who produce sentences like (148) conceive of too as non-standard (or, at least
inappropriate in certain styles) and replace it with the standard English form as well. The resulting pattern illustrates the retention of the basilectal pattern, despite seeming more acrolectal to the speakers.

(b) One upper-mesolectal speaker produced an anomalous rhetorical question with auxiliary inversion:

\[(149) \text{What must I go?} (= ‘I certainly won’t go’).\]

As discussed in 2.3.1.3 rhetorical \textit{wh}-questions occur primarily in the basilect. They never involve aux-inversion. The basilectal equivalent \textit{What, I must go} would indicate an unwillingness to go on the part of the speaker, and an unreasonable order by the addressee in the first place. In attempting not to sound basilectal the mesolectal speaker applies auxiliary inversion, but keeps the basic basilectal construction beginning with \textit{what}. The result deviates from both basilectal and acrolectal usage. It illustrates the property of change of form without significant change of the semantics associated with the basilectal rhetorical construction. (An acrolectal equivalent would be something like \textit{Why must I go?/ I don’t want to go, etc.})

(c) Along similar lines, mesolectal speakers occasionally produce an intermediate construction between basilectal \textit{must be} + S (see 7.3.2.4(a)) and the acrolectal form with \textit{must be} or \textit{must have} as part of AUX. Sentences (150) and (151) were produced by mesolectal speakers:

\[(150) \text{They mus’ be stole it. (basilectal equivalent: Mus’ be they stole it; acrolectal equivalent: They must have stolen it)}\]

\[(151) \text{That one mus’ be died by now. (basilectal equivalent: Mus’ be that one died by now; acrolectal equivalent: It must have died by now)}\]

In the basilect \textit{mus’ be} may occur under AUX if it is followed by an adjective or NP, or if it is part of a present-progressive construction (\textit{They must be stealing it}). When \textit{must be} modifies a past-tense verb form (equivalent to acrolectal \textit{must have}) it remains in sentence-external position. The mesolectal forms thus share something of the basilectal construction (the invariant \textit{must be} form) and the acrolectal equivalent (in migration of \textit{must be} to AUX position). At the same time they illustrate the theme of differing from basilectal usage, without being quite acrolectal. One mesolectal speaker produced the even more advanced form \textit{must been}:

\[(152) \text{Q: Your parents didn’t say where they came from?}
\text{A: No, mus’ been told us. (= ‘Yes, they must have told us’)}\]

(d) Another manifestation of this phenomenon occurs in mesolectal negation, when there is a transition in syntax associated with \textit{never} (see 6.4.6). In the speech of the eight mesolectal speakers studied in 6.4.6 there
were four examples of *never* being used with acrolectal syntax (i.e. with a past verb form rather than the infinitive), whilst retaining basilectal semantics (‘didn’t’, rather than ‘not ever’).

(e) A similar phenomenon occurs in the use of lexis and idioms. The basilectal phrase for a bin, *dirty box* is stigmatised in the classroom, and in an effort to sound less basilectal some speakers use the phrase *dirt-box*. Likewise, the basilectal phrase *to make dirty* (= ‘to litter’) is realigned as *to make dirt* which is syntactically standardish without being a standard English idiom. The same phenomenon can be seen in the change from *to make masti* (= ‘to be naughty’, based on the Bhojpuri noun *mastī* ‘mischief’) to a mesolectal form *to make naughty* (showing non-standard use of adjective as noun).

7.5.2 Addition of features

A related modification of basilectal features in SAIE involves addition rather than replacement. The result is, once again, less basilectal but not more standard, though it might feel so to mesolectal speakers.

(a) **Copula deletion**: Sentences (153) and (154) illustrate two patterns in the basilect involving absence of the copula (the basilect generally favours a zero copula after *that*). Whereas (153) shows simple absence of the reduced form *’s* after *where*, (154) shows an attempt at compensation for copula absence, by use of the deictic *that* at the end of the clause.

(153) Where that place - Chatsworth? (= ‘Where’s that place, Chatsworth?’)
(154) Paan that. (= ‘That’s paan/ it’s paan’; *paan* = ‘betel leaf’)

In attempting to avoid this basilectal pattern some speakers (usually mesolectal) produce intermediary sentences which incorporate both basilectal and acrolectal forms:

(155) Where’s the place is, Chatsworth?
(156) It’s paan that.
(157) Once you put thumb-prints, well it’s black and white that.

In attempting to ‘put in’ a copula in a *that* sentence, one mesolectal speaker conspicuously inserted it twice, each time at an inappropriate point:

(158) Your uncle is that – that Nehru is in India.

(*basilectal equivalent:* Your uncle that – that Nehru in India; *acrolectal equivalent:* That Nehru in India is your uncle.)

We have seen that one of the features of SAIE that occurs in all lects is the attraction of the copula to *wh*-forms in indirect questions (for example,
even acrolectal speakers say: *Do you know where's the plane going to land?*). Acrolectal speakers may use the standard equivalent without attraction in slightly formal styles. Interestingly, a few times in the corpus mesolectal speakers (only) produced the copula in both 'attracted' position as well as in its original trace position:

(159) You see where's the bridge is?

For different reasons, no basilectal or acrolectal speaker would produce such a hypercorrection.

(b) **Reduplication**: When participles are reduplicated in SAIE they carry a distributive meaning, and incorporate the sense conveyed by an introductory conjunction. Thus *sweeping-sweeping* = 'on account of over-sweeping'; *talking-talking* = 'while talking a lot'. A few examples in the mesolect ran counter to this tendency – once again they keep the basilectal construction (reduplication), while adding a formal touch from the acrolect (the conjunction *while*):

(160) While talking-talking some time there might be one guy say something faulty, then they all jump on him an' carry on.

(c) **Perfective aspect**: The use of *finish* as a salient marker of completed action is found in many English dialects. Sentence (161) shows the usual basilectal manifestation in SAIE, with the main verb in stem form.

(161) You finish eat? (= *Have you eaten?*)

The standard equivalent given in parentheses is too formal for SAIE, and would qualify as a hyper-acrolectal or even non-SAIE form altogether. I have observed a few acrolectal and mesolectal speakers use an intermediate structure, *You finished eat?* The crucial point is that the latter is based on the pre-existing basilectal structure, not the other way round.

(d) **Too as hypothetical marker**: Clause-final *too* in the sense of 'if, even if' or as focus marker will be familiar by now (see 4.3.5 and 7.3.2.4(e)). It is significant that a few mesolectal speakers occasionally use the clause-initial acrolectal form together with clause-final *too* in the same sentence:

(162) Even if I perspire too, it's nothing to me.

(163) Even now too, it happens to me in the mornings.

(e) **Morphological marking**: Morphological attestations of the phenomenon we are dealing with are greater, and listed in table 7.3. The first two columns give the basilectal and standard English forms, the third gives the intermediate forms. While restructuring of this sort is not the most salient characteristic of mesolectal grammar, when such restructuring occurs it is *almost always* found in the speech of people impressionistically labelled
Table 7.3 *A comparison of basilectal, standard and intermediate mesolectal forms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basilectal form</th>
<th>Standard English form</th>
<th>Intermediary mesolectal form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associative plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mother-them</em></td>
<td><em>mother and her friends</em></td>
<td><em>mother-and-them</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mother-all</em></td>
<td><em>mother and her family</em></td>
<td><em>mother-and-all</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>y'all</em></td>
<td><em>you (pl.)</em></td>
<td><em>you-all</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postpositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Umlazi-side</em></td>
<td><em>to/at/near Umlazi</em></td>
<td><em>to/near Umlazi-side</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Diwali-time</em></td>
<td><em>at/during Diwali</em></td>
<td><em>at/during Diwali-time</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>morning-part</em></td>
<td><em>in the morning</em></td>
<td><em>in the morning-part</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process of targeting a new form (from an external system) and gradually restructuring one’s grammar around it is not limited to decreolising systems; it is a general property of language learning. McNeil (1966: 69) gives an illustration from child–adult L1 discourse regarding negation:

Child: Nobody don’t like me.
Adult: No, say, ‘Nobody likes me’
Child: Nobody don’t like me.
(after eight repetitions of this kind)
Adult: No, now listen carefully. Say ‘Nobody likes me.’
Child: Oh, nobody don’t likes me.

Radford (1988: 21) discusses a similar kind of hypercorrective conflation in the speech of his daughter between the ages of four to four-and-a-half years:

(164) What was that noise was?

7.5.3 Near misses

A third process, suggestive of an intermediary stage between the basilect and acrolect in SAIE, involves what I call ‘near misses’. Speakers use forms that are close to the standard, but differ in minor details: a divergent use of a preposition from the acrolect, an overgeneralised environment for a rule, a re-subcategorisation of a verb, a novel form of an old idiom, etc. These are partially suggestive of decreolisation since they involve neither the creation of a form (as one often finds in the basilect) nor its exact ‘inheritance’ (as one finds in the acrolect). Speakers have learned a form, but not completely. In monitored situations they are easily able to produce a standard form, but in spontaneous discourse, under either very relaxed or
very tense situations, display several ‘near-misses’. By contrast, forms
typical of the basilect often involve not-so-near misses. The first of our two
sets of illustrations concerns items that are recognisably part of the dialect
(chiefly the mesolect).

(a)(i) Prepositions:

(165) He’s got no worries of anyone. (‘about’)
(166) I’m not fluent with Afrikaans. (‘in’)
(167) I was good in arithmetic. (‘at’)
(168) You should be appreciated with that thing. (‘appreciative of’)
(169) She was quite used of it. (‘to’)
(170) One of my sisters died with stroke. (‘of’)
(171) I won’t be happy to that. (‘with’)
(172) He did everything to his power to please them. (‘in’)
(173) I was robbed twice with my watch. (‘of’)
(174) If it’s not in your karma, you won’t agree to a place. (‘with’)
(175) I phoned by Dr N.T. Singh. (‘to’ or 0)
(176) They insisted on me to carry on. (particle on reinterpreted)
(177) We not entitled for it. (‘to’)
(178) I ordered shampoo by Sathia (‘from’)
(179) It was lent to me from somebody else. (‘by’)
(180) That was caused through a carpet I had in my house. (‘by’)

(ii) Adverbials, adjectives and quantifiers:

for really ‘really, truly’
farest ‘furthest’
worst ‘worse’ (in addition to its usual meaning)
more worse ‘worse’
the both ‘both’
big amount of people ‘large number of people’

(iii) Verbs: The pairs see/watch; say/tell; speak/talk show great fluctuation
in mesolectal speech and writing. Some examples that would count as
anomalies within standard English are given below. These should not be
taken to imply that the verbs have switched their subcategorisations, since
‘normal’ uses are more prevalent.

(181) He’s seeing t.v.
(182) I can talk Tamil.
(183) Tell what’s your name.
(184) Say him I’m coming now.
(185) What they telling?

One pair that does not show fluctuation is borrow/lend, though it does so
to a noticeable extent in many Afrikaans-influenced varieties of South
African English.
(iv) Lexis and idioms:

slow ‘soft’ – see (186)
fast ‘loud’ (rare)
sincing ‘since’ – see (187)
catch up ‘catch on’
scratch ‘itch’
can’t stick the heat ‘can’t stand the heat’
play fools ‘play the fool’
grow one’s children ‘raise one’s children’
see to someone ‘attend to’
long-cut ‘long route’
to run a mock ‘to run amuck, to revel’ – see (188)
to pick somebody out ‘to pick on someone’ – see (189)
to take out one’s clothes ‘to take off one’s clothes’
capsize ‘overturn’ (used of any mode of transport)

(186) Put the radio slow.
(187) Sincing he was my cousin, I helped him out.
(188) She was running a big mock there. (= ‘She was having a very good time there’)
(189) He was picking us out. (= ‘He was picking on us/insulting us’)

Some of the ‘near misses’ involve a conflation of two target-language items, or the influence of one over another. Thus sincing seems to be based on both since and seeing; long-cut is by analogy with short-cut; agree to (my body) is influenced by agree to something; insist on me is influenced by insist on something. Such neologisms, overgeneralisations and recategorisations are very common in the New Englishes generally. Sey’s (1973) grammar of Ghanaian English and Nihalani, Tongue and Hosali’s (1978) lexicon of Indian English give examples which suggest that these processes occur to a much greater extent than in SAIE. Indeed, these are the most salient feature of those varieties of English. In SAIE they are one of a widely varying set of processes, and not the most divergent of these from standard English.

(b) Another interesting set involves items that are ‘one-off’ errors, used by mesolectal speakers in the interviews. Although the individual items exemplified in (190)-(199) are not characteristic of the dialect, the process is widespread enough in the mesolect to warrant our attention.

(190) I accompany all the vegetables with spices. (= ‘I mix the vegetables with spices’)
(191) I overlooked it. (= ‘I neglected to do it’)
(192) You’ll find one person is linked relatively to a number of people. (= ‘... is related to a number of people’)
(193) She was a very hard-nut. (= ‘She was very hard-hearted’)
(194) The usual cat will be afraid, but not this fellow. (= ‘A cat will usually be afraid ...’ – cf. standard English ‘Your usual cat ...’)
(195) An accident appeared to us. (= ‘We met with an accident’)
(196) That was the worst thing that ever came across us. (= ‘... that ever happened to us’)
(197) We just keep an eye on each other. (= ‘We keep a look out on each other’s behalf’)
(198) To be trustful, y’know, I failed it. (= ‘to be truthful ...’ – probably influenced by trustworthy)
(199) Poorness was our drawback. (= ‘Poverty ...’)

This class of near-misses is psychologically interesting, since the speakers would have little difficulty in using the correct forms in most situations. Yet there seems to be an asymmetry between the passive command of English and the productions of mesolectal speakers in semi-formal speech.

The gap between the basilect and acrolect is a wide one in SAIE, and the mesolect mediates via a series of strategies. The decreolisation model is useful as an analogy in explaining some of the strategies operative in language shift. However, decreolisation, as reported in creolistics, would appear to be a ‘deeper’ process.

7.6 Undeveloped themes, conclusions, prognoses

Among the issues that this study has addressed but has not been able to analyse conclusively is the nature of the vernacular, if this is taken to mean the variety that shows the greatest deviation from the standard. For SAIE the right balance for L1 speakers seems to be the ‘Washabaugh option’: do not sound too basilectal or too acrolectal in the presence of other L1 SAIE speakers. In the most intimate family interactions even acrolectal speakers veer towards certain basilectal features. This study has not been able to report quantitatively on such style-shifting (apart from section 2.4.1 on interviewer accommodation).

Style-shifting opens up questions about the relationship between role-playing and language choice, a fruitful area for future investigators. The basilect and mesolect appear to me to symbolise community values and ‘solidarity’, but a lack of (economic) power. Acrolectal speech, on the other hand, symbolises the possibilities of upward social movement and economic advancement, with a concomitant alienation from ‘community’ values.

A few observations outside the interview situation will illustrate these possibilities. I once had occasion to join a long queue at a hospital serving mainly working-class and lower-middle-class Indian South Africans, and observe the stylistic choices of some patients in their interactions with the
medical clerk. The range of most patients seemed to be basilectal to mesolectal. In attempting to describe their ailments in such a way as to elicit sympathy and rapid treatment, most of the speakers I observed used a basilectal style appropriate to pleading, which covertly implied, 'I am sick, unable to fend for myself, not rich; please help me as much as you can.' One speaker, however, used a conspicuously near-acrolectal style, which implied the converse, 'I am educated and financially capable of looking after myself; I don’t need to beg for your assistance, though I do need treatment and would be glad of help.' The basilect thus expressed solidarity, but a lack of power in that setting. Use of the acrolect expressed confidence in entering the ‘system’ and achieving a measure of independence within it. As a member of the SAIE speech community one adjusts downwards towards the mesolect or basilect to ask for favours, and adjusts upwards towards the mesolect or acrolect to distance oneself from favours. Anger and fear are expressed by adjusting downwards, as might be expected.

That downshifting is part of a co-operative principle is suggested by another incident in a public setting - the security section at an airport. A young SAIE-speaking attendant once asked me, ‘You haven’t got anything to declare?’ This single utterance carried a whole history of pragmatic meaning, on account of four non-acrolectal and non-South African English features (in addition to accent). These are: an uninverted auxiliary; absence of do-support; got for ‘have’ (or, more generally, use of the chunk haven’t got), and the use of a negative rather than positive question. Although we were strangers, the speaker was tacitly affirming some solidarity, while still performing his duty.

If the security guard at the airport was defusing the syntax of power (‘Do you have anything to declare?’) in favour of mesolectal solidarity, police officers often do the reverse. However, using the tell-tale marks of power and distance (aux-inversion, do-support, etc.) would not be enough, since an acrolectal syntax generally symbolises education, middle-class and (possibly) liberal values. It is interesting that young police officers on duty wishing to absolve themselves from solidarity with other SAIE speakers occasionally switch code to a more general South African English, much-laden with Afrikaans lexis. An extreme case was an Indian police officer in Durban who issued a speeding ticket to another SAIE speaker, using Afrikaans all the time.² In instances such as these the ‘outshifting’ (rather than upshifting) carries overtones of power and intolerance - a kind of ‘symbolic violence’ (Bourdieu 1977). Although style-shifting is no doubt common in all societies, my point is that the shifts have significant syntactic consequences in SAIE today.

I have had nothing to say in this study about the place of SAIE in the
education system today, and do not consider it my brief to delve deeply into the complex arena of language in education. I cannot shirk from a few obvious pointers emerging from this study, however. The first is that SAIE is a social dialect in its own right, not a substandard variety or a 'bad' approximation of (good) English. The understanding of speech in its neighbourhood context must form a basis for understanding the special use of language (for both formal speech and writing) in the classroom. Given the enormous range of constructions in actual use in natural settings, I would say that it is inaccurate to characterise SAIE as constituting an 'interference' in the acquisition of standard English. It is surprising that more SAIE features do not surface in the classroom to 'bother' an already overburdened teacher. (There has never been a problem in the interface between dialect and standard in the classroom, given that almost all teachers in the apartheid system share the same background as their pupils.)

In my opinion (spoken straight from the armchair) a good English teacher ought to tap into the colloquial resources of the SAIE-speaking pupil, and be able to extend her/his already-flexible stylistic repertoire to include more formal-sounding varieties of English not generally available in the home. Although most English teachers do this anyway, it is often accompanied by subtle devaluation of the pupils' natural style of speaking. On the other hand, I do acknowledge that opposition to the inclusion of non-standard varieties in the classroom often comes from those speakers themselves.

The focus in this book on the creation of a living, spoken idiom very different from standard forms of English should not mislead the reader into anticipating all kinds of problems in the educational sphere, especially in the written mode. Even Bughwan, who generally paints a gloomy picture of the linguistic skills of the pupils in her study, admits (1970: 32) 'it cannot be said that the pupils tested were as articulate in their spoken language as they often were in their written'. Perhaps this should be recentred, more optimistically, as follows: 'Pupils are highly fluent in their own style of playground and neighbourhood English. Although they have not fully mastered formal standard styles of speaking (and will not need to unless they take up certain professions later in life), their written style is often quite articulate.' I do not wish to sweep away or trivialise the countless frustrations that all teachers and pupils occasionally feel, but the language-in-the-classroom issue has to be placed within the context of the larger sociohistorical setting of the language shift.
In conclusion, one might want to speculate on the future of SAIE. Three outcomes seem realistically possible:

(a) merger with the standard (i.e. loss of the main characteristics of SAIE, except possibly for phonetic details);
(b) evolution away from the standard towards a focussed vernacular (located somewhere at mid to upper mesolect – i.e. bidialectism involving a dialect vs standard dichotomy);
(c) maintenance of the status quo described in this study.

The first view is based on arguments that point to the fact that English is now an L1 for most children, that there have been improvements in education and economic prospects in the twentieth century and greater opportunities for contact with South African English speakers, especially in post-apartheid South Africa.

The second view emphasises that the dialect expresses all the nuances of social experience that its users wish to. It expresses a sense of identity in a country in which its speakers have long been discriminated against by the ruling class. The language shift has not resulted in SAIE speakers becoming ‘Englishmen/Englishwomen’; rather, it is their English which has undergone a distinctly Indian incarnation. SAIE has become something of an ‘Indian’ language (or at least an ‘Indian’ dialect of English). Of course, it is not race or ethnicity per se which causes and maintains the differences in speech patterns, but the historical factors – including the demographics of L2 learners versus target-language speakers, housing, sociocultural patterns and the effects of the now-moribund apartheid legislation. All of these shape the networks that reinforce the existence of SAIE.

Unless there is large-scale desegregation in housing and education, outcome (a) is unlikely. On the other hand, (b) in its extreme form is equally unlikely, given the social-class continua developing within the SAIE speech community. A modified form of (c) seems most likely in the short term, with SAIE continuing to exist as a continuum of varying lects, and the extremes between the basilect and acrolect becoming less pronounced than as at present.
Appendix A

Comparison between SAIE sample and census data for Indians in Natal

I  Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1985 census (%)</th>
<th>SAIE sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3 yrs of schooling</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–6 yrs</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–9 yrs</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12 yrs</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ yrs (post-school)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* People aged 0–14 years were excluded since they were not part of the SAIE survey.)

II  Ancestral language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970 census (%)</th>
<th>SAIE sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* 1985 figures are not usable since they reflect English as main language.)

III  Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1985 census (%)</th>
<th>SAIE sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15–19 yrs</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–30 yrs</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–40 yrs</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>1985 Census (%)</td>
<td>SAIE Sample (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50 yrs</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60 yrs</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ yrs</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(0-14 years excluded.)

### IV Rural-urban domicile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1987 (%)*</th>
<th>SAIE sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### V Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1985 Census (%)</th>
<th>SAIE sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Types of relative clauses used by individual speakers

(Speakers are arranged as follows: first those who do not use relative clauses even in long conversations; then those who use only non-standard types; then those who use both standard and non-standard types; then those who use only standard relative clauses; finally teenagers, those involved in short interviews and one individual speaker who did not use any relative clauses in the interviews.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Types of relative clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Types of relative clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key to titles:

A = speaker
B = prenominal external and compound relatives
C = correlatives
D = near relatives
E = topicalisation strategy
F = resumptive pronouns
G = contact relatives
H = other non-standard relatives
I = standard relatives
J = total
K = percentage non-standard
Appendix C

Rank orders for relative clauses, topics and morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Lect by impression</th>
<th>Relative clauses</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>pre-basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>pre-basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Lect by impression</td>
<td>Relative clauses</td>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>pre-basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>pre-basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>pre-basilect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rank orders for relative clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Lect by impression</th>
<th>Relative clauses</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>pre-basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>acrolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>basilect</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

#### Rank orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Lect by impression</th>
<th>Relative clauses</th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>mesolect</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

1 Historical background: the shaping of a New English

1. One difference is that Kachru’s distinction captures the status of pidgin Englishes (which are essentially performance varieties, institutionalised only in exceptional circumstances) better than the L2–foreign English dichotomy.

2. ‘Coloured’ in South African terms denotes a person considered to be of mixed descent. The quotes are frequently used in academic writing to signal opposition to the apartheid regime's easy use of racial labels and categories to its own advantage.

3. The total number of passengers on the Truro was 342 (Brain 1983: 12).

4. The three letters are contained in File I.I 1/48 in the Natal Archives, Pietermaritzburg, (I 352/89, I 300/89 and I 1736/1900).

5. Master of the Supreme Court, Assigned and Insolvent Estates (Miscellaneous Correspondence). Natal Archives, Pietermaritzburg.


7. In perusing one of my own composition books in the final year of primary school, I found the form alphabets (for ‘letters of the alphabet’) uncorrected by an otherwise solicitous teacher.

8. I am grateful to Prof. J. Brain for information regarding the background of individual missionaries. Interpretations of their linguistic resources are my own.


10. Accession No. 957/706, S. Bhana Collection, Documentation Centre, University of Durban-Westville.

11. Interview with Mr Govindsamy Pillay, Umkomaas (November 1985).

12. Interview with Mrs R. Misthry, formerly of Verulam, December 1985.


2 Variation in SAIE: a first glimpse

1. Note that wisdom here is short for wisdom tooth.

2. Although reduplication occurs in general South African English under Afrikaans influence, it is relatively restricted (mainly to a few temporal
adverbs). These have probably reinforced SAIE reduplicative usage rather than given rise to it.

3. One middle-class child of four years already seems to use auxiliary inversion as a stylistic rule, generally not inverting in her usual child-like style. However, in some interactions with adults and in playing ‘mommy’ she does occasionally invert.

4. SAE speakers would generally use do-support here. Incidentally, this speaker’s ‘downshifting’ in my presence shows her linguistic and social confidence. Less secure interviewees might have been tempted to retain a semi-formal style when speaking to peers, for the ‘benefit’ of the tape-recorder.

5. Trudgill (1986: 5) discusses Giles’s (1973) warning against circularity in sociolinguistics if the interviewer accommodates in anticipation of a speaker’s level (for example, the interviewer might speak ‘broader’ to a working-class interviewee, thereby eliciting ‘broad’ forms). Like Trudgill, I would argue that accommodation occurred towards the interviewee rather than towards the interviewer. Teenagers, for example, did not accommodate at all (see 3.5). In the SAIE interviews the variation shown by individual speakers is far too great to have been caused by accommodation to the interviewer.

6. An example of an echo-question occurs in the following excerpt: Interviewer: ‘Your husband, aunty – what job he should do?’ Interviewee: ‘He used to do prayers.’ Interviewer: ‘He used to do prayers!’

7. An example of this kind of half-question occurs in the second clause of the following utterance: You can’t speak Tamil – but you can understand it well!!

8. The last type of question that was excluded from the analysis was the ‘danger of death question’, which was so often asked as to become formulaic, usually beginning with auxiliary inversion in all interviews: ‘Can you tell me, what was the worst moment of your life?’

3 Syntactic variation: the relative clause

1. This pattern may be obscured by topicalisation, as in a sentence like For any wedding anniversary carries on, he used to come here.

2. The use of a pseudo-relative in a co-ordinative function, as reported for Philadelphia speech by Kroch (1982: 59) is rare in SAIE. Only three examples of sentences like It was one month back, I was very ill, which was the first time I felt so ill occurred in the SAIE corpus.

3. No special techniques were used to enhance the number of relative clauses, since at the time of interviews no decision had been taken as to what phenomena were to be studied.

4. A clarification of some of the terms in table 3.2 is necessary. Zero-relative includes only standard relatives with object focus, as contrasted with subject focus and non-standard contact relative clauses. The category ‘other’, under standard, includes incomplete utterances, slips of the tongue and corrections towards the standard involving relative clauses. Under the non-standard category, ‘other’ indicates sentences that were problematic in some ways: unusual use of relative pronouns (for example, which for human nouns); the
use of *like* (an all-purpose tag) as relative clause marker (for example, *You get some people like you meet them in the street and you greet them in your own language, and they'll get so embarrassed*); where for *when* with time NPs, etc. Note that the total of 557 in table 3.2 exceeds the number of relative clauses (543) on account of fourteen sentences having a relative clause falling into more than one of the categories in table 3.2 (for example, a relative clause with both the topicalisation strategy and a non-standard relative pronoun).

5. In the remaining discussion pre-basilectal and basilectal speakers will be grouped together.

6. There are no crossover patterns in the different lects, with respect to focussing and embedding in SAIE – unlike Romaine’s (1988: 234) findings for Scots schoolchildren, who switch from OO > OS > SO > SS to the patterns reported in table 3.12 at around the age of 8.

### 4 Word-order principles

1. The method of calculation was similar to that reported for relative clauses. The number of subjects, objects, etc. in the corpus was estimated by examining one-fifteenth of the sample. The number of actual subject topicalisations, etc. was expressed as a percentage of this projected total.

2. If we list the first three functions together, against the last (‘salient topic’) then the totals are 76:55.

3. If we transfer examples under left-dislocation that involve the ‘given’ function, then the totals are 175:159 – i.e. not greatly changed.

4. I wish to thank Sue Watermeyer and Roger Lass for making their transcripts of informal interviews available to me.

5. It was checked whether the ranking for topics correlated better with the R-groups (for relative clauses in chapter 3) or with the impressionistic classification in chapter 2. The latter grouping gives (only) a slightly better fit.

### 5 Non-syntactic variation

1. The figures for table 5.6 exclude the following: the sixteen ‘difficult subjects’ for relative clauses, the six pre-basilectal speakers for topics. For morphology all 150 interviews were usable.

2. *Markers* as defined by Labov will not be studied here. With the emergence of social-class continua, and as SAIE comes into greater contact with other varieties of SAE, some vowels (e.g. /ɔː/) are beginning to show the kind of stratification associated with Labov’s New York City studies (1966). In the early stages of language shift, which this work essentially focusses on, the indicators and stereotypes are more significant.

3. Exceptions are the few SAIE speakers who show the influence of speakers of other dialects of English in Natal.

4. *Glosses:* *dhania* ‘coriander leaves’; *ghee* ‘clarified butter’; *shallat* ‘shallot’; *garam masala* ‘mild type of curry spice’; *mung dol* ‘type of lentil used for soup’.
5. It is not clear to me that *pungent* carries the right overtones anyway. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* gives examples like *pungent gas, pungent smoke, pungent sauce*.

6 Perspectives from second-language acquisition

1. However, there are many SAIE features which are not even reported for Indian English.

7 Perspectives from pidgin and creole studies

1. This is suggested by several incidents: (a) an SAIE-speaking child (of seven) visiting Cape Town was easily understood by her playmates, but when she downshifted to a basilectal construction involving *isn’t* as a question marker presupposing the answer ‘yes’ (*Isn’t I can colour this brown? = ‘I can colour this brown, can’t I’) had to repeat herself three times before being understood; (b) South African English-speaking students with little previous experience of SAIE understood samples of the mesolect andacrolect on tape, but could not understand the basilect at its most fluent; (c) two South African English-speaking friends of mine were unable to follow basilectal speech as portrayed (accurately, though slightly exaggeratedly) on stage, despite the help of a clear dramatic and narrative context.

2. As explained in chapter 1, Afrikaans is rarely used (or understood) in much of Natal. In this formulaic situation it did not matter if the driver of the speeding car actually understood the Afrikaans of the policeman.
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Index

`a-coloured' schwa, 141
acrolang, 167
adacency, 104
adjectives, 53, 158
as nouns, 208
as verbs, 208
Afrikaans, 6, 23, 33, 147, 149, 199, 210, 220
all, 68, 180, 200
already, 176
American Blacks, 7; see also Black English
Amerindian English, 3, 4, 5
apartheid, 22, 24, 40, 221
Appalachian English, 73
approximants, 137, 140
articles, 155, 174, 206
before adjectives, 158, 208
aspect, 198, 206
audience design, 42, 44, 62, 147
auxiliaries, 163, 168ff.
  auxiliary inversion, 47, 63–4, 148, 219, 233–4
Awadhi, 9
Babu English, 13, 14, 15
backsliding, 34, 44, 62, 174, 219, 234
barracks, 23
basilang, 167, 185
basilect, 43, 45ff., 67ff., 85ff., 94, 101, 125–7, 133ff., 146, 148, 156, 164, 170–1, 185, 191ff., 219
be + -ing, 51–2; see also -ing
Bearer English, 13
because-why, 180, 203
been, 189
Bhojpuri, 7, 9, 23, 32, 38, 65, 141, 143–4, 159, 162, 193, 201
bimorphic question words, 204, 208
Black English, 5, 41, 49, 83, 148, 207
Bombay, 9
bookish style, 13, 22
born, 57ff., 62, 69ff., 203, 209
British immigrants, 6
‘broken’ English, 26, 127, 187
Butler English, 13, 66, 187ff.
by, 192
Calcutta, 7
Cape Province Indians, 6
Cape Town Agreement, 30
Caribbean, 7, 23
Caribbean creoles, see creoles
caste, 9–10
census, 27, 38, 222–3
change of function, 198ff.
Cheechee English, 13
child language, 60–1, 91–2, 168, 215
  negation, 160ff., 215
childrens, 129ff., 176
Christian Indians, 12, 19, 27, 29, 134
Christianity, 12, 19
classroom language, 13, 19, 22, 41, 60, 220–1
clause-final elements,
  but, 21, 108
  conjunctions, 108
  quantifiers, 197
  too, 108, 157, 196–7
clerks, 13, 19, 27
cline,
  of bilingualism, 13
  of creoleness, 191
co-existent systems, 58
co-ordination, 103, 106, 197
‘Coloured’ English, 5, 6, 56, 149–50
complementation, 194ff., 206–7
complexification, 191, 197ff.
conditional clauses, 196
configurational languages, 127
continuum, 42, 210
convergent developments, 17, 200–2
copula, 49, 61, 207
deletion, 49ff., 68, 148, 155, 157, 213ff.
Index

counterfactual conditional, 108
creoles, 2, 27, 43, 52, 191, 205ff.
Caribbean, 23, 199, 202, 205, 210
Guyanese, 32, 42, 59, 206, 208, 211
Hawaiian, 77, 92, 192, 199
Jamaican, 131
Mauritian, 20, 23, 25
Portuguese, 12
creolisation, 183ff., 191ff., 205ff.
creoloid, 191ff., 210
‘danger of death’ question, 39, 63, 234
dawa, 57, 59, 204
decreolisation, 210ff.
dental stops, 136
direct speech, 104
discourse universals, 76ff., 121ff., 191ff.
do-support, 47ff., 64, 148, 219
done, 189
double marking of clauses, 180, 198
double negation, 207
Dravidian euphony, 140
Dravidian languages, 7, 20, 50, 73ff., 89, 105, 139ff., 155, 190, 208, 210
economy of production, 176
education, 19ff., 30, 220; see also classroom language
empty pronoun subjects, 168ff.
English language family, 1ff.
errors, 152, 215, 217–18
expansion of inner form, 191ff.
expletives, 187
Fanagalo, 23ff., 28ff., 142, 193, 200ff.
fieldwork, 39; see also interviews
finish, 176, 178, 214
focus markers, 21
only, 55–6, 69, 157–8
too, 157–8, 196–7
focus movement, 110ff., 121ff.
Foreign English, 3–4, 16
fossilisation, 154, 165
French, 19, 21, 25, 29, 136
gamma statistic, 85ff.
Gandhi, 16, 25–6
German, 21, 162
got, 68, 189, 207
Gujarati, 9ff., 25, 32, 73, 90, 133, 136, 140–1, 143, 162
Guyana, 7, 23
Guyanese Creole, see creoles
/h/, 138ff.
hakke, 57
hawa, 57, 59, 204
Hawaiian Creole English, see creoles
here, 202
Hiberno-English, 3, 4, 5, 138
Hindi, 7, 12, 22, 26, 159
Hinduism, 143ff.
Hindustani, 16, 25; see also Hindi
historical present in -ing, 50ff., 148, 188
how, 48–9, 201
hypercorrection, 130, 139, 215
hypotaxis, 101ff.
idioms, 13, 18, 142
Immigrant English, 3, 5
indenture, 6ff., 11ff., 18ff.
Indian English, 3, 13ff., 17, 22, 108, 136ff., 180, 204
Indian Immigration School Board, 19–20
Indian languages, 7, 9, 25, 32, 141ff., 147, 155, 159
Indian traders, 9, 16, 24; see also passenger Indians
Indic languages, 7, 52, 73ff., 88, 105, 155, 158, 162, 210
indirect questions, 61, 214
-ing, 67, 188; see also be + -ing
input, 20ff., 24, 30, 190
Inspector of Indian Schools, 19–20
institutionalised variety, 4–5
intappears, 57, 58, 59, 62
integrative motivation, 184
interpreters, 14, 18, 27
interrogatives, 47, 208
interruptive embedding, 78, 103
interviewer accommodation, 62ff., 234
interviews, 39ff., 60ff., 84–5
invariant tags, 174, 176–7
Irish, 20, 21
is, 189; see also be + ing, copula
Islam, 143; see also Muslims
isn’t, 194
it as suffix, 186–7
Italian, 168
iz as possessive marker, 187
Jamaican Creole, see creoles
Japanese, 28, 74, 111, 157, 172–3
Joint Indo-European Women’s Association, 30
Kalkatyä bät, 7
kinship, terms, 145–7
titles, 108
Konkani, 9, 98
Labovian methods, 39ff.
Index

language shift, 1, 10, 31ff., 71, 141ff., 221
language-shift Englishes, 3, 5
leave, 198–9
left dislocation, 111ff., 116
like, 21, 196, 235
look-atting, 69, 189

Madras, 12–14, 28, 187
Malayalam, 7
Malaysian English, 122
Marathi, 9
Mauritian Creole, see creoles
Mauritius, 7, 9, 14, 16, 20, 23, 25, 27
Meman, 9
mesolang, 167
mesolect, 43, 62
mines, 21
mission schools, 19ff., 29
missionaries, 12, 19ff., 29
modal ‘t’d, 56, 149
modal-like qualifiers, 194ff.
morphology, 128ff.
   social correlations, 133ff.
movement rules, 205
Muslims, 9, 29, 32; see also Islam

Nahuatl, 98
nativisation, 3, 16
negation, 161ff., 201, 207, 213
acrolectal, 166
basilectal, 163ff.
in Indian languages, 162
mesolectal, 165ff.
never, 163ff., 179–80, 213
new elites, 27, 29ff.
New Englishes, 1ff., 4ff., 42ff., 154, 174ff., 217
Norwegian, 162, 210
noun plurals, 129ff., 159ff., 174, 178, 188, 199–200
Nundoo, Henry, 12, 19

observer’s paradox, 39ff.
oh as complement marker, 196
operating principles, 175–6
OV influences, 105ff., 156
OV languages, 74, 156
overgeneralisation, 153, 217
overseers, 29; see also sirdars

parameter setting, 167ff.
parataxis, 77–8, 101ff., 197
part of speech, 202ff.
partitive genitive of, 21, 61
passenger Indians, 9, 16, 24; see also Indian traders
passives, 57, 208ff.
past habitual, 51, 130
perfective aspect, 51, 179, 214
performance variety, 4, 233
phonetic characteristics, 136ff.
pidgin, see also Fanagalo, 2, 23ff., 28ff., 77, 187ff.

pidgin English, see also Butler English
   Tok Pisin, 2, 14, 23
pidginisation, 16, 66, 183ff.
pleonastic subjects, 122ff., 168ff.
policemen, 18, 27, 219–20
polylectal continuum, 43
Portuguese creoles, see creoles
possessive -s, 187, 189
post-acrolectal speakers, 45, 138
power and language, 40, 60, 219ff.
pragmatic mode, 75ff., 124ff.
pre-basilect, 45, 65ff., 84, 163ff., 169ff., 187ff.
prepositions, 69, 192ff., 216ff.
   by, 192
   on, 193; see also quasi-postpositions
pro-drop parameter, 167ff.
promotion, 93, 117, 118
pronouns, 61, 189, 199ff., 215
Protector of Indian Immigrants, 14, 23, 24

quasi-postpositions, 105, 192, 215
rank reduction, 108ff.
reduction of ambiguity, 179ff.
redundancy, 178
reduplication, 52, 148, 204, 214
regularisation, 176ff.
relative clauses,
   ‘almost-standard’, 72ff.
in British dialects, 71ff.
contact, 73, 80
copy pronoun, 78ff.
correlative, 74ff.
‘created’, 83–4, 88
discourse-governed, 76ff.
embedding, 78, 91ff., 172–3
focussing, 78, 82, 91ff., 172–3
genitive, 93
hierarchy, 92ff.
infinitive, 71
‘inherited’, 83–4, 88
internal, 80
interruptive, 78
near-relative, 78, 94
Old English, 97
paratactic, 80ff.
participial, 74ff.
pied-piping, 80
prenominal, 73ff.
prenominal external, 74ff.
preposition chopping, 79ff.
promotion, 93
proportions of, 81ff.
restrictive, 71ff.
resumptive pronoun, 78ff.
rung-on, 77ff.
social correlations, 82ff.
standard, 72
substrate-influenced, 73ff.
topicalisation strategy, 79
trace, 78
transfer, 73ff., 98, 156
zero, 77ff., 234
religious terms, 143ff.
retroflex consonants, 18, 136–7
rhetorical questions, 48ff., 148, 20ff., 212
see also where, how
Roman Catholic church, 19
Romance verbs, 22
run-on sentences, 103

Sabon, Father, 12, 19, 21
salience, 180ff.
sample, 35ff.
say, 202
as preposition, 193
schooling, 19ff., 27; see also classroom
language
Scots, 5, 21, 77, 91ff.
second-language acquisition, 152ff.
and negation, 161ff.
strategies, 174ff.
semantic shift, 146
semi-speakers, 65ff.
serial verbs, 193, 195, 210
should, 130–3, 171
Sindhi, 9
Singapore English, 44, 122–3, 177, 206, 210
sirdars, 8, 16, 18, 20; see also overseers
slang, 41, 147
slavery, 7
social network, 39ff., 159
sociolexical variation, 141ff.
Somer’s statistics, 85ff.
South African Black English, 3, 5, 150
South African English, 21, 54, 61, 128,
136ff., 149, 192, 199, 221
Spanish, 162, 167, 168, 172–3
Spearman rank correlations, 135
speech accommodation, 40, 42, 62ff.
Sri Lankan English, 107
stabilisation of variation, 191

stay, 198ff.
stative, 51–2
Stott, Reverend Ralph, 12, 19
stress, 138
Stuart, James, 26
style, 41ff., 44, 61
style-shifting, 58ff., 62ff., 218ff.
subject deletion, 50, 68, 69, 168ff.
substrate influence, 17, 73ff., 105ff., 159ff.,
190, 20ff., 208; see also transfer
sugar plantations, 23, 66
suicide, 8
syllable-timing, 136
syntactic mode, 75ff., 124ff.
syntactic variation, 82ff., 110ff.

Tamil, 7, 9, 15, 23, 25ff., 29, 38, 65, 74,
106, 157, 159, 162, 166, 20ff., 208
teachers, 12, 14, 19, 20–1, 29, 220
teenage speech, 41, 84, 89, 133
Telugu, 7, 9, 15, 25, 65, 157, 162, 166
tense, modality, aspect, 206
them, 199, 215
there, 193
Thumbi Naidoo, 25
time, 105, 179, 192
Tok Pisin, 2, 77, 98, 205
too, 157–8, 196–7, 212, 214–17
topic-prominent languages, 111, 122ff.
topicalisation, 79, 95–6, 110ff., 192, 205
embedded clauses, 120
extraction, 121
hierarchy, 120
pragmatic functions, 110ff., 124ff.
promotions, 117, 119
social correlations, 125
stacking, 121
transfer, 10ff., 154ff.
morphological, 159ff.
syntactic, 155; see also substrate
influences
transparency, 179–80
Transvaal Indians, 6, 16, 30
triggers, 168, 172
Trinidad, 23
Truro, 12
Turkish, 74, 98

Universal Grammar, 167ff.
universals,
in creoles, 191ff.
of second language acquisition, 160ff.
Urdu, 7, 9, 31–2, 75, 106, 141ff., 157, 162
Dakhini Urdu, 7

/v/, 136, 137, 140
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Deletion</th>
<th>Wh-Forms</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Word Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>48, 61</td>
<td>48, 201ff., 204, 214</td>
<td>103ff., 175, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular</td>
<td>39ff., 59ff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary, see soci lexical variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel System</td>
<td>137–8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>136, 137, 140</td>
<td>y'all, 61, 200</td>
<td>Yiddish movement', 110ff., 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washabaugh Pressures</td>
<td>59ff., 218</td>
<td>Zulu, 6, 23, 29, 142, 147, 150, 193, 200–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>