View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Trepo - Institutional Repository of Tampere University

Scots, Scottish English and Austrian German – Applying principles of sociolinguistic pluricentricity to describe non-dominant varieties in language continua

Michael Klade
University of Tampere
School of Language, Translation
and Literary Studies
English Philology
Second subject thesis
December 2014

Tampereen yliopisto
Englantilainen filologia
Kieli-, käännös- ja kirjallisuustieteiden yksikkö

KLADE, MICHAEL: Scots, Scottish English and Austrian German – Applying principles of sociolinguistic pluricentricity to describe non-dominant varieties in language continua

Sivuaineen progradu –tutkielma, 48 s.
Joulukuu 2014

Skotin kieli on kiistanalainen käsite, jonka määrittely ja status jakavat tutkijoiden ja maallikkojen mielipiteet sekä englannin kielialueen sisä- että ulkopuolella. Onko skotin kieli englannin kielen murre vai itsenäinen kieli? Skotin ja englannin välistä suhdetta pidetään esimerkkinä kielijatkumosta ja Skotlannissa liikutaan puhutussa kielessä kielijatkumon ääripäiden välissä, mm. alueen murteesta, puhujan taustasta ja tilanteesta riippuen.

Englanti on suurena naapurina vaikuttanut voimakkaasti siihen, mitä Skotlannissa pidetään kielellisenä standardina. Näin ollen skotin kielen status on kärsinyt ja sitä pidetään usein murteiden värittämänä tai huonona englantina. Tilanne muistuttaa jonkin verran Saksan ja Itävallan kielellistä tilannetta sekä kielijatkumon että valtioiden voimasuhteiden vuoksi. Siksi plurisentrisen variaatiolingvistiikan lähestymistapa voisi rikastuttaa Skotlannin kielitilanteeseen liittyvää keskustelua ja tutkimusta.

Tämän sivuaineen progradu –tutkielman tavoitteena on avata, mitä kaikkea skotin ja englannin kielijatkumo voi pitää sisällään ja miten käsitteen määrittelyn tarkentaminen on mahdollista plurisentrisen variaatiolingvistiikan näkökulmasta.

Plurisentrinen kieli on kieli, jolla on useita virallisia varieteettejä niin puhutuissa kuin kirjoitetuissa muodossakin. Plurisentristen kielten tutkimus on sosiolingvististä tutkimusta, sillä se tutkii kieltä ja sen käyttöä suhteessa sosiaaliseen ympäristöön. Sosiolingvistiikassa kieltä kuvataan sosiaalisena ilmiönä, ja etsitään yhteiskunnallisia syitä siihen, miksi kieli vaihtelee ja muuttuu. Myös skotin kielen tutkimuksessa plurisentrisen variaatiolingvistiikan näkökulmasta korostuu rakenteellisten erityispiirteiden, kuten ääntämisen, taivutuksen, sanaston, sananmuodostuksen ja syntaksin lisäksi erityisesti kommunikatiivisia käytänteitä, murrejatkumoa ja ekstralingvistisiä eli kielenulkoisia piirteitä. Varieteetin empiirisen tutkimuksen on lähdettävä pragmaattisesti kielen todellisesta käytöstä.

Plurisentrisen kielen varieteettien ja niiden keskuksien määrittelyyn liittyy usein avoimia kysymyksiä ja yleensä varieteettien väliset voimasuhteet ovat asymmetrisiä, kuten myös skotin ja englannin voimasuhteet.

Asiasanat: Skotin kieli, skottienglanti, variaatiolingvistiikka, plurisentrinen kieli

Table of Contents

1 Introduction……………………………………………………………………..…...1

2 On the history of research and the conceptualization of terminology………...4

3 Variety, variants and language variation……………………………………….5

3.1 Variety, variants and features…………………………………………………….…6

3.2 Regional, social and situational dimensions of variety…………………………….7

3.3 Dealing with variety in English and German………………………………........9

4 **The concept of pluricentricity and its subconcepts……………………..….…10**

4.1 Levels of pluricentrism…………………………………….......................12

4.1.1 Pluricentric, plurinational and pluri-areal definitions……………13
4.1.2 Primary and secondary levels of pluricentricity………………….....16

4.2 Pluricentricity and language change... 17

4.3 Symmetrical and assymetrical pluricentricity………………………...........18

5 **Varieties of Scots and English in present day Scotland……………….........21**

5.1 Perception and status of contemporary Scots and English………..……..21

5.1.1 Scots as an expression of identity……………………..………....23
5.1.2 Scots as non-standard or sub-standard………………….............25

5.2 Possible definitions of contemporary Scots……………………….……26
5.3 Linguistic features of Scots………………………………………........29

5.3.1 The verbal area…………………………………………….....…31
5.3.2 Pronouns, adverbs and noun inflection…………………...……..33
5.3.2 Negation and quantifiers……………………………….............34
5.3.4 Phonological features………………………………….…...….34

6 **Discussion……………………………………………………………….......37**

7 Conclusion………………………………………………………………....…39

Bibliography………………………………………………………………….…....42

1. Introduction

The general research topic of this Second Subject Thesis is the linguistic situation of Scots and Scottish English in Scotland. The different varieties and subvarieties of Scots and English that are used in Scotland today can be identified and analyzed on a linguistic continuum that ranges from Scottish Standard English on one pole to Broad Scots on the opposite pole. A similar situation exists in Austria between Austrian Standard German and the most dialectal varieties of Austrian German.

As in Austria, many speakers in Scotland code switch or drift between different varieties and languages, including different subvarieties and dialects of Scots as well as Scots and English. In actual language use, regionally defined varieties cannot be clearly separated from social and situational types of language variation. Thus the language reality consists of a highly complex pattern of interwoven linguistic and extralinguistic features that can only be analyzed by breaking down language phenomena into separate, sociolinguistically defined problems. However, attitudes towards language in general and language variety in particular vary considerably among linguists as well as among laymen and the regular language users. The topic is often complicated even further by underlying ideological differences and the fact that studies of pluricentricity always entail elements of language planning and politics.

Scotland's other language varieties will not be included in this study. The most important omissions are the Celtic varieties of Scottish Gaelic. Scots, on the other hand, regardless of its status and whether it is considered an autonomous language or a dialect, has developed from Old English and must therefore be considered a linguistically close relative of Modern English. It is the small linguistic distance

between Scots and English that has led to the existence of a language continuum between the two languages in Scotland and has allowed the gradual replacement of Scots as a standard language with English. In England, Scots has traditionally often been referred to as a northern dialect of English, an interpretation that seems both unscientific to most linguists today and derogative to speakers of Scots, since the term dialect is not just a linguistic device but also has sociopolitical consequences.

Different dialects and sociolects are often marked or even stigmatized. Thus, socioeconomical status and power correlates with certain accepted language varieties and certain pragmatic language skills are necessary to make oneself heard, for example in politically relevant circles. The mainstream media and the educational system will reflect these mechanisms and re-enforce the influence and importance of the favored variety. Such processes are often experienced as cultural imperialism by the speakers of the smaller, non-dominant varieties, such as the varieties of Scots in Scotland or the varieties of Austrian German in Austria.

In the concept of pluricentricity a distinction is made between symmetrical and asymmetrical pluricentric languages. Most pluricentric languages, in fact, are asymmetrical, in other words, one variety is considerably larger and more powerful than the other or others and exerts socioeconomical as well as cultural influence on the smaller varieties. Germany and Austria are a good example for such a pair of dominant and non-dominant varieties. While Germany today simply dominates its smaller neighbour in terms of sheer size of population and economy, England has certainly played a similar role as a colonial power – especially for Scotland, which, like Austria, plays the role of the smaller geographical neighbour of a great nation.

Therefore it is perhaps not surprising that the linguistic situations in Scotland and Austria bear certain similarities, despite the fact that the case of Scotland

is usually not considered a question of pluricentricity. The general approach of this study is the hypothesis that the established principles of pluricentric language studies can be (to some extent) applied to the Scottish continuum. Austrian German will be used for the purpose of reference because it can also be described as a continuum and also constitutes a non-dominant variety with relatively small linguistic distance to its larger neighbour. The focus, however lies on the language situation in Scotland and references to the German speaking world are kept to a minimum.

Accordingly my central research question can be outlined as follows: *To what extent can the principles of pluricentricity be used to describe the language continuum that exists between Scottish Standard English and Broad Scots?* This central research question can be broken down into a set of related sub-questions, ranging from the *concept of pluricentricity*, its *origins*, its *principles* and its applications to *the relevant linguistic and extralinguistic features* of the Scottish language varieties.

The goals of the study are to gain a comprehensive overview over the Scottish continuum’s relevant features and the parallels that exist between this continuum and the situation of asymmetrical pluricentric languages. The goal is also to create a theoretical foundation that can be used for empirical research in the future.

2. On the history of research and the conceptualization of terminology

The language situations in Scotland and Austria have been documented from the point of view of traditional dialectology and dialect geography, which, as Schneider and Barron note "dealt with regional variation exclusively" (Schneider and Barron 2008, 16). Thus dialect areas were established and dialect maps were drawn, typically based on historical perceptions and on data that was gathered from informants who were expected to be among the most conservative speakers available (ibid.). The various dialects of Austria, for example, were categorized and labelled under the umbrella term *Bavarian*, (with the exception of the most western region of Austria, which is considered *Alemannic*, alongside the dialects of bordering Switzerland and South Western Germany (cf. König, 2001). Detailed regional dialect geography exists for Scotland, for example in the form of *The Linguistic Atlas of Scotland* (Mather and Speitel, 1975). A division of dialect areas is also used as a rough overview over the internal variation of Scots (see section 5.2).

Dialect geography dominated dialectology until the middle of the 20th century. After the appearance of sociolinguistics and pragmatics, however, beginning in the 1960s, "the focus shifted radically from regional to social variation" (Schneider and Barron 2008, 16) and socio-economic class (sociolects) and social factors, such as gender, ethnicity and age were considered in new dialectology research (ibid.). Variation in the diatopical dimension (regional variation) was not of primary interest to sociolinguists until the development of the concept of pluricentricity (see chapter 4), especially by the Australian Michael Clyne. Based on Clyne's work, Rudolf Muhr applied sociolinguistic principles and methods to the questions concerning the nature and status of Austrian German (see chapter 4).

Whereas the neutral term *variety* (see chapter 3) is now generally preferred over *dialect* (Schneider and Barron 2008, 17), traditional, regionally defined dialects are now often referred to as regional varieties or regiolects (ibid.). Studies in pluricentricity have led to a renewed interest, not only in national varieties, but also in sub-national regional varieties (ibid.) (see section 4.1.2).

The new sub-discipline of “variational pragmatics” (Schneider and Barron 2008) explicitly includes the various levels of regional variation and combines them with the emphasis on social factors of earlier sociolinguistics. Given the importance of the question of identity (see section 5.1.1) for the central research question of this thesis, it may be sound to regard also my approach, which is the expansion of the principles of pluricentricity, an example of *variational pragmatics*.

3. Variety, Variants and language variation

The central research question of this thesis, how the principles of pluricentricity can be used to describe the language continuum that exists between Scottish Standard English and Broad Scots cannot be addressed before several key terms of sociolinguistics have been examined.

Studies of pluricentricity constitute a specific branch of variationist linguistics and the scholars who have conducted empirical research within this branch and have contributed to the theoretical conceptualization of pluricentricity have also developed a set of terms to deal with the various levels of language variation and change that are encountered whenever different language varieties are examined. Some of these terms have come to be widely accepted while others, including the term pluricentricity itself, are still the cause of confusion and dispute (see Section 4.1.1). Before the

discussion of the concept of pluricentricity in chapter 4, however, the following sections examine different forms of language variation, the different dimensions in which these forms occur and different approaches scholars have chosen to deal with language variation.

3.1 Variety, variants and features

According to Hudson (2001, 22) a language variety can, as a concept, be defined as "a set of linguistic items with similar social distribution" (ibid.). Hudson's broad definition of language variety can be applied not only to full-fledged languages but also to dialects, other types of sociolinguistically defined lects and registers. Thus language variety can refer to specific linguistic items but also to a phenomenon that extends beyond language. Following this definition it is possible to discuss whether any particular variety should or could be considered a dialect of one language or as a distinct language.

In this thesis the term *variety* is generally used as a neutral umbrella term for any linguistic (sub)system that is shared by any community of language users for any communicative or cultural purpose. In a specific context a language variety can be specified and defined more precisely by modifying it with an appropriate label, for example *standard variety*, *non-standard variety*, *dialectal variety*, *sociolectal*[1] *variety*, *subvariety* etc. (cf. Hudson, 2001).

[1] Some scholars, for example Trudgill (1994, 5) prefer the term *social dialect*, which does imply that each identifiable *sociolect* occurs within a certain diatopical space or geographical area. On the other hand, social dialect may also seem ill-coined because it can be interpreted as a confusion of two separate dimensions of language variation: the spatial dimension and the social dimension. After all it is possible to identify more than one sociolects within one geographically defined dialect area.

Since the term *variety* is understood to refer to a system, another term is needed to refer to specific language forms (such as words, particles or sounds). Ammon (1995, 61) considers specific language forms aspects of linguistic variables. In other words, a linguistic variable may occur in different forms, or, in mathematical terms, assumes any one of a set of values. Each one of these forms or values constitutes a linguistic *variant* (cf. ibid.). For example the cardinal number two can be described as the variable TWO, which can assume (among others) the Standard English variant *two* and the Scots variant *twa*.

Linguistic variants of a variety can subsequently be regarded specific and often characteristic *features* of that variety. Thus, in this thesis, the term *feature* is used as a neutral linguistic term for any specific variant of Scots or English.

3.2 Regional, social and situational dimensions of variety

The organization of language varieties and their variants can be based on regulatory dimensions. Dittmar (1997, 173) defines four dimensions of language variation, which allow the precise definition of a complex sociolinguistic phenomenon: diatopic, diastratic, diaphasic and diachronic:

Dimension	Characteristics	Examples
Diatopic (spatial)	refers to different areas, regions or countries;	traditional dialectology, narrow definition of dialect, dialectal features, Glaswegian, Scots, Bavarian etc.
Diastratic (social)	refers to different social groups, socioeconomic class, profession, sex, age;	sociolects, social dialects, sociolectal features, slang, jargón;
Diaphasic (situational)	refers to different situational and communicative settings;	different levels of style or register, accommodation;

Diachronic (time)	refers to historical language change, varieties and variants on a linear axis;	any change in usage or codification over time, obsolete or old-fashioned variants, emerging neologisms etc.

Table 1. Dimensions of language variation, based on Dittmar (1997, 173-183).

Dittmar's model reflects the multidimensional nature of language reality and allows the analyses of the complex interwoven patterns of variants that empirical research (particularly in the fields of pluricentricity or variational pragmatics) is likely to produce. Any speech recording or transcription, for example, can be analyzed by breaking its components down to different features of different dimensions, such as the use of variants that are typical for a certain region, combined with the use of variants that are typical for a certain social class, combined with the use of variants or communicative behavior that is typical in certain situations. It should also be noted that the diachronic dimension acts as a linear axis or timeline, which allows the recording of language change on the other three dimensions of variation. In other words, each dimension of variation possesses its own diachronic aspect.

The ongoing debates on and around pluricentric studies suggests that the diatopical dimension should be organized, defined or subcategorized further, according to the size and the demographic and political situation of the area (see Section 4.1.2). Definitions of local dialects, urbanolects, regiolects and national standard varieties all show maps in different scales and have different functions, even though they often depict the same overlapping areas and concern the same language users. In the diastratic dimension specifications of different groups have been the rule from the beginnings of sociolinguistics (cf. Schneider and Barron 2008, 16). Finally, there is also considerable overlap between diatopical and diastratic phenomena, which

makes a clear distinction between the two respective dimensions often impossible: "All dialects are both regional and social, since all speakers have a social background as well as a regional location." (Chambers & Trudgill 1980, 54).

3.3 Dealing with variety in English and German

Based on the variants found in a specific context, different varieties can be identified within a language and associated with particular regions, social groups or situations. A multidimensional model that aims to consider as many aspects of language reality and language change as possible (see section 3.2) can only be used to its full potential if a language use oriented approach (in other words a socio-pragmatic approach) is adopted. Strictly normative approaches focus on standard language, prescribing correct use and correct variants. Thus traditional normative approaches are not suitable to detect significant language variation and show a relatively homogeneous picture of a language, which is based on the exclusion unwanted variants.

Codification in the German speaking countries remains largely normative and the Germany-based dictionaries generally apply German German standards to the entire German language. Therefore no distinction is usually made between Standard German and German Standard German. For example, whenever Austrian and Swiss lexical items are codified they will be marked accordingly, highlighting the limited usage and communicative range of the item. Words that are used only in Germany, however, remain unmarked, creating a misleading picture of their usage and communicative range. As Schrodt (1997, 13) points out, the inconsistent codification policy in Germany suggests that the pluricentric equality of national language varieties has not fully replaced the old monocentric attitudes of the past and Austrian variants are still regarded oddities, which are situated on the fringe of the German

speaking area. The vast majority of characteristic lexical items of Austrian German are not codified at all in German dictionaries.

Sociolinguistics has probably had a greater impact in Britain than in the German speaking world, let alone countries with a prescriptive culture such as France or Italy. Milroy and Milroy (1985, 5), however, point out that priority of description has not eradicated prescription, nor have prescriptive phenomena ceased to play a role in language. The reservations that modern scholars often express towards prescription do not seem to reflect the attitudes of the general public “who continue to look to dictionaries, grammars and handbooks as authorities on ‘correct’ usage” (Milroy and Milroy 1985, 6). Furthermore, since the same linguists who express reservations against prescription and stress the priority of description continue to work on dictionaries, grammars and handbooks, the situation may even be seen contradictory, at least to some extent.

> Many professional language scholars appear to feel that, whereas it is respectable to write formal grammars, it is not quite respectable to study prescription. (Milroy and Milroy 1985, 5-6).

4. The concept of pluricentricity and its subconcepts

This chapter consists of a thorough discussion of the concept of pluricentricity, which is perceived and used in this thesis as a subvariety of sociolinguistically oriented variationist linguistics. After a general introduction to the concept and its history in linguistics section 4.1 will deal with different approaches and definitions of pluricentricity and also with some of the criticism that some proponents of pluricentric studies have received. Whereas section 4.1 assumes a strictly synchronic perspective and the various levels of pluricentricity belong to the diatopical dimension

of language variety (see section 3.2) in section 4.2 the focus will shift towards the different ways languages and varieties can develop different pluricentric qualities. Since the processes described in section 4.2 include elements of active participation (such as language planning) and other extralinguistic criteria the focus shift towards power dynamics (section 4.3) will be a gradual one.

The concept of pluricentricity is a relatively recent phenomenon but the questions it is concerned with have been asked long before the advent of sociolinguistics paved the way for modern linguistic studies of language variation. That two nations can be divided by a common language is a humorous idea that numerous writers and intellectuals of different nationalities have expressed with reference to different nations. Probably the most famous example, the claim that England and America are separated by a common language, is commonly attributed to George Bernard Shaw. Similar quotes exist about Germany and Austria and probably about many other nations that share a pluricentric language. The idea seems humorous because of the seemingly paradoxical situation it implies: a common element (a shared language) does not unite as is normally the case but serves to separate instead. The situation, however, only seems paradoxical because the witticism is based on simplification as it implies that a shared or common language is a homogeneous whole. The separating qualities, however, are not the shared elements but the specific features of each national variety that are accepted standard or commonly used only in one particular country and therefore seem odd (or are not even understood) in the other country. Thus these specific features of national language varieties constitute a part of language that contributes to the building of cultural identity. In addition to this constructive role that the specific national linguistic features have played domestically, they have also complicated the communication between people from

Great Britain, America, Ireland, Australia, Germany, Austria, Switzerland and many more. The authors of the aforementioned witticisms surely understood the respective differences within the supposedly common languages and addressed the specific features' ambiguous qualities.

Today interest in these qualities is no longer restricted to the genre of humour and the specific linguistic features of national varieties can be studied scientifically within the field of variationist linguistics. Kloss (1978, 66-67) introduced the term *pluricentric* to point out the fact that some languages indeed have more than one center and also national varieties with own norms. The dual role of such varieties as unifiers (domestic use within a center) and dividers (the interacting of different centers) was recognized by Kloss and other pioneers of the concept of pluricentricity (Clyne 1992, 1).

There is a broad spectrum of different approaches for empirical research within pluricentric studies because different levels of language (for example lexical, phonetical, grammatical, semantic or pragmatic features) can be in- or excluded when the research questions are conceived. The diatopical dimension must also be determined, which may include the definition of geographic or political language centers and their spheres of influence. It should be noted, however, that not all scholars explicitly define the range of their research.

4.1. Levels of pluricentrism

Unlike monocentric languages all pluricentric languages consist of two or more different versions, each one containing its own center and distinctive linguistic features and some own norms (Clyne 1992, 1). This kind of variation is easiest to

recognize (and most widely accepted as pluricentricity among scholars) between distinct nations. For example Great Britain and the United States of America can be seen as two distinct (yet interacting) centers, both contain distinctive linguistic features and both have developed own norms, which are codified thoroughly on the lexical level (in dictionaries) and at least to some extent on other language levels. Both are bestowed with official status and are used by the vast majority of the respective population in private and public communication. There is a consensus that the distinctive features and the degree of their codification seem sufficient in order to justify the use of terms like British English and American English, yet most language users and scholars do not consider the differences between those national varieties great enough to consider them separate languages.

Thus on the primary level of pluricentricity the center of a language variety corresponds to a nation, which has led some scholars to favor the term plurinational[2] over the term pluricentric (Pohl 1997, 74). Since this level of pluricentricity does not consider language variation within nations and is generally restricted to codified standard features, different solutions and alternative concepts have been suggested.

4.1.1 Pluricentric, plurinational and pluri-areal definitions

Wiesinger (1995, 69) insists that nations and languages do not correlate with each other and language centers should not be identified via political nations. Wiesinger accuses pluricentrist scholars like Clyne of wrongfully suggesting that political

---

[2] For a thorough discussion of the terminology see Ammon 1995, 97ff.

nations coincide with coherent language centres and form national varieties, which, according to Wiesinger (ibid.), do not exist.

Also Pohl (1997, 67) criticizes what he considers synonymous use of the terms and concepts of pluricentricity and plurinationality. According to Pohl (ibid.) only the administrative centers of nations should be considered as language centers of pluricentric languages whereas the entire nation may be covered by several language varieties. Pohl's criticism aims at the fact that the primary level of pluricentricity fails to consider internal language variety, especially regional differences between political nations. At the same time his criticism is also directed towards the idea that the entire spectrum of language variety might be descriptively summed up as national (standard) variety. Pohl's own concept, the concept of pluri-areal language variety, is based on the dialect areas that have been mapped out by pre-sociolinguist-era dialectologists and, indeed, do not correspond with the borders of present day nations.

It should be pointed out that Pohl's approach is part of the ongoing language dispute[3] in Austria and the dialect areas he refers to are located in Germany, Austria and Switzerland. However, as a contribution to pluricentric studies, Pohl's pluri-areal concept of language variety can also be seen as a universal approach that can be applied to any other region in the world, provided that one language is used by two or more neighbouring countries and different dialect areas have been identified in the region. Proponents of pluricentric models have, in turn, dismissed the pluri-areal

[3] The Austrian scholars Muhr, Pohl, Schrodt, Wiesinger and others have presented their respective views on the status of Austrian German along with their respective pluricentric, pluriareal and other models of language in the form of papers and scientific articles. Their texts (see for example Muhr, Rudolf / Schrodt, Richard / Wiesinger, Peter (eds.) 1995) frequently include disputatious arguments and counter arguments as reactions to texts that have been previously published or presented by the respective opposition. The sometimes polemical exchange is not strictly limited to linguistic research but mingles with ideological differences and different (language) political goals.

concept because it does not seem to distinguish between regional dialects and standard varieties.

For example Muhr (1997, 56) points out that in addition to the occurrence of distinctive language features also their respective status must be considered when varieties are defined because ”the sociolinguistic significance” (ibid.) that determines the usage and communicative importance of a particular language variant should be paramount. The same variant can occur on both sides of a border between politically sovereign countries but its status and therefore its communicative range can differ greatly: a particular word, for example, may be considered dialectal nonstandard on one side of the border and standard on the other side. Differences in status are especially important because language varieties are in a state of flux and dialectal forms can become codified standard forms if the political regulations and the public discourse in a particular country at a particular time favor such a development. Such status changes affect the language use within the politically defined center or area of the variety but not (or noticeably less so) in the same dialect area of a neighbouring country. The reason for this is that areas in neighbouring countries remain unaffected by foreign codifying policies and do not share the same public discourse due to the presence of different national and regional media and different interests and ongoing affairs. Neither do dialect regions have the ability or authority to codify their distinctive language features. Such authority is generally only bestowed upon sovereign political entities such as independent countries and possibly, but to a far lesser degree, to some autonomous regions.

4.1.2 Primary and secondary levels of pluricentricity

Pluricentricity, in its generally accepted yet vaguely defined form (see Section 4.1) does not provide scholars with satisfactory tools to describe language variation within a (politically and diatopically defined) language center and its national variety. Rival concepts, on the other hand (see Subsection 4.1.1) ignore essential sociolinguistic principles, such as the frequency of usage, communicative importance and matters of cultural identity. As Muhr's (1997, 43) analysis of the scientific (yet ideologically charged) dispute reveals, proponents of the pluri-areal concept and other critics of (nation-oriented) pluricentricity tend to be also proponents of normative and descriptive approaches to language variation who tend to exclude dialectal forms and spoken language features from their research whereas proponents of the pluricentric concept(s) tend to favor language use oriented, descriptive models and employ sociolinguistic methods.

Excluding nonstandard language features from supposedly variationist linguistic research also provides normative scholars with additional arguments against the existence of national varieties because dictionary-based word lists and corpus studies that are based exclusively on codified language show only very small numbers of distinctive language features. Thus dialectal and spoken language elements are brushed aside, remain unnoticed by linguistic studies and therefore remain uncodified, which is then used once again as a justification to exclude these variants form further linguistic research. From Muhr’s (1995, 103) point of view these normative scholars, who are his critics and opponents in the dispute hide outdated monocentric attitudes behind new confusing terminology, are deliberately inconsistent in the use of existing terminology and use circular argumentation. Whether or not deliberate

misunderstanding and misrepresentation have indeed taken place it can perhaps be said with adequate objectivity that some ideological and professional differences between descriptive and prescriptive scholars are mutual exclusive and irreconcilable.

Constructive suggestions on how multiple layers of internal language variation can be addressed within the concept of pluricentricity have been largely ignored by the proponents of pluri-arealism. Regional language variation can be described by introducing a *Secondary level of pluricentricity*, as Muhr (2000, 29) pointed out. Centers of regional language variation can thus be identified and defined and all of these regional centers and their varieties are positioned within the national variety, which is referred to as the *Primary level of pluricentricity*. For even more detailed distinctions even local centers of language variation could be found within each regional variety, which would introduce a third level of pluricentricity.

4.2 Pluricentricity and language change

Languages, their varieties, the variants within the varieties and the social, cultural and political conditions of the diatopically defined language centers are all subject to change at all times. When Kloss (1978, 66-67) first outlined the concept of pluricentricity he did so from a diachronic rather than a synchronic point of view and also introduced two other new terms of sociolinguistics: *Abstand* and *Ausbau* (ibid.). Both concern language change and the development of pluricentric and potentially pluricentric languages. *Abstand* and *Ausbau* refer to linguistic distance and functional development respectively (Muhr 2012, 24).

A national variety of a pluricentric language must show some linguistic distance from other varieties of the same language ”to be perceived as a variety of its

own" (ibid.). Albeit some scholars, for example Ammon (1995, 4), use the term linguistic distance (or linguistic proximity) only to describe differences and similarities in the structures (syntax, morphosyntax) of languages or varieties (ibid.), the term *Abstand* can also be used to describe differences and similarities on the levels of pragmatics and cultural identity (Muhr 2012, 30). In addition to linguistic distance a national variety of a pluricentric language must also codify its characteristic features (at least to some extent), which means that "the functionality of the variety is expanded to all domains of language use" (Muhr 2012, 24). This functional development (*Ausbau*) can continue until the process ultimately results in the creation of a new specific language (ibid.).

According to Muhr (2012, 29-30) the following criteria must be fulfilled before a language can be considered pluricentric: *Occurrence* (in at least two interacting centers), *Abstand* (linguistic distance on any level), *Status* (official function in at least two nations), A*cceptance* of the pluricentricity of the language by the language community and *Relevance* for identity (which leads to the codification of national norms) Languages or their varieties go through these stages as they gradually become pluricentric or they remain on a certain level of the development (ibid.).

4.3 Symmetrical and asymmetrical pluricentricity

The concept of pluricentrism was never intended to create word lists or compare differences in pronunciation or grammar or be applied to any other purely linguistic question. From its very conception and its early days in the 1980s pluricentricity was developed as a sociolinguistic concept and political and cultural matters, which are always influenced by ideological beliefs and attitudes were clearly of particular importance for the pioneers of the concept:

> The question of pluricentricity concerns the relationship between language and identity on the one hand, and language and power on the other. Almost invariably, pluricentricity is asymmetrical, i.e., the norms of one national variety (or some national varieties) is (are) afforded a higher status, internally and externally, than those of the others. (Clyne 1992, 455).

Clyne returns to his concept of symmetrical and asymmetrical pluricentricity in his later publications and develops it into a substantial set of principles that, as is argued in this thesis, hold water also outside the field of pluricentric studies and can equally be applied to other non-dominant language varieties. Clyne (1995, 21) specifies that the national varieties of more populous and economically more powerful nations enjoy a higher status than the smaller varieties. It should be noted that the asymmetrical power dynamics that Clyne's (ibid.) model describes are not seen as positive role models or fixed laws but rather as unfair, yet real and discernible phenomena (e.g. notions of cultural imperialism), which might be overcome, at least to a certain degree, if language communities revised their attitudes towards language.

Historical factors, such as the origin of the shared language and the occurrence of other languages in the respective nations can also play a role (ibid.). The mutual relationship of national varieties of pluricentric languages ”may be symmetrical but is usually asymmetrical” (ibid.). For example British (English) English and American English constitute varieties of powerful nations and enjoy a higher status than Australian and Canadian English, whereas indigenized varieties of English, such as those in India and Singapore rank even lower. Thus Clyne generally distinguishes between D(ominant) and O(ther) varieties, whose interaction is explained in the following ten principles:

i. The D nations have difficulty in understanding the 'flavor rather than substance' notion[4] of pluricentricity, dismissing national variation as trivial.
ii. The D nations tend to confuse 'national variation' with 'regional variation' on the strength of overlapping linguistic indices without understanding the function, status and symbolic character of the 'national varieties' and their indices.
iii. The D nations generally regard their national variety as the standard and themselves as the custodians of standard norms. They tend to consider national varieties of O nations as deviant, non-standard and exotic, cute, charming and somewhat archaic.
iv. Cultural elites in the O nations tend to defer to norms from the D nation(s). This is related to the fact that the more distinctive forms of national varieties are dialectally and sociolectally marked. It is also the result of conservative and unrealistic norms.
v. Norms are not believed to be as rigid in O nations as in D nations.
vi. Convergence is generally in the direction of D varieties when speakers of different national varieties communicate (e.g. in international work teams, conferences, migration, tourist encounters in third countries).
vii. D nations have better resources than O nations to export their varieties through foreign-language teaching programmes.
viii. D nations also have the better means of codifying the language as the publishers of grammars and dictionaries tend to be located in such countries.
ix. There is a belief, especially in the D nations, that diversity exists only in the spoken norm.
x. In some cases, members of D nations are not even familiar with (or do not understand) O national varieties. (Clyne 1995, 22).

A good example for such a pair of D and O nations and varieties are Germany and Austria. While Germany today simply dominates its smaller neighbour in terms of sheer size of population and economy and therefore exerts socioeconomical as well as cultural influence on Austria, England has certainly played a similar role as a colonial power – especially for Scotland, which, like Austria, plays the role of the smaller geographical neighbour of a great nation.

---

[4] This notion was expressed by Wardhaugh (1986, 31) and refers to the actual difference between national varieties. Seemingly small linguistic differences or distance can still become ”a marker of national identity” (Clyne 1995, 21).

5. Varieties of Scots and English in present day Scotland

This chapter will deal with the occurrence, *Abstand* (see Section 4.2), status, general acceptance and relevance of different varieties of both Scots and English that can be found in Scotland today. Status and general acceptance, i.e. the perception of the different varieties will be examined first because the assumptions that (1.) Scots suffers from relatively low prestige and (2.) Clyne's (1995, 22) principles concerning (D)ominant and (O)ther varieties can also be applied to English (D) and Scots (O) to describe the language situation in Scotland merit examination.

5.1 Perception and status of contemporary Scots and English

The sociolinguistic situation in Scotland is complex because Scots and English, although co-occurring in a diatopically clearly defined area (Scotland), are only partly shared by the language users (the people who live in Scotland) who use different varieties and subvarieties with different degrees of code-switching and with different degrees of symbolic and ideological relevance. The usage of Scots and English as forms of communication cannot be considered neutral but the choice of language or (sub)variety is perceived as conveying different symbolic and ideological status (cf. Craith 2003, 62).

The central underlying question in the context of any discussion of the sociolinguistic situation in Scotland and the communicative, symbolic and ideological status of Scots is the controversy regarding the general status of Scots, i.e. whether Scots should be considered a distinct language, a dialect or a regional or national variety of English (cf. McClure, 1988 and Jones, 2002). Thus the sociolinguistic situation in Scotland includes a sociopolitical and a language political debate and

therefore raises more than linguistic questions: Ideological beliefs and attitudes towards culture influence the issue of Scots (cf. Sandred, 1983 and Trudgill, 2004). It is in this respect, as a cultural and political matter, that parallels between Scots and Austrian German become evident (see Section 4.1.1).

The language situation of Scotland can also be viewed from the point of view of the pluricentricity of English. In this context Leitner (1992, 212) argues that Scottish English used to be an interference-based national variety with "intensive unbroken" (ibid.) contact, which has

> stripped off the greatest number of such features and/or demoted them to informal of non-standard registers, before developing educated varieties. […] But Scottish is also interesting because elements of the defunct Scots standard live on in regionalized, educated and non-standard, speech (Leitner 1992, 212).

Thus Scots remains, to a varying extent, intertwined with English on all levels of speech, which makes a clear distinction between Scottish Standard English and Scots very problematic. The following sections will provide further evidence for this difficulty in defining the basic elements of Scotland's language situation, which is an underlying problem of the Scottish language debate. It also is a typical problem of O(ther) varieties (see section 4.3) of pluricentric languages that the borders between varieties and/or subvarieties are difficult to define and no academic consensus can be reached on such matters.

Avoiding the problems of inter-varietal overlap, Scots can, at least on an abstract and political level, simply be defined as a language. Thus Scots is recognized officially under the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. However, the UK ratified only parts of the charter in 2001 (cf. *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* 1992, 5-10). The more specific parts of the charter (Part III)

(cf. ibid.), which include concrete provisions for application were not ratified. Scots language activists campaign for the full recognition of the charter because it would obligate the government to promote the use of Scots. There are also several associations in Scotland which promote and support Scots, including the Scots Language Resource Center, the Scots Language Society, the Association for Scots Literary Studies and Scottish Language Dictionaries. Language activism within these and other groups includes also projects that aim to improve the level of standardization of contemporary Scots and its autonomy as a language (cf. The Scottish Government 2007).

5.1.1 Scots as an expression of identity

The significance of Scots as a cultural matter is reflected by the literary revival of Scots during the 20th century. Scottish writers have used forms of Scots not only to express themselves but also to express specifically Scottish cultural concerns in their literary texts. For example the Scottish poet Tom Leonard tells his poem *No.3* (of his '*Unrelated Incidents'*) (Leonard, 1984) both in its spoken and in its written form in his own interpretation of a Glaswegian working class voice, which, according to Carruther "operates as critique of colonial power relations within the British Isles" (ibid. 2009, 67). A literary text written in Scots underlines these power relations by expressing otherness. In Millar's (2007a, 15) words, Scots has a function as "a literary language which acts as a national symbol for many people" (ibid.).

However, different attitudes towards language also influence the importance of Scots as a marker of Scottish identity. Scottish cultural concerns in general and feelings of Scottish identity in particular can be expressed in any language; any variety or form on a language continuum ranging from Broad Scots to Scottish

Standard English (English with a Scottish accent) as well as Celtic languages, or even non-native languages such as English English and immigrants' languages can become a channel for specifically Scottish cultural concerns. Empirical research (cf. Nihtinen 2006, 45) suggests a lack of a consensus on the subject matter among the Scottish population. Leitner (1992, 192) states that "the prestige of the educated Scottish accent" (ibid.) has been very influential and popular in Great Britain, abroad and in language education.

Leonard's (1984) original approach to transcribing his idiolectic Scots yields poetry that is permeated with cultural and political concerns from the point of view of the "little man". The poetic voice of Leonard's '*Unrelated Incidents' – No.3* is an angry working class voice, a voice from below, directing its anger at the representatives of higher socioeconomic layers of society and their prestigious standard English. The stigmatized dialectal and sociolectal voice criticizes the dominating English voice of Westminster but it also seems directed at fellow Scotsmen who have accepted or even adopted the language and language attitudes of the English.

Miller (2004, 48) notes the importance of the characteristic structures of (spoken) Scots "in the construction of Scottish identity and the identity of individuals" (ibid.) and regrets that the bearing of these structures on important social issues "is ignored by politicians and many educators" (ibid.). The use of varieties of Scots on the one hand and Scottish Standard English on the other also reflect the socioeconomic structure of the British society. The aforementioned labels of "correct" and "proper" correlate with the educated middle class of society, which, as Stuart Smith (2004, 47) states, are the typical speakers of Scottish Standard English, whereas

Scots "is generally, but not always, spoken by the working classes" (ibid.). Jenkins confirms, on a universal level, defining identity as "the systematic establishment and signification, between individuals, between collectives, and between individuals and collectives, of relationships of similarity and difference" (Jenkins 1996, 4). Despite the lack of a consensus on the matter of Scots as an expression of Scottish identity (cf. Nihtinen 2006, 45), (see above), the use of some forms of Scots and their preference over standard language equivalents can still be considered an essential aspect of identity building and identity expression. As Schneider points out:

> While other means of expressing solidarity and identity boundaries may be costly and sometimes difficult or impossible to archive, choosing in-group specific language forms is a relatively simple and usually achievable goal, and thus a natural choice as a means of identity expression. (Schneider 2003, 239-240).

5.1.2 Scots as non-standard or sub-standard

Lacking formal codification and an accepted standard form, varieties of Scots are often perceived as flawed forms of English rather than forms of a distinct language or language variety. Consequently English (or forms that are closer to Scottish Standard English than Broad Scots) tend to be associated with "correct" and "proper" use of language. As McClure (1988, 19) points out, non-linguistic factors, especially "social attitudes, aesthetic feelings, or simple personal prejudice" (ibid.) play an important role when the status of a variety or a mode of speech is under discussion. According to Millar (2007b) most speakers of Scots are unaware of the problem that Scots has as a controversial entity next to English. Furthermore the problematic position of Scots is worsened by the "lack of a literate adult population and lack of government support and comprehension" (ibid.). It is left to the personal freedom of each language user

and expert scholar to subjectively decide, whether they prefer the label *Broad Scots* or the label *bad English* for the language that shows the greatest distance to *standard* on the bipolar continuum. However, the former label presents more interesting opportunities for contemporary linguists than the latter, which is strictly normative and leaves little room for further study.

Interestingly, rural varieties of Scots seem to enjoy a markedly better reputation than urban varieties. Aitken (1984, 529) finds that rural features of Scots tend to be regarded as “good” and “traditional”, whereas urban features of Scots (especially of the city dialects of Edinburgh and Glasgow) tend to be regarded as “bad” and even “degenerate” by other speakers. Generally there has been a noticeable decline in the sociolinguistic and communicative range of Scots, i.e. formal domains have become clearly dominated by Scottish Standard English and Scots is now often restricted to informal domains (cf. Stuart Smith 2004, 47). Leitner (1992, 204) points out that universal education and other normative measures played an important role in the process that led to the gradual replacement of Scots with forms of Standard English. The grammar and lexis of Standard English and Received Pronunciation “lost their regional (southern) association and became non-regional, social varieties” (ibid.). Thus, according to Leitner, British English “aborted an independent standard in Scotland” (ibid.).

5.2 Possible definitions of contemporary Scots

Based on linguistic criteria, such as lexis, morphology and phonology, the distance between Scots and English appears relatively small, which is a fact that is stressed by some scholars who classify Scots as a variety of the English language (cf. Smith 2000, 159). However, linguistic distance or, to use a more sociolinguistic term, *Abstand* is

not restricted to restricted to the aforementioned traditional areas of grammar (see section 4.2). In addition or alternatively to grammar other criteria, (including extra-linguistic criteria) may be considered relevant enough to classify a variety as a distinct language. There are strong historical, cultural and political reasons that can be seen to speak for a definition of Scots as a distinct language. For example McClure (1988, 3) and Corbett (2007, 1) emphasize these reasons.

Next to the notion of close linguistic proximity another argument against an independent Scots language is the variety's incomplete standardization and the absence of relevant codification in the areas of grammar and orthography (cf. Macafee 1981, 33-37). Existing codification often refers to older forms of Scots. Historically, a process of standardization, which could have led to the development of Scots as a fully independent and official language of Scotland was taking place during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. However, Standard English then became the dominant variety in Scotland and its standards were adopted. Having common roots in Old English and therefore relatively great linguistic similarity, Scots entered a process of becoming "dialectalised" (Millar 2007a, 15). The outcome of this process Millar calls a "socially conditioned dialect" (Millar 2006, 64). Thus Clyne (1992, 3) considers Scots an example of "traditional substratum national varieties" (ibid.).

In the light of the difficult sociolinguistic situation and the difficult historical development of Scots the traditional terms *language* and *dialect* may seem inadequate labels, whereas the neutral term *variety* offers no description of Scots unless it is modified with further labels. Leith dismisses the traditional terms, criticizing their lack of nuances:

> To call Scots a dialect of English is to ignore its development during Scottish independence, and to reduce its status to that of the regional dialects of England, unless we use the term dialect in a more specialised sense, to refer to regional varieties with their own traditions of writing (as we speak of the dialects of English in medieval times). In sum, the terms dialect and language are not fine enough to apply unequivocally to Scots. (Leith 1983, 161).

Since Scots is "not clearly Scottish English but not clearly standard written English either" (Miller 1993, 99-100) a language continuum might be the most promising approach to describe the status of contemporary Scots. A "language continuum ranging from Broad Scots to Scottish Standard English" (Corbett, McClure & Stuart-Smith 2003, 2) was chosen for this thesis because it allows the depiction of gradual changes and code switching between any sociolinguistically defined subvarieties of Scots and Scottish English. In other words, a language (or dialect) continuum model seems to be the most realistic method to analyze controversial and complex language situations, such as the situations of Scotland and Austria.

The adoption of a continuum also addresses the fact that the language situation in Scotland is not an example of diglossia, i.e. speakers do not switch between one clearly defined variety of English for certain communicative purposes and one clearly variety of Scots for other purposes. Instead there are gradual shifts between forms of Scottish Standard English (which could be described as English with a Scottish accent[5]) and different forms of Scots. Scots, as McClure points out, "is not uniform but shows considerable local and social variation, so that it is not one dialect but several" (McClure 1988, 18). According to the Scottish National Dictionary (Grant, 1976) a diatopical division of Scots into four main dialect areas have been established:

---

[5] It should be noted that for some scholars Scottish Standard English has more specific features than just a Scottish accent. For example, Trudgill (1994, 6) lists lexical and grammatical features (which are, in this thesis, regarded close to Broad Scots) as features of Scottish Standard English. These differences in the definition of Scottish Standard English are indicative of the problematic and controversial nature of language standards and language normativity in general.

Northern or Doric Scots, Insular Scots (Orkney and Shetland), Mid or Central Scots (including the urban varieties of Edinburgh and Glasgow) and Southern or Border Scots. It should be pointed out that the various subvarieties of Scots within these dialect areas have also been in contact with different forms of Scottish Gaelic and have consequently been affected by Celtic forms in different ways. However, the diachronic processes that have taken place between varieties of Scots and varieties of Scottish Gaelic lie outside the scope of this thesis, which is only concerned with the relationship between Scots and Standard English.

Stuart Smith (2004, 47) follows the model of a bipolar linguistic continuum to describe "Scottish English" (ibid.), using the term to include Scottish Standard English and also varieties of Scots. According to Stuart Smith gradual "style/dialect-drifting" (ibid.) is typical of the urban varieties of Scots, which are used by the working classes, whereas the practice of rural speakers of Scots is better described as "style-dialect switching" (ibid.) because they "switch discreetly between points on the continuum" (ibid.).

5.3 Linguistic features of Scots

This section will deal with the most important linguistic features of the varieties and subvarieties of Scots that can be located within the bipolar linguistic continuum between Broad Scots and Scottish Standard English (see section 5.2). The focus will therefore shift away from sociolinguistic aspects and towards elements of traditional grammar, especially phonology, morphology and syntax. The purpose of this section is to present an overview over the most relevant ways in which varieties of Scots become manifest and can be distinguished from Scottish Standard English and other varieties.

We've come intil a gey queer time
When scrievin Scots is near a crime,
'There's no one speaks like that', they fleer,
-But wha the deil spoke like King Lear?
(Smith, 1975).

From the end of the 14th century until the Union of the Crowns in 1603, Scots developed, flourished and was in a process of standardisation, not only as a spoken but also as a literary language with formal functions (e.g. at the Scottish Parliament) (cf. Stuart-Smith 2004, 48). As Leitner (1992, 192) points out, the Union of the Crowns of 1603 meant that “the external socio-political and economic base for an independent language centre was removed” (ibid.), and, especially following the Union of Parliaments in 1707, “[t]he national domains were shifted to London and Edinburgh was demoted to a regional centre” (ibid.).

Having lost its status as a literary language for formal domains, Scots, in its written form, has since been restricted to specific literary genres. Individual poets have attempted to create standard forms for Scots, based on their own subjective perceptions and idiolects. Most notably, the Scottish poet Hugh Mac Diarmid developed a standard Scots called *synthetic Scots* for Scottish literature and poetry. His and other attempts to create a written standard for Scots are often referred to as *Lallans* (lowlands), a term that is also used to describe the lowland varieties of Scots and sometimes synonymous with the term *Scots*. However, Mac Diarmid’s synthetic Scots was not generally accepted and derogatively called *plastic Scots* by Mac Diarmid’s opponents during the Scottish Renaissance of the early 20th century (c.f. Crystal 1995, 333). The poem at the beginning of this subsection, called *Epistle to John Guthrie* was written by Sidney Goodsir Smith (Smith, 1975) in 1941 as a reminder to Mac Diarmid’s critics that even William Shakespeare had changed and modified the English language artificially and subjectively.

The lack of a generally accepted norm, the controversial status of Scots as a variety or a language and the ongoing debates have lead contemporary linguists to avoid the question of literary Scots and focus on the morphological and syntactic features of spoken Scots instead. For example Miller's (2004, 47) work on the morphology and syntax of Scottish English "steers clear of the question of literary Scots and focuses on current spoken language in the Central Lowlands" (ibid.). Miller, who also accepts the model of a bipolar linguistic continuum between Broad Scots and Scottish Standard English (see sections 5.2 and 5.3) "focuses on structures towards and at the Broad Scots end of the range" (Miller 2004, 47).

5.3.1 The verbal area

Among the most noticeable morphosyntactic features of Scots are irregular verb forms that differ from Standard English usage, i.e. Scots sometimes uses irregular (strong) verb forms where Standard English uses regular (weak) verb forms and vice versa. For example the past tense forms *seen* (saw) and *sellt* (sold) and the past participles saw (*seen*) and *feart* (frightened) (cf. Miller 2004, 48). Distinctive irregular (strong) verb forms are numerous in Scots. A select few examples of very frequent verb forms must suffice here: *bite*/*bate*/*bitten* (bite, bit, bitten), *clim*/*clam*/*clum* (climb, climbed, climbed), *stick*/*stack*/*stuck* (stick, stuck, stuck), *pit*/*pat*/*pitten* (put, put, put), *speak*/*spak*/*spoken* (speak, spoke, spoken), *sleep*/*sleepit*/*sleepit* (sleep, slept, slept) etc. (cf. Aitken 1992, 896).

Within the verbal area, modal verbs feature the greatest differences between Scots and Standard English. Modal verbs occur in non-standard positions within the sentence structure, for example in infinitive structure, as Miller notes: "You have to can drive a car to get that job" (Miller 2004, 54) or together with other modals in

double modal constructions (see below). The usage of some modal verbs is restricted whereas others are used differently than in Standard English.

The forms *may* (*mey*), *ought to* (*ocht ti*) and *shall* (*sall*) no longer occur in spoken Scots, which favors the modals *can*, *should* (*shoud*) and *will* instead (cf. Aitken 1992, 896 and Miller 2004, 52). According to Miller (ibid.) *can* is used to express permission and *will* is used for the future tense, promises and in interrogatives. In addition to *shou*(*l*)*d, want* is frequently used instead of *ought*. *Get* and *get to* (+ gerund) function as alternative expressions of permission (cf. Miller 2004, 52).

Scots speakers usually do not use modal *must* to express obligations but favor *have to* and *need to* and constructions with *supposed to* and *meant to*. Miller states that "[m]any speakers of Scots (and Scottish English) use *have got to* for external compulsion and *will have to* for milder compulsion, which can even be self-compulsion […]" (Miller 2004, 52). Correspondingly "[*h*]*ave to* is less strong than *have got to*" (ibid.). Constructions with *need to* constitute alternatives to *have to* in the expression of obligation. Constructions with *have* and *must* can be also used to express conclusions (ibid.). Also the negative form of *must*, *mustn't*, expresses conclusion rather than obligation and is often used instead of the Standard English *can't*, for example in "*This mustn't be the place*" (Miller 2004, 53).

Aitken (1992, 896) notes that Scots uses double modal constructions. Frequently co-occurring modals include *will* and *can*, *might* and *can*, *might* and *could* and *would* and *could*. Double modal constructions also occur in negated form, with the negating word positioned between the two modals, for example in "*She'll no can*

come the day”. In Standard English the *will-no-can* construction would be replaced by *won't be able to*.

5.3.2 Pronouns, adverbs and noun inflection

Personal and possessive pronouns differ considerably in appearance. For example the Standard English pronouns *I*, *me*, *myself*, *mine* and *my* have the following counterparts in Scots: *A*, *me*, *masel*, *mines* and *ma* (cf. Grant 1921, 95). An interesting structural difference is the existence and widespread use of a second person plural *yous* (or *youse*, *yous yins*). According to Miller, however, educated speakers avoid the *yous* second person plural (c.f. Miller 2004, 49). Other common Scots pronouns include *thir* (this), *thae* (those), *nocht* (nothing), *baith* (both), *ilk* (each), *ither* (other), *ony*- (any-) and *aw*- (every-). Miller, who classifies them as demonstrative adjectives, notes that *them* is now frequently used instead of *thae* and questions whether *thir* is still used as a plural form of *this* with relevant frequency (c.f. Miller 2004, 49).

Adverbs often appear in the same form as adjectives or verb, i.e. they lack the distinctive *–ly* ending (e.g. drive *slow*) (c.f. Miller 2004, 49). As Aitken (1992, 896) notes, Scots also forms adverbs with *–s* (e.g. *whiles* (at times) and *maistlins* (almost).

Number agreement is an area of grammar that shows interesting differences between Scots and Standard English. According to Miller “[p]lural subject nouns usually combine with *is* and *was*” (Miller 2004, 49). However, he notes that structures like *the lambs is* are avoided by educated speakers, whereas “existential constructions” (ibid.) like *there's no bottles* are more acceptable (ibid.).

Nouns of measure or quantity often remain unchanged in the plural and forms like *twa mile* (two miles), *twa pund* (two pounds) appear frequently in spoken Scots (cf. Aitken 1992, 896).

5.3.3 Negation and quantifiers

Scots features several characteristic elements of negation: Perhaps most noticeable is the elective use of *no* and *not,* for example in *she's no leaving* / *she's not leaving* (Miller 2004, 50). In addition to these independent words of negation Scots also has the suffix *–nae* as an alternative for *–n't*, for example in *she isnae leaving* / *she isn't leaving* (ibid.). According to Aitken (1992, 896) *nae* is used in the North East of Scotland, whereas Miller (2004, 50) points out that *nae* occurs with modal verbs and the structure *to do*. No and not occur most frequently with the verb be, in negative interrogative structures and in tag questions. (cf. Miller 2004, 50-51).

There are also differences between Scots and Standard English in the co-occurrence of quantifiers (*all*, *each*, *every*) and negations and in the non-emphatic and emphatic use of certain negatives. *Never*, for example, occurs as a non-emphatic generic pro-verb (*it never = it didn't*). *So* (especially with *I am*, *I will* and *I can*) is used to emphasise disagreement and *nane* (none) emphasises the lack of something, for example "Rab can sing nane" (Miller 2004, 51) means that "[…] Rab is completely useless at singing" (ibid.).

5.3.4 Phonological features

Phonological features typically represent the most obvious and most striking differences between different varieties and subvarieties. Speakers from other varieties of English and most advanced learners of English are able to identify speakers from

Scotland because their speech exhibits recognizable phonological features and intonation patterns. “Speaking with a Scottish accent” is considered by many scholars to be a sufficiently strong and clear marker on its own and is often used to distinguish between Standard Scottish English and Standard English (or English English) (see sections 5.1 and 5.2). It is this Scottish accent, therefore, which is shared by most speakers in Scotland, although the phonological features become more marked and numerous towards the Broad Scots-end of the linguistic continuum. Different subvarieties of Scots also show regional differences, for example in the vowel system (cf. Stuart-Smith 2004, 53). The same principles apply to the relationship between German German and Austrian Standard German and to the linguistic continuum that exists between Austrian Standard German and dialectal Austrian varieties.

The Scottish Vowel Length Rule (SVLR, Aitken’s Law) describes how the length of most vowels in Scots and Scottish Standard English is conditioned by the vowel’s phonetic environment. Thus all vowels, with the exception of the KIT and STRUT vowels[6], are phonetically long before /r/, voiced fricatives and morpheme boundaries (cf. Aitken 1984, 94-98). For example the vowel in *breathe* is longer than the vowel in *brief* (cf. Stuart-Smith 2004, 57).

Aside from the SVLR short vowels tend to be longer and long vowels tend to be shorter than in English Standard English, in other words quantity makes usually no phonemic distinction (for example the realization of *pool* and *pull* as homophones) Due to rhoticity there are generally no centering diphthongs in Scots and most

[6] KIT and STRUT refer to the lexical sets developed by Wells (1982). In some subvarieties of Scots also other vowels may be unaffected by the SVLR.

diphthongs of English Standard English tend to be realized as monophthongs in Scots and in Scottish Standard English (c.f. Aitken, 1992).

A detailed discussion of all the phonemes of Scots is not possible within the scope of this thesis because a comparison of vowel qualities between English Standard English vowels and the vowels we find in Scotland lead deep into the realm of phonetics. However, the most important consonant features of Scots must be included to allow a general overview.

Scots uses a /*x*/ (*ch*) sound, for example in the words *loch* (lake), *nicht* (night) and *dochter* (daughter), which is comparable to the German /*x*/ in words like Nacht (night) or Tochter (daughter) (cf. Johnston 1997, 499).

Speakers in Scotland are generally considered rhotic (Wells 1982, 10-11) throughout the linguistic continuum and there is no regular /h/-dropping (Wells 1982, 412). According to Stuart-Smith (2004, 63) the phonetic realization of /r/ includes approximants, post-alveolar and alveolar taps and retroflex, whereas trills are not commonly used. Stops tend to be less aspirated than in the South of Britain (Wells 1982, 409) and /*t*/ is often realized as a glottal stop between vowels (Johnston 1997, 501), which, as Stuart-Smith notes, "is a stereotype of Glasgow speech and Urban Scots" (Stuart-Smith 2004, 60).

The general sound of Scots and Scottish Standard English, however, which consists of suprasegmentals, the rhythm, intonation patterns and small differences in vowel sounds, defy description (at least on the relatively rudimentary level of phonetics that is applied here) even though it is easily recognizable to most nonexperts of linguistics.

6. Discussion

A variational-pragmatic comparison of Scots and Austrian German shows clear parallels between the linguistic and extra-linguistic situations of the two respective varieties. Linguistically both varieties can be described in terms of bipolar language continua, which is the approach that is favored in this thesis as the most meaningful way to analyze Scots and Austrian German respectively. In both cases there is a national variety with a long and complex history and various intertwined dialectal, regiolectal and sociolectal sub-varieties on one end of the continuum, opposed by a standard variety on the other end. Code switching and drifting along the continuum depending on social background, situational factors and personal preferences, is typical. Language use can only be adequately analyzed within the framework of a multidimensional model of language variation and change, identifying the complex interwoven combinations of spatial, social and situational factors and also change (see section 3.2). (Broad) Scots and Austrian German are smaller varieties than Standard English and Standard German. Standard Scottish English and Standard Austrian German are not clearly defined but resemble the respective general standard variety in all respects except for accent and a few lexical and (in some definitions) common grammatical issues. Neither Scots nor Austrian German are fully standardized nor fully codified and both lean heavily on oral tradition and usage. Scots and Austrian German literary works are often orthographically experimental and are not widely recognized as true alternatives to the accepted standard language variety for literature and its standard orthography.

Scots and Austrian German are both controversial entities domestically and abroad. Their respective status is debated in terms of culture, cultural and national

identity and language, which adds strong ideological and political elements to the discussion. Most importantly, reasons for disagreements can be found in general language attitudes, the vagueness of the concepts *language* and *dialect*, lack of knowledge about other language varieties and lack of language awareness, which corresponds with Clyne's (1995, 22) concept of (D)ominant and (O)ther varieties (see section 4.3).

Scots and Austrian German, despite their obvious linguistic and political differences, can both be considered O varieties, which coexist and interact with a far more powerful D variety, with convergence in the direction of the D variety (see Clyne 1995, 22, point xi). If Scots is regarded a national variety or a potential national variety of Scotland, it can be argued that all ten points Clyne (ibid.) stated about the relationship between O and D varieties apply to the relationship between Scots and English. However, the matter is complicated by unclear and inconclusive definition of Standard Scottish English, which, if regarded English with a Scottish accent, could be seen as an additional D variety that stands on opposition to Scots. In other words, Scots is then an O variety not only next to English English (or Standard British English, RP) but also to the relatively prestigious Standard Scottish English (Standard British English with a Scottish accent). If Scottish Standard English is defined, however, to include also certain typical lexical and syntactical elements of Scots, it follows that Scottish Standard English occupies a wider, only vaguely defined section of the bipolar continuum's standard end. In the latter case Scottish Standard English is inseparable from Scots and the entire continuum must be seen in opposition to the English of England and RP.

Clarity could be improved by the Scottish authorities by creating an official, endonormative dictionary of Scottish Standard English (similar to the official Austrian Dictionary), which would allow at least a rudimentary definition of Scottish Standard English as the formally codified parts of the variety that differ from the usual norms of British English. Full political independence would have made this step more likely and would have led to even more similarities between the situations of Scotland and Scots / Scottish Standard English and Austria and Austrian German. Although full political independence would have allowed the Scottish authorities to change the political status of Scots, the language reality of Scots (and its subvarieties) as O varieties would have remained the same and possible long term effects of altered post-independence language politics would have been difficult to predict.

Leitner's (1992, 194) assessment, according to which Scotland lacks a "fully established standard variet[y]" (ibid.) and "probably will remain in close contact with the normative centre in (southern) England" (ibid.) seems to have lost none of its accuracy in 2014.

7. Conclusion

If Scots is to be regarded a fully independent national language, it follows that Scots lies outside of the pluricentric model of World Englishes or any other pluricentric model that recognizes separate and independent national varieties of English. In this case Scots would require extensive measures of standardization and codification, which, in turn, require adequate political independence and substantial language planning to allow the development (*Ausbau*) of Scots. This could be seen as the continuation of the historical process of the standardization of Scots that was stopped by the overwhelming influence of England and its (standard) language. However,

considering the language reality of Scotland today such a course of language separatism seems unlikely and unrealistic because of the prominent role of (Scottish) Standard English in Scottish society. Further codification and further political and cultural recognition of Scots, however, are possible also without guided *Ausbau* and within the current socio-political reality.

If, on the other hand, Scots is to be regarded a national variety within the general framework of the English language, it follows that Scots constitutes an O variety (a non-dominant variety) in the sense of Clyne's model of asymmetrical pluricentricity. Its (D)ominant partner variety is the variety of English in England. This model is plausible if:

(1) Scots is defined as umbrella term for all dialectal, regiolectal and sociolectal subvarieties and variants that can be located on a bipolar linguistic continuum between Standard English with a Scottish accent on the one end and the most non-standard Broad Scots on the other end;
(2) the definition of Scottish Standard English is not restricted to accent but allows further distinctive features of Scots, or, at the least, Scottish accent is regarded as a distinctive linguistic feature;
(3) the entire Scottish linguistic continuum with all its internal variety is subsumed under the concept Scottish English and perceived as a national variety of English, for example as part of the concept of World Englishes.

Within this integrative system it is possible to analyze and define subvarieties of Scottish English in all dimensions of language variation. Muhr's model of secondary

levels of pluricentricity (see section 4.1.2) can be drawn upon to categorize multiple levels of subvarieties, especially diatopically. The questions of standardization and normativity and to what extent they are necessary or to be desired, remains with the language users and their political representatives, as do all other language political questions.

Regardless of the model of definition and conceptualization one wishes to choose, the language reality in Scotland remains the same: an interwoven and highly complex pattern of interacting subvarieties on all levels of language variation, historically rooted in English and Scots, which, in turn, are both rooted in Old English.

So long as the Scottish language reality reflects elements of national and cultural identity, Clyne's concept of asymmetrical pluricentricity can be applied to describe the sociolinguistic relationships between the Scottish and the English and, possibly, between the speakers of a form of Broad Scots and speakers of Scottish Standard English. In this respect parallels between Scotland and Austria are evident as speakers in both countries are confronted with a language reality that simultaneously romanticizes and stigmatizes its most native language forms. This troubled and often confused and confusing set of attitudes is complicated further by idealized and often outdated concepts about standard, non-standard and substandard, which are reflected by uneven level of codification as compared to the respective D(ominant) variety, which is often regarded as superior.

Drawing on the methodology and the experience of international pluricentricity studies could provide a fruitful ground for future empirical studies of the language situation in Scotland, especially in the area of variational pragmatics.

Clyne's model of asymmetrical pluricentricity stresses the significance of power dynamics, status and identity and transcends the boundaries of its original conceptualization.

Bibliography

Aitken,A.J. 1981. "The Good Old Scots Tongue: does Scots have an identity?" In: Haugen, Einar; McClure, Derrick J., Thomson, Derick (eds.). *Minority languages today*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 73-88.

Aitken, A.J. 1984. 'Scottish Accents and Dialects'. In: Trudgill, Peter (ed.). *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 94-98.

Aitken, A.J. 1992. 'Scottish English'. In: McArthur, Tom (ed.). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford University Press.

Ammon, Ulrich. 1995. *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz. Das Problem der nationalen Varietäten.* Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Chambers, James K. & Trudgill, Peter. 1980. *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, Michael. 1992. *Pluricentric languages. Differing norms in different nations*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Clyne, Michael. 1995. *The German Language in a changing Europe.* Cambridge University Press.

Corbett, John; McClure, J. Derrick; Stuart-Smith, Jane. 2003. *The Edinburgh companion to Scots.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Corbett, John. "Your voice. Scots today". BBC Voices project. Available from http://www.bbc.co.uk/voices/multilingual/scots.shtml#A. [Accessed 11 December 2014, last updated in March 2007].

Corbett, John & Jane Stuart-Smith. 2012. Standard English in Scotland. In Raymond Hickey (ed.) *Standards of English. Codified Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: CUP. 72-95.

Craith, Nic M. 2003. "Facilitating or generating linguistic diversity. The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages". In: Hogan-Brun, Gabrielle and Wolff, Stefan (eds.). *Minority Languages in Europe. Frameworks, status, prospects*. Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan, 56-73.

Crystal, David. 1995. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambride: Cambridge University Press.

Dittmar, Norbert. 1997. *Grundlagen der Soziolinguistik – Ein Arbeitsbuch mit Aufgaben.* Max Niemeyer Verlag,Tübingen.

European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and Explanatory Report. 1992. *Convention opened for signature on 5 November 1992*. (European Treaty Series No. 148). Council of Europe Publishing.

Grant, William and Dixon, James Main. 1921. *Manual of Modern Scots*. Cambridge, University Press.

Grant, William. 1976. *The Scottish National Dictionary. Designed Partly on Regional Lines and Partly on Historical Principles, and Containing All the Scottish Words Known to Be in Use or to Have Been in Use Since c. 1700.* Scottish National Dictionary Association.

Hudson, Richard. 2001. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, Richard. 1996. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.

Jones, Charles. 2002. *The English Language in Scotland: An introduction to Scots*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press.

Johnston, Paul. 1997. 'Regional Variation' In: Jones, Charles (ed.) *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kloss, Heinz. 1978. *Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800*. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.

König, Werner. 2001. *Deutsche Sprache. dtv Atlas.* Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, München.

Leith, Dick. 1983. *A social history of English*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Leitner, Gerhard. 1992. "English as a pluricentric language". In: Clyne, Michael (ed.). *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations*. Mouton De Gruyter.

Leonard, Tom. 1984. "Unrelated Incidents – No.3". *Intimate Voices*. Galloping Dog Press.

Macafee, Caroline. 1981. "Nationalism and the Scots Renaissance now". *English World-Wide 2*, 29-38.

Mather J.Y. and Speitel, H.H. (eds.) 1975. *The Linguistic Atlas of Scotland*. Croom Helm ltd.

McClure, Derrick J. 1988. *Why Scots Matters*. Edinburgh: Saltire Publications.

Millar, Robert McColl. 2006. "'Burying alive'. Unfocused governmental language policy and Scots". *Language Policy 5*, 63-86.

Millar, Robert McColl. 2007a. *Dialects of English. Northern and Insular Scots*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Millar, Robert McColl. 2007b. “Linguistic Democracy?” *7th Language and Politics Symposium on Sustaining Minority Language Communities*. Belfast: Queens University. November 2007.

Miller, Jim. “The Grammar of Scottish English”. In: Milroy, James & Milroy, Lesley (eds.) *Real English. The grammar of English dialects in the British Isles*. London: Longman. 99-138.

Miller, Jim. 2004. Scottish English: Morphology and Syntax. In: Bernd Kortmann & Clive Upton (eds.) *Varieties of English. Vol. 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 47-72.

Milroy, James & Milroy, Lesley. 1985. *Authority in Language. Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation*. Routledge.

Muhr, Rudolf. 1995. “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich und zum Begriff ‚Standardsprache‘ in plurizentrischen Sprachen. Sprache und Identität in Österreich”. In: Muhr, Rudolf / Schrodt, Richard / Wiesinger, Peter (eds.) 1995, 75-109.

Muhr, Rudolf&Schrodt, Richard (eds.). 1997. “Zur Terminologie und Methode der Beschreibung plurizentrischer Sprachen und deren Varietäten am Beispiel des Deutschen.“ 40-66.

Muhr, Rudolf. 2000. *Österreichisches Sprachdiplom Deutsch. Lernzielkataloge zu Basisformulierungen, Lexik, Sprechhandlungen, Höflichkeitskonventionen, Diskurs und Diskursstrukturen, Deutsch als plurizentrische Sprache.* Wien, öbv&hpt.

Muhr, Rudolf (ed.). 2012. *Non-dominant varieties of pluricentric languages. Getting the picture.* Peter Lang GmbH Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, Frankfurt am Main.

Nihtinen, Atina. 2006. ”Towards a more complex language identity? An investigation of opinions on Scots in a sample of policy makers and others”. *Studia Celtica Fennica (SCF) 3*, 34-56.

Pohl, Heinz Dieter. 1997. “Gedanken zum Österreichischen Deutsch (als Teil der‚pluriarealen‘ deutschen Sprache”. In: Muhr, Rudolf &Schrodt, Richard (eds.) 1997, 67-88.

Sandred, Karl Inge. 1983. *Good or Bad Scots? Attitudes to Optional Lexical and Grammatical Usages in Edinburgh*. Ubsaliensis S. Academiae.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2003. „The Dynamics of New Englishes: From Identity Construction to Dialect Birth“. Language 79, 233-281. Linguistic Society of America.

Schneider, Klaus P. and Barron, Anne (eds.). 2008. *Variational pragmatics : a focus on regional varieties in pluricentric languages*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Schrodt, Richard. 1997. “Nationale Varianten, areale Unterschiede und der ‚Substandard‘: An den Quellen des Österreichischen Deutsch”. In: Muhr, Rudolf &Schrodt, Richard (eds.) 1997, 12-40.

Smith, Sidney Goodsir. 1975. *Collected Poems 1941-1975*. London: John Calder.

Smith, Jeremy. 2000. “Scots”. In: Price, Glanville (ed.). *Languages in Britain & Ireland*. Oxford: Blackwell. 159-169.

Stuart-Smith, Jane. 2004. Scottish English: Phonology. In: Bernd Kortmann & Clive Upton (eds.) *Varieties of English. Vol. 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 48-70.

The Scottish Government. 2007. A strategy for Scotland’s languages: draft version for consultation. http://www.scotland.gov.uk/publications/2007/01/24130746/9. (Accessed 11 December 2014).

Trudgill, Peter. 1994. *Dialects*. London: Routledge.

Trudgill, Peter. 2004. “Glocalisation and the ausbau socioloinguistics of modern Europe”. In: Duszak, Anna and Okulska, Ursula (eds.). *Speaking from the margin: global English from a European perspective*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 35-49.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1986. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wells, J.C. 1982. *Accents of English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wiesinger, Peter. 1995. “Das österreichische Deutsch in der Diskussion”. In: Muhr, Rudolf / Schrodt, Richard / Wiesinger, Peter (eds.) 1995, 59-74.