Kirsten Lee Morreira, BA Hons
Supervised by Prof. Rajend Mesthrie

Black South African English in relation to other second-language Englishes of Africa.

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of Cape Town, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Linguistics Section of the Department of English Language and Literature.

17 April 2005

University of Cape Town

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

University of Cape Town

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the following:

Professor Rajend Mesthrie, for his support and guidance, and his invaluable assistance and supervision.

The Volkswagen Foundation, through Dr. Christiane Meierkord of the University of Erfurt, for financial assistance.

The University of Cape Town's Postgraduate Funding Office, Research Associateship Committee, and the Linguistics Section of the Department of English Language and Literature, for financial assistance.

I hereby declare that this is my own work in conception and execution. Any opinions expressed or conclusions reached are my own, unless otherwise indicated, and are not necessarily those of the Linguistics Section of the Department of English Language and Literature.

17 April 2005

Abstract

The existence of distinctive varieties of second language English in Africa has, by now, been long recognized. Such L2 Englishes are known to arise in situations where the socioeconomic value of English is high, but where restricted access to native-speaker varieties of the language results in the establishment and, eventually, the generational transmission of a new second-language variety. These 'New Englishes' have been found to possess certain structural similarities across geographical boundaries, while still retaining distinctively local features. The New Englishes of Africa, in particular, have been observed by several authors to be sufficiently similar to warrant the possible use of 'African English' as a generalized cover term for the group. Nevertheless, the continued study of L2 English varieties in separate geographical and political areas within Africa is an indication of the existence of distinctive, if in many ways similar, local varieties.

The object of this dissertation is a systematic comparison of the syntactic structure of varieties of sub-Saharan L2 English, taking as a basis Black South African English as a point of comparison. The syntactic structures of these varieties are examined in order to determine the nature and extent of the structural similarities between them, as well as the degrees of difference that occur. It is widely acknowledged that of those sets of features of the New Englishes which differ from Standard English, syntactic variation forms the smallest part. Nevertheless, such variation does exist, both in differences between the New Englishes and the standard(s), and between the New Englishes themselves.

The syntactic features of Black South African English are discussed and compared with those of other African Englishes, in order to develop a means of describing such language varieties in relation to one another, and of assessing the extent to which certain of their syntactic features can be recognized as pan-African. A more detailed analysis of the structure of the relative clause in the varieties is given, drawing on theories regarding the origin of certain New English features, as a means of explaining the non-standard occurrence of resumptive pronouns within the relative clause. Finally, the need for corpus-based research into African Englishes is stressed, as a means of determining the frequency of occurrence of those features identified as typical of the varieties.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

1. Introduction p1
    1.1. New Englishes p2
        1.1.1 Syntactic features of the New Englishes p6

2. The New Englishes in Africa p21
    2.1. African English p21
    2.2. The history of English in Africa p26
    2.3. BSAE p31
        2.3.1. BSAE as a New English p34

3. Feature comparison of the New Englishes of sub-Saharan Africa p36
    3.1 Structural characteristics of BSAE p36
    3.2. Summarised features of BSAE p55
    3.3. BSAE features compared to other African Englishes p56
        Table 1 p72

4. A comparison of relative clause constructions in African Englishes p80
    4.1. The relative clause in standard English p80
    4.2. Relativisation in African Englishes p87
        Table 2 p94

5. Conclusions, limitations and suggestions for further research directions p98

References and Bibliography p104

1. Introduction

The existence of distinctive varieties of second language (L2) English in Africa has, by now, been long recognized and the varieties commented upon many times (see, for example, Platt et al, 1984; Kachru, 1982; Görlach, 1991; Bokamba, 1982). Such L2 Englishes are known to arise in situations where the socioeconomic value of English is high, but where restricted access to native-speaker varieties of the language results in the establishment and, eventually, the generational transmission of a new second-language variety. As will be discussed in section 1.1 below, these 'New Englishes' have been found to possess certain structural similarities across geographical boundaries, while still retaining distinctively local features. The New Englishes of Africa, in particular, have been observed by several authors (see e.g. Bokamba, 1982; Hancock and Angogo, 1982; Schmied, 1991) to be sufficiently similar to warrant the possible use of 'African English' as a generalized cover term for the group. Nevertheless, the continued study of L2 English varieties in separate geographical and political areas within Africa is an indication of the existence of distinctive, if in many ways similar, local varieties.

The object of this dissertation is a systematic comparison of these varieties of sub-Saharan L2 English, taking as a basis Black South African English (henceforth BSAE) as a point of comparison. Leaving aside similarities and differences in phonetics, phonology and semantics, the syntactic structures of these varieties are examined in order to determine the nature and extent of the structural similarities between them, as well as the degrees of difference that occur. It is widely acknowledged that of those sets of features of the New Englishes which differ from Standard English, syntactic variation forms the smallest part (Jenkins, 2003). Nevertheless, such variation does exist, both in differences between the New Englishes and the standard(s), and between the New Englishes themselves. In particular, the syntactic features of BSAE described by Mesthrie (2003a), and his theory regarding their import, will be discussed and compared with those of other African Englishes; and finally, a detailed analysis of a particular syntactic construction will be given.

It is first however necessary to examine the theory of New Englishes and their formation, before turning to general similarities among African Englishes from a comparison of the literature describing these varieties.

1.1. New Englishes

The origins of the study of variation within the English language, and of new varieties of English that have arisen, is dated by Görlach (1991:11) to around 1965, when "a descriptive phase of data collection" on these new varieties began. The second phase of this interest in new varieties of English, he suggests, began in the early 1980s, with the publication of a large number of books, monographs and collections of essays on the subject. These publications established and defined the term "New English" in relation to (usually) second-language varieties of English, and outlined similarities between the varieties; as well as suggesting possible reasons for these similarities.

Platt, Weber and Ho (1984), in characterising and defining the New Englishes, link their development with that of 'New Nations' – ex-British colonies which, after their independence, retained English (in some form) as the language of education and government. The broad reasons for this choice are given as political and socio-economic in nature: British colonisation had already established English as the language of the elite and powerful within these territories; the uses of English as a language of international communication, and therefore of diplomacy and business, was recognised; and the use of English as the major language of publication and discussion in matters of science and technology made it an attractive choice for a medium of education. Moreover, multilingualism in many of these 'new nations' meant that English seemed the most politically 'neutral' option, since the choice of the native language of any one group within the country would result in both advantages for that group and disadvantages for – and consequent resentment from – all other groups. English, by contrast, was not spoken as a native language except by very small minorities.

However, the very absence of a sizeable population of native speakers of English in these countries meant, in most cases, that the teaching of English in schools was (and still is) accomplished by teachers who were themselves L2 speakers. This point gives rise to the first of Platt et al's criteria for categorising a variety as a New English:

1) "It has developed through the education system. This means that it has been taught as a subject and, in many cases, also used as a medium of instruction in regions where languages other than English were the main languages." (Platt et al, 1984:2)

The development of distinctive *New* Englishes through the education system in this way is therefore dependent on the existence of teachers whose English is itself a second-language variety. During the early days of British colonisation, English was taught by native speakers in schools to a limited portion of the population, out of a need for "locally recruited clerks and employees"; and was also spread by the existence of (usually English-medium) Christian mission schools (Platt et al: 3). However, due to increased school enrolment and the subsequent establishment of more schools, it soon became necessary to recruit teachers who were not native speakers of English, whether these were people from older-established colonies or, later, ex-students who had passed through the local schools. In this way, any non-standardisms that had arisen in the L2 speech of these teachers were passed on, though not deliberately, as educated standard English.

Platt et al's second criterion (p2) of a genuine New English is closely tied to the first:

2) "It has developed in an area where a native variety of English was *not* the language spoken by most of the population."

This point establishes the original L2 nature of a New English, and also reinforces the first criterion by increasing the likelihood that the transmission of the New English will be from L2 speaker to L2 speaker. Thus, regardless of possible later changes in the status of English in these territories, the New English – in order to qualify as such – must be learnt and used as a second (or third, fourth, fifth etc.) language.

The third and fourth criteria relate not to the original development of the New English, but to its current status:

3) "It is used for a wide range of functions *among* those who speak or write it in the region where it is used ... It may be used as a lingua franca, a general language of communication, among those speaking different languages or, in some cases, even among those who speak the same native language but use English because it is felt to be more appropriate for certain purposes.

4) It has become 'localized' or 'nativized' by adopting some language features of its own, such as sounds, intonation patterns, sentence structures, words, expressions. Usually it has also developed some different rules for using language in communication."
(ibid, pp 2-3)

As Platt et al note, the degree to which these criteria are reflected in various countries and regions of countries varies widely; however, they are generally applicable. They can also be used, therefore, to determine when a particular variety of English cannot be considered a New English. Platt et al refer to native varieties of English in territories such as Australia, Canada and South Africa as 'new*er* Englishes', that is, extraterritorial varieties, rather than actual New Englishes. Thus, taking White South African English as an example, it is eliminated by the first criterion, because it has been continuously transmitted as a first language from the time of the arrival of British immigrants to the area. It did not, therefore, arise out of the education system. Thus, because there are clearly discernible differences between White South African English and the British English varieties which were originally spoken by the immigrants, it is undoubtedly a new extraterritorial variety of English; however, it cannot qualify as a New English.

While it would initially appear to be easier to eliminate such varieties as New Englishes by including a criterion (5), that the variety must be spoken as a second language, this is not in fact a reliable criterion. Although all New Englishes must have arisen as a result of their being learnt and used as a second language, this is no longer the case for some of the varieties. In some countries, such as Singapore, Platt et al note that a minority of the speakers of Singapore English (a New English) now speak it as a first language. Its origins, however, allow it to be firmly categorised as a New English in spite of this development.

Having listed these criteria for the identification of New Englishes, Platt et al go on to describe the three types of situation in which New Englishes arise, within the confines of the criteria. These situation-types are differentiated by the linguistic background against which the New English is used:

1) Type 1: the local languages in the region have no relation to English at all; the pupils learning English are therefore learning (and often learning *in*, as medium of instruction) a totally unfamiliar language.
2) Type 2: the pupils are already familiar with an English-based pidgin spoken in the region. However, the semantic and grammatical differences between the pidgin and any variety of English are great, forming separate language systems, and they cannot be said to know any English.
3) Type 3: the pupils are speakers of an English-based Creole. Again, however, this does not equate to knowing English.

As will be discussed below, these situation types have some relevance in categorising African Englishes, particularly with reference to the West- versus South- and East-African English distinction.

Platt et al's scheme for identifying and categorising New Englishes, although developed some twenty years ago, is still widely accepted. Jenkins (2003) refers to – and reproduces – the scheme, and further elaborates the distinction between New Englishes and what Platt et al called 'newer Englishes'. Jenkins herself refers to this distinction as being between "New Englishes and new Englishes" (p22). She describes 'new Englishes' as those in North America, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, which "developed independently of, and differently from, English in Britain", but which because of their "direct descendence from British English", and the "strong element of continuity in the use of these Englishes from pre-colonial days", qualify as new, but not New, Englishes (p22).

This distinction is particularly relevant to South Africa. As will be further discussed below, the frequent references in the literature to South Africa as an L1, 'new' but not 'New' English territory, do not take into account the presence of an L2, 'nativised' variety spoken by the indigenous populations. South Africa is, perhaps, unique in this sense; while this issue will not be taken up here, it is important to note that 'new', or extraterritorial (L1) English in South Africa applies to White South African English; while 'New English' applies to BSAE (see also Hickey, 2004: 509).

The identification of New Englishes is therefore fairly clear-cut, according to this scheme, as are theories of the origins of these varieties. It is now possible to turn to

general grammatical/syntactic similarities that have been claimed to occur in the majority of the New Englishes, before progressing to a more specific discussion of New Englishes in Africa.

1.1.1 Syntactic features of the New Englishes

Platt et al (1984), in describing these grammatical features, sum up the use of nouns and noun phrases, which they call references to "things, ideas or people" (p46), as certain "tendencies" within the New Englishes as a whole:

1) a tendency not to mark nouns for plural;
2) a tendency to use a specific/non specific system for nouns rather than a definite/indefinite system, or to use the two systems side by side ;
3) a tendency to change the form of quantifiers;
4) a tendency not to make a distinction between the third person pronouns *he* and *she*;
5) a tendency to change the word order within the noun phrase.

(Platt et al, 1984:65)

The use of the term 'tendency' expresses the fact that these usages are neither universal across the New Englishes, nor invariant within any particular variety. There is in fact considerable variation even within the English of a single speaker; and research has indicated that such variation can often be correlated with societal and educational factors.

Platt et al give numerous examples of the above tendencies in action, as well as fuller explanations of their functioning. The first of these tendencies, the lack of plural marking, is exemplified by the following (among others):

1. *They know all four dialect* (Jamaica)
2. *Up to twelve year of schooling* (India)
3. *Port Moresby University is for academic subject* (Papua New Guinea)

One possible explanation for this tendency can be found in the substrate languages of the speakers in various countries. Platt et al show that in many languages, plurality is unmarked when it can be extracted from the context; for example, when the noun is preceded by a number - as in examples 1 and 2. Transfer from native languages is therefore a possibility. Another explanation may lie in the substrate language

phonology. Platt et al claim that in many of the substrate/'background' languages of the speakers of New Englishes, word-final consonant clusters do not occur. Thus, in simplifying such consonant clusters in English, the plural marker may be lost. This explanation can be applied to examples 1 and 3 above. Further support for this explanation can be found from evidence that, when the English plural is shown by means other than suffixation, "some speakers of New Englishes are more inclined to use the plural form" (p48):

4. *Come and wash your feet and hand* (Malaysia)

Platt et al also cite studies from Singapore which have shown that the proportion of plural marking in Singapore English correlates directly with the level of education of the speaker. For speakers who have completed only primary school education, the degree of plural marking is 29%; but those with tertiary education mark the plural 91% of the time. This suggests that increased exposure to 'educated', closer-to-standard English, affects at least this aspect of a particular New English grammar.

The issue of plurality is further complicated by the use of what are, in standard English, noun-count nouns, as countable nouns:

5. *All our rices we have to import* (Hong Kong)
6. *I lost all my furnitures and valuable properties* (Nigeria)

Other terms which are used in this way include *damages, equipments, fruits, machineries, staffs* and *works*. This feature does not appear to be affected by the education level of the speaker; Platt et al note that several of their examples are taken from the utterances of educated speakers.

Platt et al discard the possibility that this is a simple case of overgeneralisation of the plural marking rule, which seems reasonable considering that plural marking appears to be variable in many of the New Englishes. Their explanation, rather, is that the above examples (and many more) are evidence of a reclassification of the nouns concerned. Possible reasons for this reclassification are given as, firstly, that some non-count nouns do occur in the plural in limited contexts within standard English, and that this may suggest to L2-speakers that they are countable. Secondly, it appears that the meaning of a non-count noun such as 'furniture' may have been reanalysed as referring to separate items: a table is *a furniture*, as is a chair, and so the loss of a

collection of these items is a loss of *furnitures*. Further evidence for this is found in the actual use of some of these nouns in the singular in reference to a single entity:

7. *A staff came up to help us* (Singapore)

A third possible explanation given by Platt et al stems from the fact that some such non-count nouns are closely related to cognate countable nouns; for example *machinery/machines*. The items included in the non-count cover term, then, are seen as semantically countable. Similarly, a non-count noun such as *fruit* covers a number of discrete and countable items. Using such terms as countables, then, makes more semantic sense than, for example, pluralising terms such as *gold*, *mud* or *petrol*, which are genuinely uncountable. Some support for this analysis, that 'non-count' nouns may be used as countable only if they refer to distinct, countable entities, is found in the fact that the above genuinely non-countable terms are very seldom pluralised in, for example, Ghanaian English (Sey, 1973 – in Platt et al).

The reclassification argument, then, particularly in the light of findings about the frequent lack of plural marking in the New Englishes, seems a convincing one; and Platt et al's suggestions as to its origins are plausible.

The second 'tendency' with regard to noun phrases in the New Englishes – that towards using a specific versus non-specific distinction for nouns, rather than a definite-indefinite one – can be explained, as with the loss of plural marking, by reference to substrate languages. Drawing implicitly on the ideas of Bickerton (1975), Platt et al suggest that the use or disuse of English articles *a* and *the* in the New Englishes, rather than being seen simply as learners' errors, is the result of transfer from the system used in many of the substrate languages, into English. The definite/indefinite system divides entities and applies the appropriate article, according to whether it is believed to be known (definite *the*) or unknown (indefinite *a(n)*) to the listener. The specific/non-specific system, which Platt et al see as functioning in the New Englishes, initially appears to be more complicated. Here, a three-way distinction is made between referents that are specific and known to the listener (*the*); specific but unknown to the listener (*a* or in some cases, *one*); and non-specific and not known to the listener, not relevant to the issue at hand, or which represent a group, type or species (zero article).

The above may be clarified by examples:

non-specific:

8. *Everyone has car* (India)
   - no specific car(s) are being discussed
9. *I'm not on scholarship* (East Africa)
   - not on any scholarship

specific and unknown to the listener:

10. *Here got one stall selling soup noodles* (Singapore)
   - a particular stall, but not mentioned before

specific and known to the listener:

11. *I diden buy the dress lah* (Singapore)
   - a dress that has been discussed before

(Platt et al, 1984: 54-7)

Platt et al state that, as in example 10, in many New Englishes, *one* is used in preference to *a*; unlike in standard English, this does not imply a contrast between 'one' and 'another', but is simply the specific-unknown marker. They also show that, in some cases, the specific-known article used may be one of the demonstratives *this/these* or *that/those*, but that this does not imply the presence of the object referred to as in standard English. Their explanation for this, again, lies in the influence of the substrates, since they claim that while there may be no direct equivalent of definite and indefinite articles in these languages, there are always demonstrative forms.

As suggested in tendency 2 above, the use of a specific/non-specific system may co-exist with the definite/indefinite system, so that speakers' uses of the articles and demonstratives is likely to vary. The likely cause of this is exposure to standard norms through schooling or contact with standard English native speakers; and it is mainly as a result of the dual systems that speakers' usage may appear erratic.

The third tendency, to change the form of quantifiers, appears partly related to the count/non-count reanalysis, since quantifiers used only with non-countable nouns in standard English may be used with countables in some New Englishes:

11. *Don't eat so much sweets!* (Singapore)

The opposite feature, that is, the use of 'countable' quantifiers with (standard or non-standard) 'non-count' quantifiers, is not documented.

A further feature of the use of quantifiers in the New Englishes is the frequent omission of *a* in expressions such *a few, a couple of,* and *a number of*:

12. *This money is given to the girl to buy few articles* (West Africa)
13. *I applied couple of places in Australia* (India)
14. *In X there are number of schools* (India)

Platt et al ascribe this tendency to the fact that the singular *a* does not comply with the plural semantics of terms such as *few* and *couple*. This is supported by the fact that the plural quantifier *some* is, occasionally, used with these expressions as an alternative:

15. *Some few minutes past nine I leave the office* (West Africa)
16. *You are expected to say some few words* (Sri Lanka)

A possible misunderstanding between speakers of a standard as opposed to a New English may arise from the following usage of *few*, where it takes on the meaning of standard English 'some':

17. *They may use few of the Singhalese words* (Sri Lanka)

This seems, however, to be the result more of the omission of the article than of a reanalysis of the meaning of *few*; in standard English, 'a few' would have a very similar meaning to 'some'. Platt et al give only this one example, and do not state whether this is a feature specifically of Sri Lankan English, or common to New Englishes in general.

A final point made about the use of quantifiers is the reduction of the expression *a (little) bit of* in some New Englishes:

18. *I did bit shopping* (Malaysia)

The fourth 'tendency' in New Englishes noun phrases is that of the occasional 'indiscriminate' use of the third-person pronouns *he, she* and *it*. Again, this is ascribed to the lack of such distinctions in the substrate languages. The final 'tendency' of Platt et al's own summary is that of changes in the word-order within the noun phrase. These changes apply to the ordering of quantifiers, adjectives and nouns, and seem to be realised differently in different New Englishes:

19. *Dis two last years* (Papua New Guinea)

20. *A two hour exciting display* (Ghana)

21. *That your brother will he come?* (West Africa – Nigeria)

22. *Your that brother come back already or not?* (Singapore/Malaysia)

These differences are also ascribed to substrate influence, but here, the different substrates in each New English territory result in different constructions.

Although not included in the summary, Platt et al also record different uses of adjectives in the New Englishes. These seem, for the most part, to stem from an overgeneralisation of certain morphological processes of adjective-formation:

23. *I find my daughter's behaviour* <u>*disgracing*</u> i.e. 'disgraceful' (West Africa)

24. *The instructions are very* <u>*complicating*</u> i.e. 'complicated' (Singapore)

25. *A* <u>*matured*</u> *woman required to fill the position* i.e. 'mature' (Singapore)

They also record the use of certain possessive constructions which omit the *'s* of standard varieties:

26. *this man brother* (West Indies)

27. *children playground* (Malaysia)

Finally, the absence of conjunctions, particularly when they are not emphatically required, is noted:

28. *Altogether I have two brother, four sister* (Singapore)

29. *Four, five blocks away* (Malaysia)

These, then, are the common New English features, or tendencies, found with regard to noun phrases, most of which are explained by Platt et al by reference to transfer from the substrate languages. The use of verbs, or expressions of "actions, states and perceptions", is similarly summarised as a set of tendencies:

1) a tendency not to mark the verb for third-person singular in its present-tense form;

2) a tendency not to mark verbs for the past tense. This tendency is stronger when the verbs are used non-punctually;

3) a tendency to use an aspect system rather than a tense system or to use both systems side by side;

4) a tendency to extend the use of BE + VERB + *-ing* constructions to stative verbs;

5) the formation of different phrasal and prepositional verb constructions. (Platt et al, 1984:85-86)

The most important and frequent of these tendencies, then, seem to relate to the tense/aspect systems of the New Englishes. Firstly, the omission of the 3rd person singular *–s* suffix on present tense verbs is discussed. Platt et al point out that standard English, unlike many of the substrate languages, has no inflection for person (other than on the verb 'be') other than this *-s*; but that this inflection itself is often dropped in the New Englishes:

30. *He go to school* (Philippines)

31. *This cater for most of the students* (East Africa)

However, the highly variable nature of this 'tendency' is illustrated by a further example, in which the suffix is retained on one verb but not the other:

32. *If she realise that you are not following in English she switches to Swahili* (East Africa)

Moreover, Platt et al's own research in Singapore illustrates that this feature's proportional occurrence, as with plural marking, correlates (at least in Singapore) with the educational level of the speaker. Explanations for the omission of the inflection, again, can be found either by reference to the morphology of the substrates (which either mark all verbs for person, e.g. Swahili; or none, e.g. Chinese dialects); or by reference to substrate phonology and consonant-cluster simplification.

The second verb-phrase tendency, that of non-marking of past tense verbs, may similarly be related to substrate phonology. However, the following examples indicate that the cause cannot be purely phonological:

33. *And then I go to the public school* (Philippines)

34. *I was new here and I don't know where to go* (Philippines)

35. *Before is five years. Now they change it* (Papua New Guinea)

The past tenses of the above verbs *go* (33), *don't* (34) and *is* (35) are not formed by the addition of past marker *–ed*. Platt et al therefore find an alternative explanation. In many substrates of the New Englishes, they claim, it is unnecessary to mark the tense of a verb once time has been established by means of a time adverbial. This appears to be the case in the New Englishes too. For example, 33-35 above all contain some

reference to time preceding the verb; in 34, it could be argued that the tense has already been established by *was*.

More specifically, individual New Englishes make use of particular verbs or adverbs as aspect markers, rather than marking the main verb for tense. Both Singapore and Malaysian English use *use to* as a habitual marker, but for present/ongoing as well as past habitual:

36. *My mother, she use to go to Pulau Tikus market* (i.e. she still does)

To show completive aspect, many New Englishes use an aspect marker taken from either a substrate or standard English:

37. *Matthew finish na* (Philippines)

38. *My father already pass away* (Singapore/Malaysia)

39. *You eat finish, go out and play* (Singapore/Malaysia)

The standard English construction '*has/have* V*en*' is also apparently used in some New Englishes, not only to indicate perfective/completive aspect, but as a more general past tense:

40. *I have read this book yesterday* (India)

To mark durative or progressive aspect, New Englishes may similarly make use of an aspect marker rather than the standard BE + *-ing*:

41. *What you stay eat?* (Hawaii)

Platt et al therefore conclude that, as is the case in many of the New Englishes' substrates, aspect appears to be a more relevant and frequently marked category than tense (i.e. tendency 3).They also comment, however, that for some of the New Englishes, where past tense is marked, it is more likely to be on a verb of punctual duration rather than non-punctual.

The above use of *stay* to mark progressive aspect in Hawaiian English contrasts with another tendency (the fourth in the above summary) in the New Englishes, the extension of the use of BE + -ing to stative verbs:

42. *I was doubting it* (India)

43. *She is having a headache* (Singapore)

44. *She is knowing her science very well* (East Africa)

Explanations for this feature again call on substrate influences, such as the distinction between *I have* for permanent states and *I am having* for non-permanent in the Kwa

languages of West Africa. However, Platt et al conclude that, since this is not a feature of all substrates, substrate influence is an insufficient explanation. Another, more likely possibility is overgeneralisation from standard constructions such as 'I'm having a good time'. In the case of the verbs 'tell' and 'say', Platt et al suggest that using these with BE + *-ing* suggests a repetition of the process of telling or saying.
In the formation of the future tense, some New Englishes make use of *go* rather than the auxiliary *will*:

45. *I think I go and make one new dress for Chinese New Year* (Singapore)

Although the authors do not comment on this, it seems likely that this construction is related to standard English 'I'm going to…' as an expression of the future.

Other New Englishes do use future *will*, and in some cases also use it where standard English would use subjunctive modality (*would*):

46. *If I will have my way, I will leave this place now* (Ghana)

By contrast, Singapore English seems to prefer *would* over *will* for future events:

47. *The advertisement in the paper says that the film would begin promptly at seven*

However, Platt et al acknowledge that all their examples of this usage are taken from printed sources, and may be instances of hypercorrection in formal registers. In constructions such as 'I'd better', 'I'd like' or 'I would prefer', many New Englishes instead drop *would/had/'d;* for example:

48. *I better leave now* (Ghana)

Platt et al note that, as with all features mentioned thus far, the use of tense and aspect by speakers of the New Englishes is variable, and may depend not only on the education level of the speaker, but on the situation and speech style.

In negating verbs, some New Englishes make use of *never* as a negative marker:

49. *I never sleep today* (Hawaii)

50. *I never take your book!* (Singapore)

This is also common to non-standard L1 Englishes that are long-established, though usually accompanied by past tense marking on the verb. Where negation is achieved by the more standard 'didn't, 'couldn't', 'don't', etc., the consonant-cluster simplification mentioned above results in their pronunciation as *diden, coulden,*

woulden, dɔn, etc. Related to these negative forms of *do* is the occasional use of unstressed positive *do* in certain New Englishes, such as Indian English.

The copular (linking) verb BE is sometimes omitted in the New Englishes; Platt et al relate this again to substrate influence. Particularly, they note that in the substrates of Singapore and Malaysian English, *be* is very seldom used before adjectives. This deletion of the copula, however, occurs in other new Englishes as well:

51. *This ^ my dialect* (East Africa)

52. *English ^ main language of instruction* (Hong Kong)

In passive constructions too, some New Englishes allow the omission of the BE verb:

53. *As soon as children are about 4 or 3 they sent to Kinder* (Ghana)

Again, however, as 54 demonstrates, all such deletions of BE are variable. A possibly related feature is the identical construction of passive and active forms of certain verbs in Singapore English. Compare:

55. *You can eat this cake*

56. *The seed can eat (i.e. can be eaten or are edible)*

Although Platt et al do not mention this possibility, it seems as likely that this is an instance of topicalisation and pronoun deletion (i.e. 'the seeds one can eat'), as that it represents a new passive construction.

Existential BE, in for example 'there is...' constructions, seems to be avoided in some of the New Englishes. Instead, forms of *get* may be used, similarly to the standard alternative 'this N has (got)...':

57. *This here coffeehouse got a lot of cockroaches* (Singapore)

However, *get* may also occur directly in place of existential BE:

58. *Here got a lot of people come and eat* (Singapore)

Finally, as summarised in tendency 5, the New Englishes may use new or different phrasal and prepositional verb constructions. There are six possibilities here, as given by Platt et al; each is exemplified below:

1) standard English phrasal verbs used without a particle:

59. *He picked him outside his house* (East Africa)

2) standard English phrasal verbs used with a different particle:

60. *It took [them] about two hours to put off the fire* (West Africa)

3) verbs used as phrasal verbs:

61. *I'm going to voice out my opinion* (West Africa)

4) standard English prepositional verbs used without a preposition:

62. *I applied couple of places in Australia* (India)

5) standard English prepositional verbs used with different prepositions:

63. *He got up the bus* (Singapore)

6) standard English non-prepositional verbs used with prepositions:

64. *We must discuss about this later* (Papua New Guinea)

Several possible reasons are given for these different constructions. Apart from possible transfer from substrate languages, there are analogies that may be drawn with similar constructions in standard English. For example, *voice out* may be formed by analogy with 'speak out'; and *discuss about* may be influenced by the preposition used with the nominal form 'discussion', i.e. 'a discussion about...'. New phrasal verbs such as *vacate out* may be motivated by the semantics of 'vacate', which suggests movement 'out'; and other constructions may simply be motivated by confusion with closely related and similar forms such as *pick* versus *pick up*, or *take/take up/take off*.

Platt et al also discuss other syntactic features of the New Englishes which do not fall neatly into noun- or verb-related categories. These too are summarised as a set of tendencies (130-131):

1) a tendency to imply rather than explicitly state subject and object pronouns which can be understood from the context;
2) a tendency to use pronoun copying;
3) a tendency to use adverbs such as *already*, *only*, *even* in sentence final position;
4) a tendency not to invert in WH-questions and *yes/no* questions;
5) a tendency to use invariant tags.

Tendency 1 is fairly self-explanatory, and is exemplified by Platt et al as follows:

65. Q: *Have you got some friends there?*
A: *Yes, ^ have got* (India)

66. *Could I ask you people to send ^ to me?* (Papua New Guinea)

Again, this tendency is attributed mainly to substrate influence; the possibility of phonological reduction being the cause is rejected on the grounds that many of Platt et al's examples are taken from speech communities where such reduction is not commonly found.

The second tendency, that of pronoun copying, is slightly more complicated in that it relates to means of focussing and emphasising the subject of a sentence.. Platt et al define the term as "the practice of adding a pronoun after the noun subject of a sentence" (119), and give the following examples:

67. *My daughter she is attending the University of Nairobi* (East Africa)

68. *People they don't have that sort of belief now* (Bangladesh)

As the authors point out, this feature is not unknown in older or standard Englishes; however, here it is used only for emphatic purposes, in what Platt et al refer to as "a rather pompous oratorical style" or, conversely, in a "very colloquial" style (p120). In the New Englishes, it seems to be used far more frequently, and is not confined to any particular style. Platt et al suggest that this frequency may be the result of another New English feature, in that speakers tend not to make use of intonation for emphasis; rather, these syntactic means are used.

The issue of pronoun copying is not, apparently, confined to subject: Platt et al also give examples of object pronoun copying:

69. *Kasy, I expect him to make an exciting contribution to Tamil studies* (Sri Lanka)

This, however, seems to be more of a question of fronting the object for emphasis, and inserting a pronoun in its original place. This focussing is mentioned by Platt et al with other examples, where a pronoun is not inserted:

70. *Because Hindi they have declared as National Language* (India)

It can also be used as a means of focussing an indirect object:

71. *To my sister sometime I speak English* (Singapore)

The issue of such emphatic or topicalised constructions, some of which use a pronoun, has been discussed more fully by Mesthrie (1997), with reference to Black South African English. His analysis gives a clearer picture of the types of

topicalisation that may be used, which in fact constitute three separate topicalisation processes, all of which seem to be exemplified by Platt et al. Left Dislocation, of the type Platt et al refer to as "pronoun copying", is by far the most common. BSAE makes use of Left Dislocation primarily with subjects, but also occasionally with objects, as in:

72. *Tswana, I learnt it in Pretoria.*

The other two topicalisation processes are Fronting and Focus Movement. The latter is the least common, but is used to introduce new information or to give the value of an attribute, as in the extract below:

73. Q: *And how long did you live in East London?*
    A: *For my life I'm there.*

This seems to be of the type illustrated by Platt et al in 71. Fronting is used primarily to introduce contrasts or to list, but also to refer to given information:

(given)

74. Q: *But does she speak English?*
    A: *Yes, English, she's perfect*

(contrast)

75. *Yah, I think in Soweto that thing was well planned. In other townships they just joined after being given some info.*

This later study, therefore, gives a clearer picture of what Platt et al initially described. Mesthrie notes that all three of these processes are also found in colloquial standard English, and possibly in other styles too, but that their frequency appears to be higher in BSAE.

The third tendency relates to word order in the case of adverbials. These tend to occur in sentence-final position rather than internally as in standard Englishes:

76. *By the time I graduate I will be too old already* (Hong Kong)

77. *Some parents do not accept Western education even* (Papua New Guinea)

Platt et al also mention the use of sentence-final *also* in preference to *too*; and the use of *already* in negative sentences where the standard would use *yet*. Other new uses of adverbs included are the use of *before* and *last time* as sentence adverbs meaning 'previously' or 'in the past'.

The fourth tendency similarly concerns word-order, here as found in the formation of questions. While standard English inverts the word order in WH-questions, New Englishes frequently do not:

78. *What you would like to eat?* (India)

Conversely, when questions are reported, inversion does occur, along with consequent *do*-support as below, where standard English would not invert:

79. *I asked Hari where does he work* (India)

In the case of *yes/no* questions, inversion of the word-order is also avoided; instead, rising intonation is often used. Related to this is tendency 5, the use of invariant tags:

80. *You are going, ah?* (Papua New Guinea)

81. *He loves you, isn't it?* (West Africa)

As Platt et al point out, this enables speakers to avoid the complex system of standard English question tags; they also note that invariant tags are the norm rather than the exception in many languages.

Apart from the summarised tendencies, Platt et al give several more features which tend to occur in some New Englishes. The first of these concerns the use of reflexive pronouns for both reflexive and reciprocal contexts:

82. *They speak to themselves in English* (i.e. to each other) (Africa)

A further feature concerns comparative structures. Where an adjective does not have a synthetic comparative form, standard English uses 'more (ADJ) than'. In some New Englishes, however, *more* may be omitted:

83. *It is the youths who are skilful in performing than the adults* (West Africa)

Platt et al also give an example where the suffix *–er* is deleted, which suggests that this is a case not so much of the specific loss of *more* or *–er*, but simply a new comparative structure - (ADJ) *than*:

84. *He was clever than the rest* (Papua New Guinea)

However, *more* may also be omitted in verbal comparisons:

85. *He values his car than his wife* (West Africa)

Platt et al suggest that these may be accounted for by the fact that, in many African languages, the comparative is expressed by a single word. Although they do not mention whether the same is true of substrate languages outside Africa, Mesthrie (personal communication) confirms that this is also the case in Indian languages.

The omission of conjunctions is also mentioned as occurring in some of the New Englishes; others make use of new conjunctions such as *suppose*, *if suppose* and *supposing* in place of standard *if*. Related to these features is the use in Singapore and Malaysian English of *some more*, meaning 'what's more' or 'on top of that' to join sentences in discourse:

86. *Some more he's a very cheeky fella at dat time. He got two wife ah. Some more he see pretty girl ónly, sure chase after.*

These, then, are the syntactic features that have been identified as typical of the New Englishes in general. Although the occurrence of the features is variable, and they do not all occur in all New English varieties, they are nevertheless widely accepted as general tendencies. Having discussed these common features, we can now turn more specifically towards sub-Saharan Africa, and the New 'African English', or Englishes, that have developed there.

2. The New Englishes in Africa

2.1. African English

Schmied (1991: 64-76) provides a fairly comprehensive overview of such features as are sometimes considered to be part of 'African English' – 'Africa' in this case referring only to the sub-Saharan areas of the continent. Although there is some debate over whether the Englishes of sub-Saharan Africa can in fact be joined under this single term (see, for example, Platt et al (1984), Jenkins (2003) and Görlach, (1991)), or whether more subtle distinctions are necessary, it is nevertheless of interest to begin with this question as a basis for further analysis.

The structural features are grouped by Schmied (1991: 65) according to "broad categories of word class type, independent of any specific syntax ... theories." Thus they are categorised as to whether their effect is on verbs, nouns, or larger syntactic constructions, where these have been found to be different to those of standard English. In this respect, then, he follows Platt et al's broad scheme (see 1.1.1. above). Concerning verbs, he notes firstly that inflectional endings are not always added: the "general, regular and unmarked forms" are used instead. In particular, this affects the 3rd person singular present tense forms, the past tense, and irregular verb forms. Verb inflection is however inconsistent, as this feature does not always occur. This, therefore, accords fully with Platt et al's description of verb inflection in the New Englishes in general.

Another verb-related feature is the avoidance of complex tenses. Schmied states that this applies particularly to the past perfect and conditionals, and occurs most frequently when these could occur in subordinate clauses in past contexts, or when an irrealis modality is expressed. However, he also notes that, in spoken colloquial native-speaker English today, the use of these tenses is becoming less common; it is possible that this may account for this feature's not having been mentioned in relation to other New Englishes.

The third verb-related feature given by Schmied for African English is the generalization of VERB–*ing* constructions; the progressive is extended to all verbs, whether stative or dynamic. Schmied also notes that phrasal or prepositional verbs are used 'differently' from those in standard English; that is, the preposition/particle may

be omitted entirely or replaced by a different one. New phrasal and prepositional verb forms also occur, where a particle is 'added' to a verb that does not require one in the standard. Thus, for example, forms such as *discuss about* and *voice out* are common. These features, too, accord with Platt et al's overall description of the New Englishes.

Schmied's fifth feature relating to African English verbs concerns complementation; infinitives and gerunds as verb complements "vary freely": "the subtle distinction between infinitive and gerund constructions tends to be neglected" (p68). Schmied gives as examples:

87. *It will be necessary here highlighting the difference between the two types.*

88. *He decided buying a new car.*

Infinitival complements, where used with a bare noun form in standard English (as with *let* or *make*), may occur as follows:

89. *They made him to clean the whole yard.*

However, the opposite may also occur, with infinitival *to* being deleted where it is obligatory in the standard:

90. *Allow him _ go.*

These too, then, would appear to vary randomly; although it seems possible that instead this may simply be a case of regional variation within the posited African English. The above features are not mentioned by Platt et al as occurring in the New Englishes, and may be unique to African English(es).

Noun-related features of African Englishes mentioned include a lack of inflectional endings, similar to the first feature relating to verbs. This applies, in nouns, to number and case marking, which are often absent. Schmied also refers, however, to the converse - the pluralisation of uncountable nouns, yielding forms such as *informations*; as well as to the singularisation of mass nouns, as in *an advice*. Closely tied to this feature is the second to which Schmied refers, the overgeneralization of the *–s* plural suffix. In this case, he claims that such forms as *luggages* and *furnitures* are in fact semantically accurate, in being semantically countable (as in 'a piece of luggage/furniture'), whereas those of the type mentioned above may not be. All of the noun-related features thus far listed for African English are also given by Platt et al as typical of New Englishes in general; although their analysis of the semantic logic behind them differs somewhat (see 1.1.1 above).

The third feature discussed is the variable absence or omission of articles or other determiners before nouns, as seen in *I am going to post office*. Schmied also refers to the possibility (raised by Platt et al, 1984) that New Englishes, and here (New) African Englishes, might in fact be using a specific/non-specific distinction in the article system, as opposed to the standard system of a definite/indefinite or known/not known to hearer distinction. With reference to the above example, however, it is also possible that it is formed by analogy with (standard) uses such as 'I am going to school/church'.

The fourth noun-related feature of African Englishes concerns pronouns. Schmied notes that these are not always distinguished by gender; *he, she* and *it*, as well as *his, her* and *its* may be used indiscriminately. Again, this echoes Platt et al's general depiction of the New Englishes.

As a final feature, Schmied claims that adjective forms may be used as adverbs, resulting in utterances such as:

91. *Do it proper.*

However, since this feature is often stigmatised, some speakers may hypercorrect standard unmarked adverbs (such as *hard, first, high*) into adverbial form:

92. *She ran fastly because the train was coming.*

This feature is not mentioned by Platt et al, suggesting that it may be unique to, or at least more prevalent in, African Englishes, than in other New Englishes.

Schmied also discusses five features which concern larger syntactic structures than those above. The first of these is the use of "so-called resumptive pronouns" (p72). Anaphoric personal pronouns in African Englishes are used to take up the subject of a sentence, particularly if the subject is long and complicated, and may also be used as the head of a relative construction. Schmied refers to these as "redundant pronouns," and gives the following example:

93. *Many of the fish they have different colours.*

This feature is also mentioned by Platt et al; and as discussed above in 1.1.1, has been more fully examined as part of a set of features in a specific New English by Mesthrie (1997).

The second of the larger syntactic features of African English noted by Schmied (1991: 73) concerns *yes/no* questions: "negative *yes/no* questions are confirmed by responding to the form of the question and not to the absolute 'inner logic.'" That is, in African English(es), a negative *yes/no* question such as *You don't know this, do you?* is seen as querying the accuracy of the statement preceding the tag: to answer *No* would mean, 'No, you are wrong, and I do know it;' while *Yes* would mean, 'Yes, that is true, I don't' (example from Schmied, 1991: 73). For obvious reasons, this difference causes communicative difficulties between speakers of African English and the standard, particularly when a speaker of either variety merely answers *yes* or *no*. Although I have not included this feature in my own summary of Platt et al's findings (1.1.1. above), they do in fact discuss this issue with reference to several New Englishes, not all of them African (see also section 3.1. below, for further discussion).

The third of Schmied's features also concerns question tags; in African English (as in many New Englishes – see again 1.1.1), these usually have an invariant form. By these means, the complex standard English rules which govern the form that tags must take are avoided. Thus an invariant tag such as, for example, *isn't it?* or *not so?* is generally used.

The fourth feature too is question-related, and recalls Platt et al's claims for the New Englishes: in indirect speech and reported or subordinated questions, the basic interrogative word-order is retained. Questions or other utterances such as the following are therefore common:

94. *Do you know what will be the price?*

95. *Try to guess whose house is this.*

Schmied's fifth feature is also concerned with word-order, but specifically with the rules governing the position of adverbs. He claims that, in the sentences below, the position of the adverb does not place sufficient emphasis on it, "as is possible in Standard English" (p75):

96. *She went often to see them.*

97. *He did not arrive in time unfortunately.*

While the issue of emphasis appears questionable, the placement of the adverbs here does seem likely to be marked in standard English. Schmied also claims that, in

general, word order in African English is more flexible than in the standard. In support of this claim, he suggests that topicalisation processes are more frequently used for emphasis. Nevertheless, he acknowledges - as Mesthrie (1997) has observed; see above - that in spoken colloquial standard English, such processes are in fact probably fairly common. With respect to the placement of the adverbs above, the claim as to the flexibility of African English does seem justified, but in comparison not only with the standard but also with other New Englishes. As discussed in 1.1.1, Platt et al discuss New English adverbs in terms of their sentence-final position; but Schmied's examples illustrate the use of adverbs in sentence-final and -medial positions, neither of which are standard in these contexts.

Schmied also refers, briefly, to what are described as "possible cases of grammatical 'Africanisms,'" which are in his opinion less prevalent (p76). These are, therefore, described as the "tendencies" to

a) use exceptional forms of negation, e.g. *He is not almost happy.*
b) use unusual premodifications, e.g. *... to solve this our common problem.*
c) use conjuncts (adverbs) such as *also* or *so* as conjunctions to begin a clause.
d) use negations after semantically negated verbs, e.g. *His father refused that Obi can't marry Clara.*
e) 'simplify' comparative constructions by omitting either the particle *than* or *-er/-est.*

Of these, only the fifth has been mentioned as a tendency in the New Englishes as a whole; and there, it is the particle *more* rather than *than* which is claimed to be omitted. Schmied's claim that these are grammatical Africanisms may therefore well be accurate. It should be noted that, where Platt et al exemplify what Schmied refers to as an "unusual premodification" of the same type as shown in (b) above, their example is drawn from West Africa (see sentence 22).

These, then, are the general tendencies sometimes reported to constitute 'African English'. As the above discussion suggests, there seems little to indicate that, syntactically, African English(es) are sufficiently distinctive in comparison to other New Englishes to warrant such a differentiation. Of the syntactic features that Schmied describes, few seem to be distinctively African as opposed to typical of New

Englishes in general; although possible exceptions to this generalisation are mentioned above. However, from such a general overview it is not possible to draw many conclusions; instead, we will turn to a more detailed examination of the New Englishes of Africa. Firstly, however, the history and status of English in Africa, and particularly of BSAE - as the core variety used for this comparison – will be discussed, as a background to an explanation of some of the differences between the varieties.

2.2. The history of English in Africa

Görlach (1984, in Görlach 1991), in an early discussion of the possible existence of 'African English' as a unified phenomenon[1], describes the geographical and linguistic divisions of English in Africa with reference to the distinction between the English(es) spoken in the West, East and Southern regions of the continent – as does Schmied (1991). This three-way distinction is related by Görlach to the histories of the territories involved, particularly with respect to the different types of colonial contact they had with Europe. He sums up the factors affecting the position of English in the various countries concerned as the following:

1. The history of Britain as a colonial power and –possibly – of British settlement.
2. The educational history of the region, and the ways in which English has been acquired as a second or a foreign language and from what sources.
3. The functions that English served and the prestige it had in colonial times, and after independence, especially the norms that have been accepted as correct.
4. The styles and text types that have formed the input in this acquisition process.

(adapted from Görlach, 1991:123)

These factors, then, contribute to the ways in which English is used, as well as the types of English that have emerged. The geographical distribution of English in Africa is described by Görlach as of the following types, related to British settlement or influence:

1. British settlement in co-existence with other groups (South Africa, and to a lesser extent East Africa).

[1] A possibility which he rejects (p142), along with the possibility of such an entity evolving in future.

2. British colonial rule from the beginning (Nigeria, Kenya) or succeeding other powers (Tanzania, Cameroon).
3. English as a minority or third language, where the dominant colonial language is/was French or Italian (Togo, Ivory Coast, Cameroon).

   (adapted from Görlach, 1991:124)

Additionally, Liberia and Sierra Leone have settlement histories of English speakers either unrelated or less closely related to Britain: in Liberia, an original group of speakers of American English (see below), and in Sierra Leone, the existence of English and a Creole (Krio) as the native languages of sections of the metropolitan population from the time of the establishment of its colonies. West Africa, then, seems the most linguistically complex area with regard to English, and has the longest history of contact with English speakers (Görlach, 1991).

Three hundred years of slave trading and impermanent European settlements along the coast of West Africa prior to 1830, resulted in the formation of an English-lexicon Pidgin (WAPE), which gradually spread as a lingua franca, replacing Portuguese which had served this purpose previously. Following the abolition of the slave-trade at the end of this period, the only remaining British colony was in Sierra Leone; other contact between West Africans and native English-speakers was limited to a small amount of trading and missionary work in the area. British political involvement in Africa at this time was kept to a minimum, and went only so far as was necessary to maintain secure naval ports along the trade routes to the east (the Caribbean) and the west (India) (Schmied, 1991). Contact with English-speakers, therefore, came only through these missionaries and traders.

The colony in Sierra Leone constituted the first 'Western' black community in Africa, after 411 ex-slaves were returned to Africa and founded Freetown in 1787. In 1792, a further 1131 former slaves, who had been settled in Nova Scotia, came to Sierra Leone; and in 1800, 550 Jamaican Maroons were deported there. In 1807, these numbers were increased by 'recaptives' who had been taken from illegal slave-ships and, rather than returned to their home lands, were taken to Sierra Leone (Görlach, 1991). The precise linguistic origins of Sierra Leone Krio are debated among creolists, but it appears to be either directly descended from, or at least heavily influenced by, the Jamaican Creole of some of these slaves (Mülhäusler, 1997).

Additionally, West African Pidgin English (WAPE) was already present in the area, and so is likely to have had some effect on Krio; as is Yoruba, the language of many of the recaptured slaves who would have learned Krio as a second language (Görlach, 1991)

In addition to this Creole, English was also spoken in Sierra Leone from the time of the original settlement; the two languages therefore existed side by side, although English from the beginning was dominant in official life and education (Mülhäusler, 1997). English in Sierra Leone, therefore, has probably been strongly influenced by Krio, and vice-versa.

In Liberia, the picture is slightly different, in that the original population of 17,000 freed American slaves, who arrived from 1820 onwards, brought with them standard American English as well as Merico, a broad but decreolized 19th century Black English. WAPE was also already present in the area, in the form of Liberian Pidgin English. In these two colonies of ex-slaves, therefore, not only various forms of English but also new English-lexicon Creoles were introduced to West Africa (Görlach, 1991).

In Nigeria, some Krio-speaking communities were established, especially in Lagos and Ibadan, when originally Yoruba-speaking freed slaves returned from Sierra Leone after 1839. Additionally, many Krio-speakers were later employed as missionaries and teachers in southern Nigeria by the British colonial government. WAPE had existed in this region for several centuries, and Görlach suggests it stabilised at this time, as well as being influenced by Krio. After 1870, however, when British interest in Nigeria and the rest of Africa grew in the European 'scramble for Africa', standard British English was taught in schools (Schmied, 1991). In southern Nigeria, therefore, there exists a continuum between basilectal WAPE/Creole, and acrolectal Nigerian standard English. In Muslim northern Nigeria, however, where missionary influence had not been possible, the Pidgin English was not widespread; when the colonial administration began teaching (British) English in schools, therefore, there was no interference. Görlach comments that this is responsible for the stereotype, even today, that Hausas (from the north) speak 'better English' than southern Nigerians, although more recent geographical mobility is likely to blur the distinction.

This situation in (particularly southern) Nigeria, where local varieties of English coexist with WAPE as a lingua franca, is repeated throughout West Africa, in addition, of course, to the multiple indigenous languages spoken in the region. In this respect, then, New Englishes in West Africa fall under Platt et al's 'type 2' situation for the development of a New English (1984: see 1.1 above). Pupils learning English at school are already familiar with a form of Pidgin English (and in some cases speak the Pidgin natively, and hence as a Creole – Platt et al's 'type 3'), and although the structures of the two systems are very different, their existence on a continuum influences the forms of both. Bokamba (1991: 503-504), commenting on West Africa as a whole, writes that "because of the wide-spread practice of code-switching and code-mixing in the region due to pervasive multilingualism, there has been a strong and mutual influence between [West African Vernacular English] and the pidgin Englishes".

In Southern and East Africa, by contrast, the development of the New Englishes falls under 'type 1'. The native languages of the speakers of the New English are unrelated to English, and their influence on the New English is therefore likely to be more oblique. In Kenya, where from 1902 British settlement was extensive, speakers of indigenous languages had ample opportunities for contact with L1 speakers of English, particularly in education (Görlach, 1991). Görlach therefore claims that this makes the very existence of a local Kenyan variety of English doubtful, and that differences from standard English are more likely to be perceived as errors than they are in West Africa. Hancock and Angogo (1982: 306), too, comment on the region as a whole that "East African English never strayed far from the prestige dialect of England."

The other two 'heartland' countries of East Africa, Uganda and Tanzania, are, Görlach suggests, even less likely candidates for the development of an East African English, Tanzania having officially expanded the intra-national uses of Swahili, and Uganda having expelled all native speakers of English in the 1960s and 1970s. Görlach therefore questions the meaningfulness of such a term as 'East African English' at all, although this is a debatable issue. Kadeghe, for example, writing in 1992, discusses language issues in Tanzanian education, and comments that despite official policies, in practice "the two languages [English and Swahili] are used

interchangeably in the learning and teaching processes" (p46). The continuing presence of English, then, taught by non-native speakers, would make it more likely, by Platt et al's criteria, that a New English should develop. More recent commentators have indeed identified features of English in these East African countries which imply its continued use, and which do not originate in standard English (see section 3 below).

The discussion of East African English in the literature - rather than more specific national varieties - can be explained by reference to the historical conditions under which English spread in East Africa. Abdulaziz (1991) describes the British colonial governance of East Africa, up to around 1970, as encompassing the region as a whole. Thus "the wider mass media, printing presses and publishing houses were run on a regional, East African basis;" as were "major services and institutions like Railways and Harbours, the Post Office and Telecommunications, the Income Tax Department, Customs, Airlines and the territorial armed forces" (p394). As a result, "there was free transfer of officials and workers within the whole region," and additionally, "free movement and trade across the borders." The levelling of possible national forms of English within the region, therefore, is not surprising.

Although the teachers of English provided by the British administration in East Africa were native speakers of (British) English, Abdulaziz further explains that they taught only a limited, formal, literary variety of English; and that outside of the classroom, "there was very little opportunity for Africans in East Africa during the colonial period to interact socially with Europeans" (p394). It is therefore likely that, if English has developed in the region as a second language used outside such formal contexts, it will have done so outside of the influence of native-speaker varieties. This, then, would partly explain the development of features of East African English which differ from the standard British norms originally taught.

In South Africa, the presence of British settlers since the 19th century has resulted in the continuing presence of a population of native speakers of English, which variety, despite having developed differently from British English, does not constitute a *New* English (see above). However, this L1 English-speaking group has historically had little contact with the indigenous populations, who without full access to native-

speaker English are – as in East Africa – likely candidates for the development of such a New English, particularly considering the economic value of English in the country. Nevertheless, because at the time of Görlach's writing (1984) very little research was possible into the English of the black South African population, he suggests that there is little possibility of a distinct second-language, nativized variety developing:

> "One is probably right in saying that the great majority of blacks who have acquired their English in work situations and off the street rather than in formal education speak English with strong mother tongue interference. Furthermore, there seems to be little indication so far of this cline of learners' languages stabilising and being accepted as a linguistic means of identity, nor is it easy to see how such a development *could* take place under the given political conditions"
> (Görlach, 1984 - in Görlach 1991: 140)

However, just over twenty years after the original publication of this statement, the political conditions have radically altered, and research into the question has now been possible for some time. The results of such research, therefore, are summarised below, as both a history of BSAE as a distinct variety, and an argument for its existence as a New English.

2.3. BSAE

According to the most recent South African population census of 2001, English is spoken as a first language by approximately 3.67 million people in South Africa, constituting just 8.2% of the population. The vast majority of these mother tongue speakers are of European or Indian descent; just under 5% of the group is black, representing under half of a percent of the black population as a whole (Statistics South Africa, 2004). However, English as a second language, in South Africa as elsewhere, has become an important lingua franca. Although recent censuses do not include data on second-language speakers, estimates from the 1991 census suggest that 45% of the South African population speak English, either as L1 or L2. Moreover, the results of the 1993 RCM (Reaching Critical Mass) survey show that around 61% of black South Africans claim to have some knowledge of English, and the number of speakers continues to rise (Unesco: 2001).

The history of the growth and development of BSAE as a second language variety is inevitably tied to the political history of South Africa. English was first introduced to the black population by European missionaries, who established schools in which English was taught to black pupils. However, the rapid growth of the school-going population soon led to the need for state assistance, which resulted in the virtual removal of English from early education for black students. From around 1935, the government's educational policy was to enforce mother tongue education for the first eight years of schooling. The Bantu Education Act of 1953 further strengthened this policy, extending the period of mother tongue education for black children to the furthest levels. Meanwhile, the role of Afrikaans (the other official language at the time), as opposed to English, in the schools was greatly increased. Directly linked to this educational policy was the gradual removal of teachers who were mother tongue speakers of English from schools for black pupils. Thus black South African learners had virtually no access to the English of native speakers under the Nationalist government's apartheid education policy (de Klerk and Gough, 2002).

However, being denied access to English only served to greatly increase its prestige among the black population; English came to be seen as the language of the socio-economic advancement that the government was deliberately preventing. As a consequence, speakers of indigenous African languages began to value English over and above their mother tongues, since these languages did not have the same potential to grant access to wider society and better employment opportunities. Eventually, following the Soweto uprising of 1976, the government - in the form of the Department of Bantu Education - allowed schools to choose their own medium of instruction (MOI) in 1979. The majority chose English (de Klerk and Gough, 2002).

The limited contact between black South Africans and (white) native speakers of English had already, during the years of enforced mother tongue education, given rise to a distinctive variety of English among black speakers, in which characteristic norms of phonology and syntax had been established (de Klerk and Gough, 2002). Outside of schools, the apartheid policy of enforced racial segregation severely limited the possibilities of interaction with native speakers of English, further contributing to the stabilization of BSAE as a distinct sociolect. By 1990, government

policy had ensured that, although English was the official MOI, the vast majority of English teachers in the Department of Education and Training (DET) schools - those for black students - were themselves L2 speakers of English, hence presumably speakers of BSAE. Van der Walt and van Rooy (2002: 115) have commented that "most teachers of English [in South Africa] are second-language speakers who have themselves acquired English from other second-language teachers. For this reason most learners are exposed to non-standard forms as input, passed on from second-language teachers to second-language learners". Therefore, as Buthelezi (1995: 242) has expressed, "learners acquire features of (BSAE) directly from their teachers and then reproduce these items unwittingly as 'standard English'" Moreover, the teachers' often limited competence in English, coupled with the difficulties of the learners, meant (and continues to mean) that despite the official position of English as MOI, African languages continued to be used extensively in classrooms (de Klerk and Gough, 2002).

BSAE therefore became established as a variety of L2 English in a typically colonial situation, where the language of perceived wealth and political power was denied in its standard form to the black population, who nevertheless managed to acquire it, while inadvertently creating a new variety which differed from the standard. However, although Black English appears to have stabilized as a recognizable variety, considerable differences in levels of competence exist among speakers. Thus although census figures claim that English is spoken by about 7 million black South Africans, other estimates vary according to the conception of what precisely constitutes a 'knowledge of English' (de Klerk and Gough, 2002). Levels of English competence among black speakers vary from fully fluent speakers to those who know very little and whose abilities rate very low on the interlanguage continuum.

In addition to these differing levels of English proficiency, there exists a continuum of, roughly, basilectal, mesolectal and acrolectal varieties of the dialect. Thus while the English of acrolectal speakers may differ from the standard only in terms of phonology, and possibly contain small lexical and syntactic differences, basilectal BSAE may contain notable structural differences.

These differing competences and sociolects are generally attributable to the sociopolitical circumstances in which the variety arose, which severely limited the amount of access to English (of any variety) which black speakers were allowed. L2 English competence therefore varies greatly, according to the speakers' levels of interaction with L1 or other L2 English speakers. As mentioned above, during the apartheid years English and Afrikaans both had the status of official languages. However, English was seen as the more attractive language by black speakers, partly as a result of its international status, which Afrikaans lacked, and partly because of the different political connotations of the two. While Afrikaans was closely associated with the oppressive Nationalist government, English was seen as "the language of liberation and resistance to apartheid domination," playing an important role as the "language of the struggle" in the ANC and PAC (de Klerk and Gough, 2002: 359). Post-1994, English remains an important language of inter-group communication: "its apparent neutrality, its range of native and non-native users across cultures, its ability to fulfil a range of linguistic functions and its rich literary tradition have made it a strong candidate as internal *de facto* lingua franca" (de Klerk and Gough, 2002). Thus English as a second language in South Africa remains a popular choice.

2.3.1. BSAE as a New English

As discussed, the status of English as a world language, and as "an important language of education and as the language of choice for business, science and popular culture" has resulted in its becoming the 'other' or second language of choice for many world-wide, and not merely in South Africa (de Klerk and Gough, 2002).

Platt et al, in their discussion of the New Englishes, identified the four criteria which any New English variety must fulfil in order to be so categorised (see 1.1, above). The first of these, that a New English must have developed through the education system, where it is taught as a subject and, commonly, used as a medium of instruction, is clearly fulfilled by BSAE, as the above short history demonstrates. The second criterion, that the English variety has developed in an area where a native (L1) variety of English is not the language spoken by the majority of the population, is equally well fulfilled in South Africa. Although White South African English (WSAE), a mother tongue, extraterritorial variety which according to Platt et al constitutes a

'newer' English, co-exists with BSAE, it is not a majority language to which black speakers have historically had much access.

Platt et al's third criterion is that, in the area in question, English must be used for a fairly broad range of functions among those who do in fact speak and/or write it. Thus it may be used, as in Platt et al's own examples (pp 2-3), in the media, in letter writing, and for spoken communication between friends and family. In this sense, then, the New English must become a lingua franca in the area, and so also be used as a means of communication between speakers of different mother tongues – as is the case in South Africa (see 2.1). The fourth and final criterion in Platt et al's definition of a New English is that the variety must have become 'nativized,' in that it has developed phonological, structural, and lexical characteristics not found in standard English(es), as well as, more often than not, characteristic norms of discourse. While Platt et al do not mention or discuss BSAE as a New English, it seems clear that it does indeed fulfil these four criteria, as has been argued by de Klerk and Gough (2002). Those 'nativized' or 'localized' structural features which differentiate BSAE from standard English, and which have been studied previously, are discussed below in comparison with the features of other African Englishes.

3. Feature comparison of the New Englishes of sub-Saharan Africa

The discussion in section 2 has centred on a highly generalised picture of the New Englishes, in Africa and elsewhere around the world. The purpose of this dissertation, however, is to compare systematically five specific New Englishes found in sub-Saharan Africa, using Black South African English as a base. The data on the structural characteristics of the various New Englishes of Africa, reproduced below, is taken from a variety of previously published sources, but the principal sources are those recently published in *A Handbook of Varieties of English* (Kortmann et al, 2004). However, where less recent publications provide additional information, this is included.

The first, and main, African variety of English to be discussed is BSAE, since this is intended as the foundation with which the others are compared. The following section, therefore, details those features of the variety which have been previously identified.

3.1 Structural characteristics of BSAE

Studies of the structural properties of BSAE have identified several features of the dialect, in terms of phonology, lexis and syntax, as well as distinctive discourse patterns. Mesthrie (2004), Wade (1997), de Klerk and Gough (2002), Gough (1996), Buthelezi (1995), among others, have listed broad features of BSAE, only the syntactic aspects of which are outlined below. These studies (and others) have in the main not attempted to find a means of unifying these miscellaneous features, and have identified features only by their deviance from standard forms. This, however, will be dealt with below. Mesthrie (2004) provides the most recent summary of the recognised features of BSAE, including those described in Mesthrie (2003a), which proposes a hypothesis to explain similar tendencies within the set of features of the dialect.

The following grammatical features, including examples, are taken directly from those identified and listed in de Klerk and Gough (2002: 362-363) as well as Gough (1996) as being characteristic of BSAE; the authors note that they are fairly typical of the sort of features generally ascribed to the dialect. The examples used by de Klerk and Gough are taken mostly from written material by black L2 speakers of English at

Grade 12 and university level - although naturalistic speech data is generally preferable for analysis, very little has been recorded, as is the case with many African Englishes (Schmied, 1991). The features are as follows:

1) The use of non-count as count nouns:

   You must put more *efforts* into your work

   She was carrying *a luggage*

2) Omission of articles:

   He was ^ good man

3) Extensive use of resumptive pronouns:

   My standard 9, I have enjoyed *it* very much

   The man who I saw *him* was wearing a big hat

4) Gender conflation in pronouns:

   She came to see me yesterday (male referent)

5) Noun phrases not always marked for number:

   We did all our *subject* in English

6) Extension of the progressive:

   Even racism *is still existing*

   Men *are still dominating* the key positions in education

   She *was loving* him very much

7) No singular third person indicative present:

   The survival of a person *depend* on education

8) Idiosyncratic patterns of complementation:

   That thing made me *to know* God

   I went to secondary school *for doing* my standard six

   I tried *that I might see her*

9) Simplification of tense:

   I wish that people in the world *will* get educated

   We ^ supposed to stay in our homes

   They told me ... I *'ll* be having a temporary place

10) Past tense not always marked:

    In 1980 the boycott *starts*

    We stayed in our home until the boycott *stops*

11) New prepositional verb forms:

    He *explained about* the situation

    They were *refusing with* my book

I find it difficult *to cope up* with my work

12) Non-standard structures of comparison:

She was beautiful *than* all other women

Some people think they are better *to* others

13) Use of *too* and *very much* as intensifiers:

She is *too* beautiful (i.e. very much)

Hatred is *very much* common

14) Use of *in order that* in purpose clauses:

He went there *in order that* he sees her

15) Generalisation of *being* as a participle:

He left *being* thirsty (i.e. He left in a thirsty state)

16) New pronoun forms:

She was very unhappy *of which* it was clear to see

17) Question order retained in indirect questions:

I asked him *why did he go*

18) Use of subordinators:

Although she loved him *but* she didn't marry him

If at all you do not pay, you will go to jail

19) Invariant *né* in tag questions (borrowed from Afrikaans):

You start again by pushing this button, *né*?

20) New quantifier forms:

Others were drinking, *others* were eating

I stay *some few* miles away

21) *The most thing* for 'the thing I [verb] the most':

The most thing I like is apples

22) *X's first time* for 'the first time that X...":

This is *my first time* to go on a journey

23) *Can be able to* as modal verb phrase:

I *can be able* to go

De Klerk and Gough (2002) suggest that explanations for the above features could be found both in the transfer of structures from the substrate mother tongues of BSAE speakers, and in universal principles concerning the processes of second language learning and usage, in much the same way as do Platt et al (1984; see 1.1.1 above). The latter influence in particular is best able to explain the existence of the structural similarities between BSAE and other New Englishes.

Gough (1996), upon his original publication of this list, suggests that not all of these features are equally common in BSAE, and that more importantly, not all are equally acceptable to speakers of the dialect itself. Some of the features are viewed by fluent speakers of BSAE as being more 'standard' than others; and these would therefore be expected to be more stable than those perceived as unacceptable. In testing this hypothesis, a sample of sentences containing the above-listed features was given to 20 primary and high school teachers, who were required to indicate which they considered to be grammatical, and to correct those that seemed ungrammatical. The results were as follows, with the actual number of teachers who made corrections to the sentence on the right being given on the left:

5 He explained about the situation
5 He was carrying a luggage
6 They were refusing with my book
9 You must put more efforts into your work
9 The most thing I like is apples
9 This is my first time to go on a journey
11 That thing made me to know God
13 Hatred is very much common
13 I can be able to go
17 I tried that I might see her
19 I asked him why did he go
19 He was good man
19 Although she loved him but she didn't marry him
20 She was loving him very much
20 The man who I saw him was wearing a big hat

This scale suggests that certain of the new prepositional verb forms, and the use of non-count as count nouns, may be firmly entrenched in BSAE, and regarded as standard even by the most acrolectal and educated speakers; while those at the bottom of the scale are more likely to be identified as 'ungrammatical' and stigmatised by these speakers as belonging to the speech of those less educated speakers with an imperfect grasp of English (Gough, 1996). However, de Klerk and Gough (2002) suggest that these earlier statements may not be entirely accurate. Preliminary research has shown that only about 30% of a group of black first year students at the University of the Western Cape were able to correct into standard English sentences such as the following:

98. *After chairperson have being chosen, she will leave for Cape Town.*

Around 50% of the students changed *being* to *been*, but over 80% did not correct either the missing article or change *have* to *has*. These results suggest that the feature of article omission among these educated black speakers is more widely acceptable than Gough's (1996) scale implied (see, however, below, this section). De Klerk and Gough (2002: 364) suggest that the construction of passive sentences by the use of *been*, but with a non-standard auxiliary as above, may be attributable to "the stigmatising of particular constructions in formal education, which may raise them more to the level of awareness than others." Thus a reasonably accurate picture of what constitutes grammatically acceptable BSAE in the eyes of its fluent and educated speakers has not yet been fully constructed.

Wade (1997) has analysed five grammatical characteristics of BSAE in somewhat more detail than the Gough (1996) and de Klerk and Gough (2002) studies have done. He considers these aspects of BSAE in terms of their potential to demonstrate "the variety's grammatical and pragmatic rule-governedness" (Wade, 1997: 2). The five features treated are the non-standard use of progressives; non-standard use of the perfect tense; non-standard verb complementation; NP–AUX inversion in embedded questions; and pronoun copying.

The use of the progressive aspect appears as the 'extension of the progressive' in de Klerk and Gough's (2002) list of BSAE features, but in Gough's (1996) scale, scores very low on the level of (educated-speaker) acceptability, since the example sentence was corrected by all 20 teachers. Nevertheless, it remains a salient and frequently mentioned feature of BSAE, although it is possibly more common in less acrolectal varieties. Wade (1997) discusses the uses of the progressive tense as related to the lack of distinction between stative and dynamic verbs in BSAE, as well as in other New Englishes in general (see above). In standard English, stative verbs such as *have*, *be* and *know* are usually non-progressive; however, as the examples above have illustrated (see feature 6 of the list above), in BSAE this is not the case. Wade also mentions the use of the progressive in BSAE to refer to the simple present or to the future, as in the examples:

99. *They are getting a ten percent discount if they are buying.*

100. *Students in this university are coming from different cultural groups.*

It is also used in the simple, perfect and 'used to' habitual forms:

101. *He was speaking very fast when I was a child.*

102. *So my mother was always encouraging me to go to school.*

103. *The blacks have been learning a third grade education.*

Wade's explanations for these uses of the progressive include the possibility that, in the teaching of English, there may be an over-emphasis of the progressive over simple tense forms; the fact that in standard English (unlike other languages with a progressive aspect) it is possible to use stative verbs progressively in indicating a temporary state (as in *I'm having a bad day today*); and the apparent absence of a distinction between progressives and non-progressives in the substrate languages.

However, Makelela (2004) provides an alternative analysis of what he, similarly to de Klerk and Gough (2002), refers to as the "extension of the progressive aspect to stative verbs" (p358). Basing his argument on an analysis of Bantu languages spoken in South Africa, he finds that "Sepedi (as well as other Bantu languages in South Africa) does not mark grammatical distinctions between progressive and stative aspect through inflectional conjugations," and hence that "the temporal logic in Bantu languages does not conceptually distinguish the view of present time in terms of habituality and progressiveness" (p359). He therefore concludes that the overuse of the progressive aspect in BSAE is neither a simplification strategy nor based on analogy with other standard English usage, but rather "reflects the Bantu language logic where verbal inflections do not play an important role in the articulation of verbal meaning." Substrate influence, therefore, is strongly argued to be the motivation behind this feature of BSAE. Mesthrie (2002) adds further strength to this position by his claim that BSAE, rather than lacking a distinction between stative and progressive verbs, simply does not indicate the difference by inflection (as Makelela states is the case in Bantu languages), or, often, by any surface features at all. However, speakers' awareness of the distinction is made clear by the contexts in which (South African English) aspectual *busy* can be applied to verbs: *busy* can only be used in a progressive context and not a stative.

Turning to Wade's second feature, the past perfect tense in BSAE may be used to refer not only to an action or event completed at any time in the past (as in standard English), but, as an absolute tense, to the remote past in general, as in the example:

104. *My father had already passed away while I was doing standard one.*

Wade claims that in this utterance, there is no implication that the event of the father passing away occurred prior to the speaker being in standard one; rather, the speaker intends to show that both these events occurred in the remote past. Wade relates this usage to the existence in many Bantu languages of a remote past as well as a recent past tense; as well as the cross-linguistic relative markedness of the standard English perfect tenses.

The third feature of BSAE discussed by Wade is that of the non-standard verbal complements that occur. In de Klerk and Gough's (2002) list, the non-standard complements are discussed as a unit; however, Wade notes that in his data only the construction *make ... to* occurred frequently enough to be regarded as systematic (however, see below, this section). Standard English *make* is followed by a bare infinitive; but in BSAE *make* is followed by a *to* [V] infinitive, even in the speech of those whose English is otherwise acrolectal:

105. *What makes them to stop that product if there are people who do come to that shop and buy them.*

106. *So what will we... made you to come and buy?*

Wade also includes examples of this construction from written material by a speaker of BSAE; this appears to indicate that speakers are unaware that the construction is non-standard and so do not edit it out. His explanation for this feature lies in overgeneralisation; most English verbs, with a few exceptions such as *make*, *let* and *help*, cannot occur with a bare infinitive.

The inversion of NP–AUX in BSAE in embedded questions, so that the question order is retained, is discussed by Wade as a feature common to many second language varieties of English, resulting in utterances such as the following:

107. *Unfortunately we don't know where is she at the moment*

Sentences of this type also occur in written samples, which, as with the *make ... to* construction, indicates that this is probably perceived as standard. This feature is noted for being strongly resistant to change, since learning when not to invert subject and auxiliary necessitates "overcoming the general principle that permutations in embedded clauses are to be avoided" (Wade, 1997: 8).

The final feature of BSAE discussed in Wade is that of pronoun copying, referred to by de Klerk and Gough (2002) as the use of 'resumptive pronouns' (it should be noted, however, that de Klerk and Gough's examples show one instance of left dislocation; and one of a resumptive pronoun in a relative clause – a separate construction that is discussed below, in this section). This results in sentences such as

108. *The parents, <u>they</u> are supposed to pay ten rands*

'Interference' or transfer from the mother tongue is often claimed to be the source of this feature; however, Wade suggests that it may in fact be a means of compensating syntactically for the relative lack of intonation as a discourse marker in BSAE as opposed to the substrate languages of the speakers. The copy pronoun, in this view, can be seen as filling a 'gap' left by the lack of intonation. It is therefore seen as fulfilling a communicative need, which Wade offers as an explanation for the frequent fossilisation of this feature in the L2 English of black speakers. De Klerk and Gough (2002) also suggest this as a likely explanation of the prevalence of this construction.

As mentioned above (see section 1.1.1), Mesthrie (1997) has provided a more thorough analysis of the phenomenon of these 'copy pronouns' in BSAE, which are related to a set of topicalisation constructions. Mesthrie illustrates that there are three distinct topicalisation processes and functions in BSAE. To repeat briefly, Left Dislocation, of the type exemplified by Wade's example of 'pronoun copying', is the most common. Mesthrie also illustrates that the process occurs in many dialects of L1 English, but not often to the extent that it does in BSAE: "the reason why people have found it necessary to point to its existence in L2 Englishes would appear to be that in these varieties topicalisation phenomena are not as restricted by register as they are in L1 Englishes," and therefore appear marked to speakers of English as L1 (1997: 124). BSAE most commonly uses Left Dislocation to topicalise subjects, but also occasionally objects, as in:

109. *<u>Tswana</u>, I learnt <u>it</u> in Pretoria.*

The other two topicalisation processes utilised in BSAE are Fronting and Focus Movement, neither of which make use of a copy pronoun. Fronting is used primarily to introduce contrasts or to list, but also to refer to given information:

(given)

110. *Q: But does she speak English?*

A: Yes, <u>English</u>, she's perfect

(contrast)

111. *Yah, I think* <u>*in Soweto*</u> *that thing was well planned.* <u>*In other townships*</u> *they just joined after being given some info.*

The third process, Focus Movement, is the least common, but is used to introduce new information or to give the value of an attribute, as in the extract below:

112. *Q: And how long did you live in East London?*
A: <u>*For my life*</u> *I'm there.*

The probable pragmatic functions of these topicalisation processes are also discussed. The purpose of Left Dislocation, for example, does not appear to be greatly different to its use in L1 varieties of (standard) English; that is, it is used to reintroduce information not mentioned for some time, and to list and contrast elements. However, it is also used in BSAE for a variety of other pragmatic functions, and in some cases, particularly after *because* or *the people*, seems to have no pragmatic function at all, but is rather lexically triggered. Mesthrie found that around 10% of left dislocation in his data base had no pragmatic function. Wade's (1997) and de Klerk and Gough's (2002) references to a need to compensate syntactically for the absence of intonation to emphasise elements, therefore, may well account for the higher prevalence of all three features.

The above studies deal with features of or processes in BSAE in isolation, whether they are isolated in lists or discussed separately; moreover, they discuss only those features which are markedly different from constructions found in standard English. Mesthrie (2003a), however, has developed a hypothesis which attempts to unify many of the reported features of the dialect, and to integrate these with several other features which have been overlooked, because they are not noticeable as 'errors' or deviations from standard English. Mesthrie's "undeletion hypothesis" posits that BSAE, from the upper mesolect, can and should be seen not as an error-ridden dialect filled with non-standardisms and deviations, but rather as a coherent system, the majority of whose differences from standard English can be characterised by a single phenomenon: that of undeletion. The term "undeletion" refers to the hypothesis that certain grammatical elements which can be or are deleted systematically in standard English, can be "undeleted" in BSAE. That is, they may appear in surface form,

where in standard English they do not. In effect, this could potentially result in BSAE being more regular than standard or other L1 Englishes, rather than less.

This first premise would account for many of those features of the dialect which have been noted, as above, in earlier studies, which were identified by their marked difference from standard English constructions: for example, the variable occurrence of infinitival *to* after verbs such as *make* and *let*. These are referred to as "overt undeletions." However, the hypothesis further posits that BSAE also makes variable use of "covert undeletions," which in fact occur also in standard English, but may not occur (and therefore are deleted) in other L2 or New English varieties. As a result of their occurrence in standard English, these features have not been remarked on – or indeed recognised as features at all – in earlier research.

Mesthrie's hypothesis is based on a data sample of recorded interviews with twelve (mid-)mesolectal speakers of BSAE. The features identified within this corpus as constituting undeletions are as follows:

Overt Undeletions:

- the presence of complementiser *that* in contexts where it is deleted in standard English, such as before direct speech quotations, or in clefted WH-constructions
- the presence of infinitival *to* after standard English 'bare infinitivals' *make* and *let*
- the presence of copy pronouns with Left Dislocation
- the presence of dummy *it* after *for... to* clauses, or after *as* in e.g. *as it can be seen* (S)
- the presence of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses
- the presence of *to be* in standard English small clauses
- the presence of non-finite copula *be* within standard English phrasal complements
- the occasional undeletion of elements in WH- constructions

Covert Undeletions:

- copula undeletion
- *do*-support
- un-Pro-drop
- ungapping

- unellipsis

(Mesthrie, 2003a)

The covert undeletions, therefore, appear unremarkable in comparison with standard English; however, as Mesthrie notes, the existence of such features in BSAE contrasts with other non-standard varieties in which the above features can be deleted. In addition to the previously neglected covert undeletions, it can also be seen from the list of overt undeletions that several more features not previously mentioned are identified.

The hypothesis is summed up (Mesthrie, 2003a) in the following principle (Principle 1):

> 1. If a grammatical feature can be deleted in standard English, it can be undeleted in BSAE mesolect.

Since such undeletions are not, nevertheless, mandatory, but are instead variable, this principle requires a corollary in order to account for those deletions which do in fact occur in BSAE. Moreover, since principle 1 could in theory apply to any dialect of English, Corollary 1 is necessary in order to save the principle from overgeneralisation:

> 1a. If a grammatical feature can be deleted in standard English, it can also be (variably) deleted in BSAE, at a lower rate of frequency.

In addition to these overt and covert undeletions, there exist several other features which, while not forming as coherent a set, are nevertheless related, and conform to the same broad pattern by overtly marking such grammatical elements as are deleted or unexpressed in standard English. This tendency, which covers features such as the double marking of clauses and others involving the use of an 'extra' or additional morpheme (where standard English does not), are included under Principle 2:

> 2. If a grammatical feature can't be deleted in standard English, it almost always can't be deleted in BSAE mesolect.

Thus in effect, principle 2 states that the features of BSAE seldom involve deletion; implicit in the hypothesis is the idea that BSAE is a system that retains 'deletable' elements wherever possible.

Mesthrie provides examples from his corpus which illustrate these processes of undeletion in BSAE. For overt undeletions - those which are disallowed or marked in standard English - he provides, firstly, the following examples to illustrate the undeletion of complementiser *that* when quoting direct speech, and in clefted wh-constructions:

113. *They'll just tell you that, "We have been using Fanakalo."*

114. *... but when I came here is when that I realised that something's wrong.*

The undeletion of infinitival *to* in BSAE, in contexts where standard English would require a bare infinitive (after *make*, *let*, or (variably) *help*), is illustrated in utterances such as the following:

115. *And even the teachers at school made us to hate the course.*

116. *My friends asked, "Why do you let your child to speak Zulu?"*

Dummy *it* is also undeleted in BSAE where it occurs in the standard only as a trace element (117 and 118); and the same occurs with resumptive pronouns in relative clauses (119 and 120):

117. *As I made it clear before, I am going to talk about solutions, not problems.*

118. *For her to use the word 'shame' it doesn't mean that there is no other word in Zulu.*

119. *Because my people are having their ideas which they... didn't create that by themselves.*

120. *But I knew, like, what I want, I'll get it.*

These resumptive pronouns are further examined in section 4. Left dislocation, which Mesthrie (1997) has shown can occur variably in certain registers of standard English (see section 1.1.1, and above), also appears to be unmarked in BSAE:

121. *The people who are essentially born in Soweto, they can speak Tsotsi.*

122. *Yes, most of them, I call them confused scholars.*

The undeletion of *to be* in standard English small clauses is illustrated as follows:

123. *It challenges me or it makes me to be challenged.*

The above example overlaps with the undeletion of infinitival *to* after *make*. Similarly, *be* is undeleted in what in standard English would be either phrasal complements or relative clauses:

124. *But this higher primary and lower primary still have schools being strictly for Tswana-speaking pupils.*

125. *But here now I find things are being tough.*

Finally, the undeletion of verbs in trace positions in certain *wh-* idioms can be seen in the following:

126. *Come what may come.*

Covert undeletions, of the type that are unmarked in standard English, have not previously been noted as a feature of BSAE because they accord with standard constructions. For example, the presence of the copula in equational constructions in BSAE has been seen as unremarkable: Mesthrie (2003a), however, argues that a fully adequate description of any dialect must take into account and integrate all of its features. Platt et al (1984: 78) have noted that such a linking verb "is sometimes not used in the New Englishes, particularly not in colloquial speech." They provide the following examples from (127) Singapore English and, more closely related to BSAE, (128) East African English[2]:

127. *This coffee house ^ very cheap.*

128. *This ^ my dialect.*

The presence of the copula therefore seems to be a significant feature of BSAE, particularly in comparison with other New Englishes; and so can be counted as an undeletion. As with all such features, copula non-deletion is variable in BSAE, but the amount of deletion is very rare: in Mesthrie's corpus, only 1.5%.

The presence of *do*-support also represents a covert undeletion, which has not been previously identified as a feature of the dialect, because it accords with standard English. Unlike many other New, and even some older, Englishes, Mesthrie notes that BSAE retains *do* in a "full range of functions: dummy auxiliary with questions and negatives, emphasis, ellipsis" (2003a: 25).

[2] Since this feature is not attributed to EAfE in any other contexts, it is not treated as one in 3.3 below.

Similarly, pro-drop - the deletion of anaphoric subject or object pronouns - which is seldom possible in standard English, is equally uncommon in BSAE (in Mesthrie's data, an estimated 0.9%). By contrast, Platt et al (1984: 117) claim that in many other New Englishes, "there is a tendency ... to imply the subject or the object pronoun of a sentence rather than state it explicitly," and they give an example from 'African English' - though presumably not BSAE, which they do not recognise as a New English variety:

129. *I'll give ^ to you.*

Thus the non-deletion of pronouns in BSAE appears to be a significant feature, although not one noted by earlier studies. As with the copula additions above, Mesthrie shows that BSAE occasionally retains a pronoun where idiomatic standard English would in fact delete it:

130. *Q: Do you have brothers and sisters?*
A: Yes, I have <u>them</u>.

The fourth covert undeletion mentioned is the lack of gapping in BSAE. While sentences such as the following are not common in colloquial standard English speech, such gapping is nevertheless permissible:

131. *Mary will be going to Paris, and John _ to Tucson.*

However, Mesthrie notes that no such examples occur in his data from BSAE. Moreover, a related, if not identical, feature of BSAE is the propensity for what Mesthrie refers to as "ungapping:" the inclusion of phrases which are more usually deleted in standard English, as below:

132. *I was good when it comes to writing <u>Afrikaans</u> and speaking <u>Afrikaans</u>.*
133. *Though he didn't <u>speak English</u> at home y'know, but he does <u>speak it</u> at work.*
134. *I can read <u>them</u> and write <u>them</u>.*

The third example, however, does demonstrate that BSAE, like standard English, has mandatory deletion of identical subjects under ordinary co-ordination: without such deletion, sentence (134) above would take the form:

135. *I can read them and I can write them.*

Mesthrie (2003a) also describes several related features, which are not seen as such clear-cut cases of undeletion. BSAE commonly marks clauses as explicitly related to one another by the use of a conjunction before each clause. In standard English this is usually restricted to *if... then* constructions; more commonly a single conjunction is used.

136. *Although I'm not that shy, but it's hard for me to make friends.*

137. *But with us having a chance, then I said, "Okay, let me give it a try."*

A similar though not identical feature is the use of double conjunctions, such as *supposing if* ('if'), *unless if* ('unless') or *because why* ('because'). BSAE also uses double comparatives, as in the following example:

138. *It's far more better than ours.*

Other features seen as displaying this tendency towards addition rather than deletion, in the addition of an extra morpheme, as opposed to the deletion of an element of standard English, are:

- the frequent use of BE + *-ing* in stative verb contexts;
- the use of *can be able* for 'can';
- the use of *that one* for anaphoric 'that';
- the presence of 'underlying' prepositions with (in the standard) non-phrasal or -prepositional verbs as in *mention (about), discuss (about)* and *voice (out)*;
- the use of *more of, most of* and *too much of* (the partitive genitive) for standard English 'more', 'most', and 'too much'.

Mesthrie further suggests that many other features of BSAE which have been noted (see e.g. de Klerk and Gough, 2002 above, this section), also demonstrate a tendency towards non-deletion of elements. These include the retention and regularisation of suffixes such as adverbial *–ly* and nominal *–s*; the pluralisation of non-count nouns; the regularisation of zero plurals (e.g. *sheeps*); and the occasional existence of double plurals (e.g. *childrens*). He also notes that de Klerk's more recent (2003) examination of BSAE (in the form of Xhosa English) does not mention the absence of 3rd person singular *–s* as a feature, despite earlier claims; and that in his own corpus, it is very rare.

From all of the above, therefore, flows Principle 3 as the "overwhelming tendency" in BSAE:

3. If X is a grammatical feature of BSAE mesolect, it almost always involves the presence of an item that is deletable or absent in standard English.

Thus the basic claims of Mesthrie's undeletion hypothesis - briefly, that features which can be deleted in standard English (or, in fact, in any other L1 or L2 Englishes), can be undeleted in BSAE; and that features of this dialect most commonly involve the addition of an element which is absent or deleted in many other Englishes – are clear. However, he also discusses potential exceptions to this tendency – cases of possible deletions in the variety. Firstly, the deletion of articles has been mentioned as a feature of BSAE by Gough (1996) de Klerk and Gough (2002) – see feature 2 in the list above. However, Mesthrie claims that this feature has been over-reported: in an examination of half of Mesthrie's own data-base (6 speakers), Morreira (2002) found that while article omission occurred only 89 times, standard uses of articles occurred 1202 times. Furthermore, contrasting instances of article insertion were found, before abstract nouns which are non-countable both syntactically and semantically:

139. *You might create a chaos.*

140. *You are going to have a trouble.*

He therefore suggests that the omission of articles, where this does occur, is more characteristic of basilectal BSAE than the mesolect, and that where it does occur in the latter, is residual. In de Klerk's (2003: 230-231) analysis of her own corpus of Xhosa English, she too found that the "use of *a* and *the* with non-count nouns" was prevalent, as was "generalising the use of *a* before any noun phrase."

Another possible case of deletion in BSAE is the deletion of object pronouns, illustrated by the following examples from Mesthrie's corpus:

141. *The students are boycotting.*

142. *I try to accommodate.*

143. *You are not supporting enough.*

Mesthrie suggests that it is possible that such phrases could be seen as equivalent to *are on boycott, to be accommodating,* and *not being supportive enough* respectively. A further possible deletion occurs with verbs of motion, in a sentence such as the following:

144. *We are _from his room* (= we are coming from)

While he acknowledges that this may be a genuine counter-example, he also notes that it may be idiomatic and lexically governed, rather than grammatically: the deletion of *coming* before the preposition *to* is not permissible:

145. **I am _ to your room*

The use of adjectives as substantives, which can be seen as representing the deletion of the noun, can similarly be viewed as lexically-based; particularly since the set of such adjectives used is small, and the referent of these substantives is always the same. Hence, *the rurals* is used for 'the rural people'; *tertiary* for tertiary education, and *a Zulu-speaking* for 'a Zulu-speaking person'.

Finally, the deletion of comparative particles has been found to occur in BSAE, as in other African Englishes:

146. *My school was one of the ^ radical schools you can ever find*

However, this appears to be rare, and Mesthrie again suggests that it may be residual in the mesolect; the above sentence is the only such example in his data-base. More common was the opposite feature - the use of double comparative forms (as above):

147. *It's far <u>more better</u> than ours.*

148. *He <u>preferred</u> Tswana <u>more than</u> Sotho.*

Thus counter-examples to the undeletion hypothesis are rare, and in many cases the evidence is inconclusive; while Mesthrie's claims as to the general avoidance of deletion in BSAE are convincing. Before summarising the main features of the variety, for purposes of comparison with other African Englishes, we will turn to the most recent description of BSAE, Mesthrie (2004), which in itself provides a useful summary which includes the claims of the undeletion hypothesis. Here, only those features from Mesthrie (2004) which have not been mentioned above will be discussed.

Mesthrie's 2004 description too focuses on mesolectal varieties of BSAE, those whose speakers "speak English fluently, but with phonetic and grammatical norms that are different from 'Cultivated' [South African English]" (p962). Turning firstly to the tense-aspect-modality systems of the variety, he notes that "the broad PRESENT –

PAST – FUTURE tense distinction of (Standard English) is unaltered in (BSAE)".; variation is found only in the combinations of tense and aspect that may occur (p962). Mesthrie suggests that the past perfect (*have* + *-en*) is often replaced by the simple past, for example in a subordinate clause which is preceded by a past-tense main clause:

149. *She said she came looking for me* (= 'she said she had come looking for me')

De Klerk and Gough's (2002) claim that *–s* may be found in past tense contexts in BSAE is mentioned; however, Mesthrie found no such examples in his own data base.

Differences in modality between BSAE and other South African varieties of English include the occurrence of the phrase *can be able*, as mentioned above, as well as its negative counterpart *can't be able*. Mesthrie raises the possibility that there may be a semantic distinction between *can* and *can be able*, with the former restricted to deontic contexts, and the latter permissible for both deontic and epistemic. However, he concludes that it is more likely that the explanation for the occurrence of this feature can be found in the analogy between *can* and other modals (*shall*, *may*, *must*, *might* etc), which do occur in the standard with *be able*.

A further difference in modality concerns overlaps between modals; the present forms *can* and *will* are sometimes used in irrealis contexts where the standard would use *could* and *would*:

150. *Maybe it can be in Computer Science* (= it could have been in [the field of] Computer Science)

Similarly, *can* is sometimes used where standard English would use *might*:

151. *I said, "No, they can be wild, but they're human beings."* (= 'they might be wild...')

Can is also used in combination with *know*: *I can know* is translatable in standard English as 'I knew' or 'I could tell'. Other features found concerning these modals include the occasional use of *may* as a polite form of irrealis *could*:

152. *May you please lend me a pen* (= 'could you...)

Other than the above modals, Mesthrie claims that the uses of auxiliaries in BSAE are close to standard.

Verb phrase negation has not been mentioned in any description of BSAE, and Mesthrie notes that it does not appear to differ from the standard. However, as in many African Englishes (see section 2.1. above), the response pattern to *yes/no* questions is different. In practice, this affects only the replies to questions couched in the negative; however, Mesthrie argues that the underlying logic of answering both positive and negative questions differs in BSAE, as well as in many other New Englishes. This logic, he claims, echoes that of Bantu and West African languages. In responding to both positive and negative forms of *yes/no* questions, speakers of BSAE answer *yes* if the verb form is positive and the underlying statement is true; but *no* if the verb form is positive and the statement is false. Thus far, no communication problems will occur between speakers of BSAE and another (L1) variety of English. If, however, the verb form in the question is negative, BSAE speakers will answer *yes* if the (negative) statement is true, and *no* if it is not. Here, misunderstandings may arise, since in this case the responses differ in meaning from those of speakers of the standard. To use Mesthrie's (2004: 966) illustration:

153. *Q: Is he arriving tomorrow?*
A: Yes (= he is)

154. *Q: Isn't he arriving tomorrow?*
A: Yes (= he isn't)

Thus while the logic underlying the responses to both questions above is the same (conceding the accuracy of the proposition), only the second is in surface form different to the standard English response. Mesthrie therefore suggests that dialects of English may similarly differ in other ways in their grammar, despite similar surface structures.

In terms of agreement features, Mesthrie reports that there is very little difference between BSAE and standard English. Apart from the occasional loss of third person singular *–s*, there is some syncretism between *it* and *they/them*, although only in anaphoric contexts such as below; as referential pronouns the distinction is upheld:

155. *Both things I have to do it* (= 'I have to do both things')

There is also, as above, some variability between the gendered pronouns *he* and *she*, as well as their case marked forms *his* and *her*, and *him* and *her*.

Mesthrie also mentions the occurrence in lower sociolects of BSAE of a possessive pronoun following the noun it modifies, resulting in phrases such as *father of me* for 'my father'. Second person plural pronoun forms such as *you people*, with genitive form *your peoples'* are also reported to occur occasionally.

These, then, are the most recently-reported features of BSAE. Since these features are numerous, it is not possible for reasons of space to compare each one with every feature of other African Englishes. Instead, I will here summarise what appear to be the most significant structural features of BSAE, in order to compare such a list with the compiled features of other African Englishes in section 3.3.

3.2. Summarised features of BSAE

The features to be discussed in comparison with those of other African Englishes include those of Mesthrie (2003a and 2004), incorporating the undeleted features, both overt and covert; and those of de Klerk and Gough (2002), among others. Where a 'syntactic' feature appears to be wholly lexically triggered, this has been omitted from the list, unless otherwise stated. The features themselves have been described above, and their prevalence discussed: in general, where a feature appears to be very rare, it is not included. However, those rare features that are included are indicated as such in section 3.3 below. Moreover, BSAE features that seem to be wholly absent from any descriptions of other African Englishes have likewise been omitted; but some of these differences will be discussed below.

The features, therefore, are:

- The deletion of 3rd person singular present tense *–s*
- The use of simple past for past perfect tense
- The use of BE + *-ing* in stative contexts
- The use of BE + *-ing* for habitual ('used to') aspect
- Present tense modals in irrealis contexts
- The occurrence of *can be able*
- The occurrence of new phrasal and prepositional verb forms
- The deletion of prepositions after standard English phrasal verbs
- The use of non-count nouns as count nouns

- The (variable) omission of articles
- The (variable) insertion of articles
- The conflation of gender in pronouns
- The deletion of comparative particles
- The use of double comparatives
- The use of double conjunctions marking both clauses
- The occurrence of double conjunctions marking a single clause
- Subject/auxiliary inversion in reported questions
- The use of invariant question tags
- Differing *Yes/no* questions answer pattern
- Left Dislocation
- Fronting and Focus Movement
- The undeletion of *that*
- The undeletion of *to* after verbs *let*, *make* and *help*
- Variation in verbal complements (other than *make…to* etc)
- Ungapping and unellipsis
- The covert undeletions: copula undeletion, *do*-support, un-Pro-drop
- The occurrence of (undeleted) resumptive pronouns in relative clauses

3.3. BSAE features compared to other African Englishes

Using the descriptions of East African English (Schmied, 2004), Cameroon English (Mbangwana, 2004), Ghanaian English (Huber and Dako, 2004) and Nigerian English (Alo and Mesthrie, 2004) in *A Handbook of Varieties of English* (Kortmann et al, 2004), as well as other sources, where relevant and available, the above features of BSAE (see 3.2) are compared with those reported for these other varieties. Where a feature of BSAE is not reported as occurring in one of the varieties discussed, this is noted; and where an example of the feature in another variety is provided, this is included.

- **Deleted 3rd person singular present tense *–s***

East African English (EAfE): Although Mesthrie (2003a) finds that this feature is very rare in BSAE, Schmied (2004) claims that in East African English, encompassing the varieties of English spoken in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, the

164. *I am smelling something burning.*

165. *I am hearing you.*

166. *It is tasting terrible.*

They relate the use of these verbs of perception in this way to transfer from substrate Nigerian languages, where "verbs of perception freely take the progressive" (p815). However, this use of BE + *-ing* is also extended to other stative verbs, as in other African Englishes:

167. *We are having something to do.*

- **The use of BE + *-ing* for habitual aspect**

EAfE: Schmied does not report the use of past tense BE + *-ing* for habitual. However, he does (as above) give an example of its present tense use as habitual:

168. *It is really very toxic to the user because it produces a lot of smoke heavy smoke and it is smelling.*

CamE: Mbangwana does not report this feature. However, an example he gives as an illustration of a different feature suggests that this usage might occur:

169. *The other teacher that we were teaching English with her went away*

It is at least possible that this sentence could imply the past habitual '...who we used to teach English with'.

GhE: Huber and Dako do not report the feature in GhE.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie do not report the feature in NigE.

- **The use of present tense modals in irrealis contexts**

EAfE: Schmied refers to a general avoidance of conditionals in EAfE; but does not specifically mention the preferred use of *can* and *will* for *could* and *would.*

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako report the direct opposite of this feature in GhE: the variety in fact commonly uses *would* in place of *will*; and, less frequently, *could* in place of *can.* These conditionals are therefore used to express definite future:

170. *We hereby wish to inform you that the meeting would take place on Thursday.*

171. *We are hoping that he could finish it by tomorrow.*

However, they also note that GhE rarely uses the irrealis modal forms to show politeness; requests are usually made in the form of what would be interpreted as 'orders' in standard English. Since, however, these do not involve the use of the present tense modals, this usage is not comparable to BSAE.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report that this feature does occur in NigE, where "in the expression of politeness the present form of modals is preferred to the standard, (indirect) past forms" (p815):

172. *I will like to see you, sir.*

NigE in fact goes further than BSAE in this direction by also using *shall* for *should* and *may* for *might*.

- **The occurrence of *can be able***

EAfE: Schmied does not report the feature in EAfE.

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako do not report the feature in GhE.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report that *can be able* occurs in NigE as an equivalent of *can* or *be able*. No example is provided. Interestingly, the authors also report the use of *must have to*, another apparent 'double modal' form not reported in other varieties.

- **The occurrence of new phrasal and prepositional verb forms**

EAfE: Schmied notes that in EAfE "patterns and particles of phrasal verbs vary" (p930). As in BSAE, EAfE may substitute alternative prepositions, or add prepositions to verbs which take none in standard English. He therefore provides the examples *attach with* (for *to*), *concentrate with* (for *on*), and *result into/to* (for *in*); and *advocate for*, *mention about*, and *join with*. He also adds that the addition of prepositions appears to be the most common type of such variation in EAfE.

CamE: Mbangwana (1992) reports the substitution in CamE of alternative prepositions after certain phrasal/prepositional verbs. He gives as examples *scheduled against* (for 'scheduled for'), and *congratulate for* (for 'congratulate on'). The addition of a preposition to create a new prepositional verb is exemplified by *consider as* (for 'consider').

GhE: Huber and Dako report both the substitution and addition of prepositions with (phrasal) verbs in GhE, and exemplify the former:

173. *Put off the gas before you leave.*

174. *The audience is invited to cheer their favourite team up.*

175. *He was charged for stealing a goat.*

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie likewise report both the substitution and addition of prepositions to NigE phrasal and (in the standard) non-phrasal verbs. As examples they give *congratulate for*, and *cope up, discuss about*, and *voice out.*

- **The deletion of prepositions after standard English phrasal verbs**

EAfE: No descriptions of BSAE report the deletion of prepositions after phrasal and prepositional verbs. However, Schmied reports that EAfE deletes prepositions after certain standard English phrasal verbs such as *pick* (for 'pick up'), *crop* (for 'crop up') and *provide* (for 'provide with'). As mentioned above, however, he does claim that the addition of prepositions seems to be more common than either their deletion or substitution. Skandera (1999), however, found that at least in Kenyan English (KenE), the forms *pick* (for 'pick up') and *fill a form* (for 'fill in a form') occur variably even in educated KenE, and do not appear to be stigmatised.

CamE: Mbangwana (1992) reports the deletion of prepositions following certain phrasal/prepositional verbs in CamE, such as *pick* (for 'pick up'), *supply* (for 'supplied with') and fill (for 'fill in'.)

GhE: Huber and Dako note that particle omission after standard English phrasal verbs occurs in GhE, but give no examples.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report that NigE may omit the prepositions which follow certain verbs in standard English, such as *dispose* (for 'dispose of'), *operate* (for 'operate on') and *reply* (for 'reply to').

- **Non-count nouns used as count nouns**

EAfE: Schmied claims that "(EAfE) usage basically ignores the grammatical distinction of count vs. non-count nouns" (p 932), though he claims that, at least for the noun *advice*, "the pluralisation *advices*...seems to be less frequent than *an advice*" (p929). This may also be related to the general loss of plural marking he reports in EAfE. Nevertheless, his example shows the plural form:

176. *These advices are coming because they've already studied all of us.*

CamE: Mbangwana (1992) reports the frequent pluralisation of non-count nouns in CamE, and provides examples such as *properties, staffs, furnitures* and *fowls*. However, he does not mention the singular use of these nouns with an article.

GhE: Huber and Dako note that this is a salient feature of GhE, and their examples include both pluralisations as well as singular uses with an indefinite article. They also mention the treatment of some count nouns as non-count, which has not been reported for the other varieties.

NigE: The feature is also reported by Alo and Mesthrie as occurring in NigE, and although their examples show only pluralisations, Jowitt (1991) gives examples of these nouns used in the singular.

- **The (variable) omission of articles**

EAfE: In BSAE this feature is rare. For EAfE, Schmied reports that "articles and other determiners tend to be omitted" (p932), although his examples suggest that it is the definite article which is more commonly omitted.

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako report that "GhE omits articles that are required in BrE (British English), inserts articles where there are none in BrE, and also ignores distinctions of definiteness that are made in BrE" (p859). Particularly, the definite article is commonly omitted before the names of national and international bodies:

177. *She just arrived from ^ United States of America*

It is also deleted when the head of the NP is post-modified with an *of*-phrase:

178. *He called for ^ abolition of the death penalty.*

However, such post-modification may also result in levelling of definiteness distinctions, by analogy:

179. *He started at an early age of 15.* (by analogy with 'at an early age')

The definite and indefinite articles may be omitted even by highly-educated speakers of GhE:

180. *I want to buy ^ car.*

181. *She was on her way to ^ bank.*

Omission of an article before *majority (of)/minority (of)* appears to be categorical. Finally, there is variation between *a few* and *few*, which seem to be used interchangeably.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report "a noticeable tendency towards the omission of articles" in NigE (p820). They also note the occurrence of unstressed *one* as the indefinite article, and the occasional substitution of *the* for *a*, although not, apparently, vice-versa. There is also a tendency to omit the article before countable nouns when these function as the object of certain high-frequency and semantically full verbs, which is present even among educated speakers. Hence *get ^ contract, have ^ bath, make ^ mistake.* The authors note that this particular tendency may be due either to analogy with standard English phrases such as *give notice* and *make mischief*, or to the reclassification of these nouns as uncountable.

- **The (variable) insertion of articles**

EAfE: Schmied shows that this feature does occur in EAfE: where noun-count nouns are treated as countable, they may be used with an article.

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: As above, Huber and Dako claim that GhE does insert articles where they are not required in the standard. Contrary to the omission of articles before the names of national/international bodies, the definite article is often inserted before the name of a commercial establishment or public facility:

182. *He was appointed sales representative at the Nestlé, Ghana Ltd.*

Articles are also inserted before non-count nouns used as count, when these are in the singular; as plurals, these nouns may take a definite article:

183. *Congratulations for a good work done!*

184. *You should have seen the furnitures!*

NigE: Jowitt (1991) reports that the feature occurs in NigE when standard non-count nouns are used as singular count nouns.

- **The conflation of gender in pronouns**

EAfE: Schmied reports that EAfE uses all 3rd person singular pronouns "indiscriminately", and claims that the difference of only one consonant between *he* and *she* results in these two being the most commonly conflated. He relates this feature to mother-tongue interference, as well as suggesting that it may be accounted for by simplification.

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako note the presence of this feature in GhE, and they too relate it to the lack of gender distinction in Ghanaian mother tongues:

185. *He is called Mary.*

This loss of gender distinction is found even in the speech of highly educated users. It occurs too with nominals: in GhE, *Master* and *Madam, nephew* and *niece*, appear to be in free variation.

However, the authors find that in the case of possessive determiners, gender variation is not completely random; there is a tendency for the determiner to select the gender of the noun it modifies:

186. *He was looking for her aunt.*

187. *She thought his husband had travelled.*

NigE: Jowitt (1991) notes that in Southern Nigeria, *he* and *she* may be used interchangeably.

- **The deletion of comparative particles**

EAfE: Schmied does not report the feature in EAfE. However, Bokamba (1982) does report that this feature occurs in Kenyan English, though examples from this specific variety are not given.

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako do not report the feature in GhE. However, Bokamba (1982) also reports that this feature occurs in GhE, among others, although examples from this specific variety are not given.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report that in NigE, the comparative may be marked singly, either by using only *than* (hence deleting *more* or the comparative suffix *–er*), or less commonly, by using only the comparative form of the adjective (deleting *than*). They give examples only of the former construction:

188. *It is the youths who are ^ skilful in performing tasks than the adults.*

189. *He has ^ money than his brother.*

- **The use of double comparatives**

EAfE: Schmied does not report the feature in EAfE. However, Bokamba (1982) includes this feature as one occurring in KenE, GhE and NigE.

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako do not report the feature in GhE. However, Bokamba (1982) includes this feature as one occurring in KenE, GhE and NigE.
NigE: Alo and Mesthrie do not report the feature in NigE, but Jowitt (1991) reports that NigE uses double comparative forms such as *more better* and *more superior*.

- **The use of double conjunctions marking both clauses**

EAfE: Schmied does not report the feature in EAfE.
CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.
GhE: Huber and Dako do not report the feature in GhE.
NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report that this feature does occur in NigE, in much the same form as in BSAE:

190. *Although he is rich but he is stingy.*

- **The occurrence of combined conjunctions marking a single clause**

EAfE: Schmied does not report the feature in EAfE.
CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.
GhE: Huber and Dako (p863) report the use of *and then* as a sentence coordinator in informal spoken GhE, "especially where there is a perceived temporal order or causal relationship between the coordinated sentences" (191), but also where there is no such obvious relationship between constituents (192):

191. *I woke up and then found that the television was still on.*

192. *You take beans and then plantains.*

This is, however, the only such 'double' conjunction; and the authors do not refer to it as such. Nevertheless, it appears related to similar such forms found in other varieties.
NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report combinations of conjunctions in NigE such as *should in case* and *on my way going*, and give an example of another of these combinations:

193. *He has been in this school for five years, still yet he is not tired.*

- **Subject/auxiliary inversion in reported questions**

EAfE: Schmied too reports that in EAfE "the basic interrogative word order is maintained in indirect speech and questions" (p936):

194. *I would like to know as to where and when are you going to have your celebrations...*

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE. He does, however, note that inversion in direct yes/no questions does *not* occur; such questions take the form of statements, spoken with a rising (interrogative) tone.

GhE: Huber and Dako do not report the feature in GhE.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie do not report the feature, but Jowitt (1991) provides the following example:

195. *He asked me what was the time.*

- ***Yes/no* questions answer pattern differs**

EAfE: Schmied claims that this is an "occasional habit" in EAfE; where it does occur, the response pattern is the same as that in BSAE (p936):

196. *Q: These problems are uh not biological?*
- *A: Yes, they're not biological factor*

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako describe this feature as "a constant source of confusion for the overseas visitor...as far as negative questions are concerned" (p857). Their example demonstrates that the source of the confusion is the same as that in the other varieties in which the feature occurs. However, speakers of GhE are also likely to state their answer directly without the use of *yes* or *no*:

197. *Q: Isn't your mother at home?*

A: Yes (= she is not at home)

OR: *She is there.*

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie note that "NigE appears to be quite similar" to BSAE in its response pattern (p817). Their illustration demonstrates this:

198. *Q: Didn't Ayo receive his award?*

A: Yes (he didn't) or *No (he did).*

- **The use of invariant question tags**

EAfE: Schmied reports the use of invariant *isn't it* as a question tag in EAfE, or less frequently *is it*. However, the two are used indiscriminately with both positively and negatively posed questions. He also mentions the occasional use of *not so* as a question tag.

CamE: Mbangwana reports that CamE too uses *isn't it* as an invariant question tag. Less frequently, the invariant tags *nay, not so, ein, is that, right* and *okay* may also be used interchangeably.

GhE: Huber and Dako do not report this feature in GhE.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report that *isn't it* is also the favoured question tag in NigE

- **Left Dislocation**

EAfE: Schmied reports that the feature does occur in EAfE, "more liberal(ly)" than in standard English, as is the case in BSAE. It is most common "after long and complex subjects, (and) because of prepositional constructions" (p933):

199. *So human being in the first time of his existence he found that he was subjected to the work.*

Schmied mentions this feature as identical to the use of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses; however, from his examples it is clear that both features occur (see below). A possibly related feature in EAfE is the occasional use of a stressed reflexive pronoun placed before, and repeated as, a personal pronoun.

CamE: Mbangwana reports that left dislocation is "a regular feature of CamE" (p906), and gives the following example:

200. *Martina's aunt she works in the Ministry of Public Health.*

GhE: Huber and Dako too report that "spoken GhE has a strong tendency towards left-dislocation" with pronominal apposition (p862), as below:

201. *That woman she cheated me.*

They also note that, in the first person only, left dislocation may occur even when the 'copied' NP is a pronoun:

202. *Me I cannot come.*

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie also report left dislocation in NigE, where it is "commonly used" (p823):

203. *The politicians and their supporters, they don't often listen to advice.*

It occurs not only with complex subjects, as above, but also with simple ones:

204. *The students they are demonstrating again.*

- **Fronting and focus movement**

EAfE: Schmied does not report the feature in EAfE.

CamE: Mbangwana does not report the feature in CamE.

GhE: Although Huber and Dako do not explicitly identify the following as an example of fronting, it appears to indicate the presence of this topicalisation feature in GhE:

205. *After church I'll come.*

However, without the context in which this sentence is uttered, is does not seem possible to determine whether it is an example of fronting or of focus movement.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie do not report the feature in NigE.

- **The undeletion of complementiser *that***

EAfE: Schmied does not mention the use of complementisers, in standard or non-standard positions, in EAfE. Simo Bobda (2000) mentions the use of *what* as complementiser after *all* in KenE, but this is not comparable to the BSAE feature.

CamE: Mbangwana does not report this use of the complementiser in CamE; as discussed below, however, he discusses the recategorisation of certain verbs to take a direct object and *that* + S complement. This does not, however, seem comparable to the BSAE usage. A further use of *that* in CamE is the ability of *that*-complement clauses to stand alone as *sui generis* clauses, as in the example (taken from a literary source):

206. *That Kwifon has asked me to greet all the young mothers and to give to him.*

'I wish to inform you that Kwifon has asked me to greet all the young mothers... on his behalf.'

That-clauses in CamE can also replace adverbial clauses of reason in BrE:

207. *He is crying that I have eaten his food*

'He is crying because I have eaten his food.'

Additionally, Mbangwana (1992) reports the use of *what* as complementiser after *all*. However, none of these usages of *that* are comparable to those in BSAE; there therefore does not seem to be any evidence for the undeletion of *that* in CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako do not mention non-standard uses of *that* as a feature of GhE. Jowitt (1991) mentions the use of *what* as complementiser after *all* in GhE (see under NigE below), but this is not comparable to the BSAE feature.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie do not report any non-standard uses of *that* in NigE. However, they do include the use of *what* as complementiser in place of *that* after *all*:

208. *All what he said was false.*

Again, however, this is not comparable to the BSAE feature.

- **The deletion and undeletion of infinitival *to***

EAfE: Schmied reports the deletion of infinitival *to* after verbs such as *allow* (*allow him ^ go*); and the undeletion of *to* after *make* (*made him to do it*). He attributes both of these constructions to analogy with their semantic equivalents *let... go* and *forced... to do.*

CamE: Simo Bobda (2000) reports the deletion of *to* in CamE in constructions such as *enable/allow/permit someone ^ do something*; and the undeletion of *to* after *make*, in *make someone to do something.*

GhE: Huber and Dako do not report either feature in GhE.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report the deletion of infinitival *to* after certain verbs, as in:

209. *... enable him ^ do it*

They also note that undeleted *to* occurs in NigE after *make*:

210. *Make her to do her work.*

- **Variation in (other) verbal complements**

EAfE: Schmied reports variation in verb complementation in EAfE; this is mainly between *to* infinitives and gerunds:

211. *Would you mind to tell us uh a brief background about ICAC...*

212. *He has indicated to want to stop to deliver what he has.*

Although Schmied highlights only the *stop to deliver* non-standard complementation in (212) above, it can also be seen that in *indicated to want*, the infinitive *to want* replaces *that S.*

CamE: Mbangwana shows that verbs such as *phone, insult* and *mock* in CamE seem to have been recategorised so that they take an object + *that S* complement in the same way as *tell* does in standard English:

213. *He phoned me that he is coming*

214. *He insulted me that I am a thief.*

215. *He mocked me that I failed my exams.*

However, there is no mention of other forms of complementiser variation in CamE, of the sort that occurs in other African Englishes.

GhE: Huber and Dako note that *to*-infinitive and *–ing* forms in GhE are also often used interchangeably:

216. *He considered to leave before sunrise*

217. *The government wishes eradicating poverty.*

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report the occurrence of *to*-infinitives in place of *–ing* in NigE in instead of + NP constructions:

218. *Instead of him to travel home for the vacation...*

They also describe a related usage, where gerunds in *–ing* are avoided after *to* in expressions like *be used to.* This results in common NigE constructions such as *is used to go, looks forward to go*, and *object to go.*

- **The covert undeletions: the copula, *do*-support, and un-Pro-drop.**

EAfE: Schmied does not refer to copula deletion, loss of *do*-support, or pro-drop as features of EAfE; these covert undeletions, therefore, can presumably be said to be features of this variety.

CamE: Mbangwana too does not list the potential deletions as a feature of CamE.

GhE: Huber and Dako do not list the deletions as a feature of GhE.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie do not list these deletions as a feature of NigE.

- **'Unellipsis' and 'ungapping'**

EAfE: Schmied does not report the feature in EAfE.

CamE: Mbangwana gives examples of what he refers to as the avoidance of anaphoric nouns in CamE sentences where they are preferred in BrE. However, these resemble Mesthrie's (2003a) examples of 'unellipsis' very closely, suggesting that this is indeed a feature of CamE:

219. *We have names like Nathana, Clara and Joel which are familiar names.*

220. *You have bought clothing items like shirts, trousers, hats and gloves which are common clothings.*

GhE: Huber and Dako do not report the feature in GhE.

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie do not report the feature in NigE.

- **The occurrence of (undeleted) resumptive pronouns in relative clauses**

This final feature will be further discussed below, in a more detailed examination of relativisation processes across these African Englishes. Here, only a basic indication of the presence or absence of the feature in the varieties is given.

EAfE: Schmied reports the occurrence of 'redundant pronouns' in EAfE relative clauses:

221. *There is our glue which we are getting them near.*

CamE: Mbangwana reports the occurrence of this feature in CamE :

222. *There are some students whom I am teaching them to write.*

223. *The other teacher that we were teaching English with her went away.*

GhE: Huber and Dako report the tendency in GhE for the surfacing of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses:

224. *The book that I read it.*

225. *The old woman who I gave her the money.*

NigE: Alo and Mesthrie report that "NigE allows resumptive pronouns in non-subject relativisation" (p818):

226. *The guests whom I invited them have arrived.*

The above features, therefore, all occur in BSAE as well as at least one other variety of African English, except where stated. However, as indicated, in many cases they are not realised in precisely the same way or to the same extent in each variety. Before further differences and similarities are discussed, it will be useful to examine the distribution of the features in table form (Table 1 – presented overleaf):

Table 1: Feature distribution in African Englishes

Feature :	**BSAE**	**NigE**	**EAfE**	**GhE**	**CamE**
resump. pro	+	+	+	+	+
non-count as count	+	+	+	+	+
new prep V	+	+	+	+	+
left dislocation	+	+	+	+	+
covert undel.	+	+	+	+	+
BE + *-ing* stative	+	+	+	+	?
insert art.	+	+	+	+	-
V comp. variation	+	+	+	+	-
del. comparatives	+	+	+	+	-
pro gender confl.	+	+	+	+	-
yes/no qu. answer pattern	+	+	+	+	-
double comparatives	+	+	+	+	-
invariant tags	+	+	+	-	(+)
undel. *to*	+	+	+	-	(+)
simple past for past perfect	+	(-)	+	(?)	(+)
del. prep after V	(-)	+	+	(+)	(+)
3sg *-s* del.	+	+	+	-	-
omit art.	?	+	+	(+)	-
del. *to*	(-)	+	+	-	(+)
avoid irrealis modals	+	+	?	-	-
Inversion in reported qu.	+	+	+	-	-
BE + *-ing* habitual	+	(-)	+	-	(?)
combined conjunctions	+	+	-	(?)	-
can be able to	+	+	-	-	-
double conjunctions	+	+	-	-	-
ungapping/ unellipsis	+	-	-	-	(+)
fronting/focus m.	+	-	-	(?)	-
undel. *that*	+	-	-	-	-

(see overleaf for key)

Key to Table 1:

+ The feature has been reported in the variety

- The feature has not been reported in the variety

? There is some indication that the feature occurs in the variety, but it has not been specifically reported

(The presence of brackets surrounding the contents of the cells indicates lack of fit with the implicational scale; this is discussed below.)

Table 1 has been arranged as a possible implicational scale, in order that the pattern in which the individual features are grouped across the varieties, and the groupings into which the varieties themselves fall, can more easily be seen. The data is not ideal for the creation of an implicational scale: further, preferably corpus-based, research is necessary to determine the extent to which features occur (as opposed to a binary positive or negative value); and the data on which this assessment of the presence or absence of a feature is made has not been collected under comparable conditions by the various authors from whose work it is drawn. Nevertheless, it is possible to recognise possible implications within the table, which are discussed below. Firstly, however, the issue of scalability must be dealt with. Rickford (2002: 157) claims that an implicational scale requires a minimum of 90% scalability in order to be considered valid; but recommends 93% scalability as ideal. Calculating scalability by the proportion of non-deviant cells (i.e. those which are represented by '+' or '?' above the line; and '-' below) out of the total of filled cells – here, 124 out of 140 – the scalability of table 1 is 88.57%. While this does not meet Rickford's criteria, it nevertheless seems a considerably high figure, considering the imperfections of the data. Rickford also notes that 85% scalability has been accepted as an indication of validity in a number of earlier linguistic studies. However, it must be noted that, calculated in this way, the implications cannot be seen as entirely reliable.

Nevertheless, until further results are available, the scale can be taken as an indication of the likely implications that may be found, and several initial observations can be made at this point. Firstly, five of the BSAE features (resumptive pronouns, the use of non-count nouns as count, the creation of new phrasal/prepositional verbs, left dislocation, and the covert undeletions) have been reported as occurring in the other four varieties; and the sixth (the use of BE + -*ing* with stative verbs) is reported in four but likely occurs in all five. These could, therefore, be regarded as the 'core' features

of (at least these) African Englishes. The six features are not as yet arranged in any particular order: in order for such a rating scheme to be made, reliable statistical data on their prevalence in the varieties would have to be gathered.

A further six features are shared by all the varieties with the exception of CamE. Differences between CamE and other African Englishes have been related to the influence of French in the country by Simo Bobda (1994a), although he discusses the French influence only with regard to lexical features. The existence of this second European L2, however, could be seen as responsible for some syntactic dissimilarities. Mbangwana (1992) suggests that it is the influence of French which results in the reversal of order in CamE compounds such as *tie-head* for *head-tie*.

A second observation that can be made is that degrees of similarity to BSAE can also be seen from the table. The ordering of the varieties from left to right represents the degree of closeness between the varieties and BSAE: NigE, sharing the most features (20) with BSAE, is closest, while EAfE, sharing 18, is further to the right. This particular result is slightly unexpected: there are significant parallels in the history of English in the southern and eastern territories of the continent, which are likely to have had similar influences on the formation of these New varieties. NigE, on the other hand, as a West African variety thought to be influenced by WAPE and various Creoles, was not expected to show such a strong degree of similarity with either BSAE or EAfE. The other two West African English varieties, GhE and CamE, have less in common with BSAE, which is the result that could have been expected: CamE shares only 9 reported features with BSAE (although a further 2 are possible), while GhE shares a reported 11, though again, a further 5 are possible.

A third point which emerges from the table is the surprising lack of obvious similarity between the West African Englishes. They do not seem to form a noticeable group, which again, as a result of similar pidgin/Creole influence in the region, might have been anticipated. However, although they cannot be fully discussed here - since the issue lies largely outside of the scope of this dissertation - there are several further features of these varieties which do not occur in BSAE or EAfE, and which may well be related to the different linguistic contexts in which the varieties developed. Additionally, there are some features of EAfE which do not occur in BSAE either, but

are found in some of the West African varieties. In order to provide a fuller picture of the range of English constructions in Africa, these additional features are listed below (this section); however, only minimal description can be provided.

Before turning to these features, however, the issue of the BSAE features which do not occur in any of the other African Englishes above should be noted. Of these, the most significant group is that of the undeletions. Only the covert undeletions - those that are seldom mentioned because they coincide with standard norms – are generally found, and in fact occur in all five varieties. The non-inclusion of the features of pro-drop, copula deletion, and loss of *do*-support, in fact, suggests that the covert undeletions may be almost categorical in the other varieties, as they are in BSAE (Mesthrie, 2003a). 'Unellipsis', however, seems only to occur also in CamE. Of the overt undeletions, the occurrence of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses is reported in all five varieties, though in all it is only occasionally present (this feature is dealt with in more detail in section 4). The surfacing of infinitival *to* after the verb *make* is found in EAfE, CamE and NigE. However, it is only after this single verb that the undeletion is reported; and perhaps more significantly, its opposite feature is also found in all three varieties. No other overt undeletions are reported in the African English varieties, although some of Mesthrie's 'related features' can be found: double conjunctions marking each clause occur also in NigE, as do 'combined' conjunctions, at least one example of which also seems to occur in GhE. Double comparatives, too, are found in NigE. Left dislocation, with the use of a copy pronoun, occurs in all five as mentioned above. Overall, however, the overt undeletions do not seem to be characteristic of African Englishes as a whole in the way that they are of BSAE.

Undeletion – and particularly overt undeletion - as a feature of African English(es), then, does not seem to be prevalent. If, as Mesthrie (2003a) has suggested, all English varieties can be seen to lie on a continuum between 'deleting' and 'undeleting' dialects, the four African Englishes here discussed lie closer to the centre of this continuum than does BSAE.

Nevertheless, the degree of similarity between the African Englishes is considerable; and particularly that between BSAE, EAfE and NigE. Although table 1 as an implicational scale is imperfect, largely as a result of the lack of quantitative data, it

can nevertheless be taken as an initial indication of a hierarchy of feature representation within the varieties, until further research either confirms or negates the implications. Before proceeding to section 4, further reported features that are shared by the Englishes but do not occur in BSAE are listed below, in order to complete the picture:

- the occurrence of dummy subject *they* in quasi-passives (CamE and NigE)
- the occurrence of unmarked past tense forms (EAfE and NigE)
- the preference for common prepositions over uncommon ones (EAfE, GhE, NigE)
- the reclassification of certain transitive verbs as intransitive (GhE and NigE)
- functional/class shift of lexical items (GhE, NigE, KenE, CamE)
- reduplication (GhE, CamE, NigE, KenE)
- the use of non-standard affixation to form new words (GhE, NigE, and CamE)[3]
- the avoidance of complex tenses other than those (i.e. the past perfect and those involving irrealis modal constructions) mentioned above (EAfE and NigE)

Additionally, there exist a considerable number of features (largely syntactic, though some lie on the border between syntax and lexis) which are reported to occur in only one of the four African varieties, and these are listed below, with the exception of features that have been described in the feature list when they were relevant to part of the discussion:

<u>EAfE (Schmied, 2004; Zuengler, 1982):</u>

- the occurrence of unmarked irregular verb forms
- the loss of plural marking on nouns
- the loss of possessive *'s* on nouns in possessive constructions
- the use of unmarked adjective forms as adverbs[4]
- more flexible rules of adverb placement

[3] Van Rooy (personal communication) notes that this feature (the use of non-standard affixation to form new words) is common in his own data corpora of BSAE; however, without access to the corpora I was unable to include it as a feature of BSAE.

[4] Van Rooy (personal communication) also notes that this feature (the use of unmarked adjective forms as adverbs) occurs in his data corpora of BSAE; however, without access to the corpora I was unable to include it as a feature of BSAE.

GhE (Huber and Dako, 2004):

- the use of past perfect forms rather than present perfect
- the use of present perfect forms with reference to a completed action
- the use of *be coming to* and *be going to* to show ingressiveness.
- the use of *never* as a negative completive
- the use of *would* to show definite future
- the occurrence of *some*, *none* and *any*, or their compounds, in free variation
- the use of negative *too* rather than *either*
- the use of *please* as a politeness marker in requests
- the use of *please* + NEGATIVE S as polite denial
- the use of *please* + POSITIVE S as polite affirmation
- a preference for syntactic iconicity, resulting in different use of subordinators
- the use of *unless* to indicate a preceding event
- the determining of possessive pronouns' gender by that of the modified noun
- notional subject-verb concord
- the use of pronominal *a certain* for *some/a* if the modified element is not to be named
- the substitution of alternative prepositions after nouns and adjectives
- the deletion of *of* in partitive constructions
- the insertion of *of* in phrases consisting of *many/one of such* Npl
- a high frequency of cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions
- the frequent use of (borrowed) topicalisers
- the use of *plus* rather than *and* as a coordinating conjunction
- the use of *since* rather than *on* or *for* or *in* + definite time
- the use of *last* + time reference rather than *ago* + time reference
- the use of *next* + time reference rather than *in* + time reference
- the use of *whiles* in preference to *while*

CamE (Mbangwana, 2004; Mbangwana, 1992):

- the use of elliptical *but*
- the use of *like this* and *like that* as elliptical comparatives
- the use of *like this* and *like that* as concessive clauses, rather than *so*
- the occurrence of dangling modifiers
- the avoidance of self-embedding
- the occurrence of preposition-chopping in relative clauses
- the occurrence of *that* adverbial clauses with *what* in situ
- a lack of WH- movement in root and subordinate question clauses
- the use of *that* before echo questions
- a lack of inversion in direct *yes/no* questions
- the occurrence of the dative of obligation
- reversed ordering in compound nouns

NigE (Alo and Mesthrie, 2004; Jowitt 1991):

- the occasional double marking of simple past in negative and interrogative sentences
- the occasional regularisation of irregular past tense verbs
- the use of *might have* V*en* to indicate uncertainty about a possible future event
- the use of *must have to*
- the avoidance of present and past continuous forms in semantically future contexts
- *yes/no* questions with *have* as auxiliary answered using *do*
- the use of unstressed *one* as an indefinite article
- the pluralisation of certain generic nouns such as *the poors*, *the blinds*
- a lack of distinction between comparative and superlative adjectival forms
- the avoidance of ordinal numerals above *third*
- the use of reflexive pronouns as reciprocals
- the use of honorific *they* for singular referents
- the occurrence of possessive and demonstrative pronouns in the same NP, in the order demonstrative + possessive + N
- variability between *–ing* and *–en* verbal suffixes

- the use of the past perfect in preference to the present perfect

Having reviewed the distribution of features, I shall now turn to a specific comparison of a single syntactic construction across the five Englishes. The discussion and comparison of features of the African Englishes in this section has by necessity been broad, noting mainly the presence or absence of a feature in each variety. While the distribution of the features across the varieties provides a basis for comparison - both of the varieties themselves and of the relative prevalence of the features - any conclusions arising from such comparisons must necessarily remain based on references to sets of general 'tendencies' within African Englishes. Without any further analysis of such features as have been identified, no further progress can be made in terms of discovering similarities in the syntactic nature (and, possibly, the origins) of common features across the varieties. Thus any true comparison of these varieties requires a closer inspection of the specific realisation of a feature in each variety, in order to determine whether a common pattern of usage exists for such individual features. There remains a need, therefore, for a more intensive, detailed examination of a specific feature that seems to be common to several varieties of African English.

For this reason, therefore, section 4 focuses more closely on the construction(s) of the relative clause in the five African Englishes discussed. In the general feature list above, reference to the relative clause is made only as far as concerns the occurrence of resumptive pronouns. This use of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses is found in all five of the varieties examined; as an apparently common feature, therefore, it warrants a closer examination, and a more in-depth comparative analysis in order to determine the degrees of similarity, or difference, found in the use of these pronouns in the varieties. Additionally, an attempt must be made to account for such similarities as are found to exist. The following section, therefore, deals with the relative clause as it occurs in these African Englishes.

4. A comparison of relative clause constructions in African Englishes

In order to describe the relative clause as it occurs in African Englishes, it is first necessary to examine the structure of relative clauses in standard English, as well as cross-linguistically, so that patterns and innovations in the New Englishes can be recognised. The following section (4.1), therefore, describes the standard English relative clause construction, and provides a brief typology of relative clauses across languages for comparative purposes, before turning to the relative clauses of the African Englishes (4.2). Following Comrie (1989), the discussion below focuses on restrictive relative clauses, which in English have a very similar syntactic form to non-restrictive clauses; the distinction is marked in standard English only in the range of relative pronouns permitted (see 4.2 below). However, since a distinction can be made in standard English as well as in some African Englishes, the issue is raised again in section 4.2 below.

4.1. The relative clause in standard English

In describing the basic structure of the standard English (restrictive) relative clause, Comrie notes that English relative clauses involve a change in the order of grammatical relations within the clause. To use Comrie's (p140) example, the following can be compared:

227. *I saw the man yesterday*

228. *the man [whom I saw yesterday]*

In the independent sentence (227), the direct object *the man* directly follows the verb *saw*. However, in the relative clause, the relative pronoun *whom* – representing *the man* - has been moved so that it occurs clause-initially. Comrie refers to this as "the general principle of English relative clause formation" – that the relative pronoun must occur clause-initially, or at least as part of the clause-initial noun or prepositional phrase (p140). Thus in transformational terms, English relative clause formation involves a movement transformation: the *wh-* word form is moved from its normal position in the sentence, to a clause-initial position. More specifically, Comrie explains, the movement in (standard) English relative-clause construction leaves no overt trace in the position moved out of.

However, Comrie also refers to varieties of non-standard English - although he does not explicitly state which these are - in which an overt trace is left in the relative

clause. For example, in the relativisation of sentence 229, a trace is left in the position vacated in 230:

229. *I don't know where this road leads.*

230. *This is the road which I don't know where* <u>*it*</u> *leads.*

Comrie refers to this construction as a "copying transformation", involving movement with copying; the standard English type of relativisation above (example 228) is known technically as a "chopping transformation" – that is, movement without an overt copy (p140). In standard English, then, sentence 229 is ungrammatical. Interestingly, there is no direct standard English grammatical equivalent: **This is the road which I don't know where leads* is equally unacceptable, if not more so. It appears from Comrie's discussion, however, that it is only in the type of deeply-embedded sentence shown above, that the varieties of non-standard English to which he refers leave an overt trace, and this he explains with reference to cross-linguistic universals of relativisation processes (see below, this section). In general, most varieties of standard and non-standard English appear to favour the chopping transformation.

This simple description of the standard English relative clause is, however, inadequate in typological terms. Comrie (1989: 138-164) therefore goes on to describe the typology of relative clause constructions across languages, placing English relative clauses within this framework. Although the variety of relative clause-types found among the languages of the world is fairly wide, and the means by which relativisation is achieved are somewhat diverse, only a brief description of each will be given here, for the purposes of comparison with the standard English construction and, in the following section (4.2), with those of the African Englishes.

Comrie's central classification of the cross-linguistic types of relative clause constructions orders these types according to the level of explicitness with which they encode the role of the head noun within the relative clause. He justifies this means of classification as follows:

> "Although, a priori, [the expression of the role of the head noun within the embedded clause] might seem no more important than the role of the head in the main clause, it turns out that, from the viewpoint of typological variation,

the encoding of the role in the embedded sentence is, cross-linguistically, one of the most significant parameters."

(Comrie, 1989: 147)

While other classifications are possible, moreover, it is this one which is best suited to the purposes of this discussion, since it bears directly on the issue of the types of relative clause that occur in African Englishes, particularly with reference to the use of resumptive pronouns.

The most explicit encoding of the role of the head noun, Comrie shows, is that achieved through the "non-reduction type" of relative clause (1989: 148). Found in languages such as Bambara (a member of the Niger-Congo language family) and Diegueño (a Yunam language of North America), this type of relative clause is constructed so that the head noun occurs in its full and unreduced form within the embedded sentence. It may occur in the normal (independent sentence) position within the embedded sentence, or be marked with the usual case-marking for a noun phrase expressing that function in the clause – or, indeed, appear both in the normal position and with normal case-marking (1989: 147). The role of the head noun in the relative clause, therefore, is explicitly encoded by the same means as are used in the construction of an equivalent independent sentence. An example from Bambara is used to illustrate this (p145):

231. *N* *ye* *so* *ye*
I PAST house-the see
'I saw the house'

232. *Tyɛ̀* *be* *[n* *ye* *so* *mìn* *ye]* *dyɔ*
man-the PRESENT I PAST house REL. MARKER see build
'The man is building the house that I saw'

Here, the structure of the embedded sentence or relative clause ('the house that I saw') is identical to the structure of the independent sentence ('I saw the house' – example 231). In order to avoid ambiguity over which element of the relative clause is to be interpreted as its head, the relative marker *mìn* is placed after the head noun in 232. While not all languages with this type of relative clause avoid ambiguity in this way, this does not affect Comrie's argument regarding the explicit encoding of the role of the head noun within the relative clause.

The non-reduction type of relative clause, therefore, does not reduce the head of the relative clause at all; its function is fully encoded. In the slightly less explicit "pronoun-retention type" (p147), the head noun remains in the embedded sentence in its usual position, but only in pronominal form. This occurs in Persian, although it is categorical only for the relativisation of all grammatical relations other than subject and direct object. Comrie notes that with direct objects, the pronoun-retention is optional, and with subjects is very rare, although it may occur. The following example (from p148) illustrates (optional) pronoun-retention in a relative clause where the direct object is the relativised element and head of the embedded sentence:

233. *Hasan Mard-i-rā [ke zan (u -rā) zad] mišenāsad*
Hasan man ACCUSATIVE that woman he ACCUSATIVE hit knows
'Hasan knows the man that the woman hit'

The accusative case-marked form of the pronoun (*u -rā*) represents the accusative head noun of the relative clause *Mard-i-rā*, 'the man'. A more literal translation of 233, then, would be 'Hasan knows the man that the woman hit him'. Although the head noun appears in this reduced, pronominal form, it is still present within the relative clause, and case-marked as the direct object.

The third type of relative clause with regard to the explicit encoding of the head noun (the third-most explicit) is the "relative-pronoun type" (p149). Comrie notes that, while this is the type most frequently found within European languages, it is not in fact particularly common across the world's languages as a whole. As in the pronoun-retention type, there is a (relative) pronoun in the relative clause indicating the head; however, it does not remain in the usual position for a word expressing its particular grammatical relation. Instead, it is moved to clause initial position (although it can be preceded by a preposition). In order that this pronoun encode the role of the head noun within the relative clause, which it cannot do by its position in the linear order, it must be case-marked to indicate this role. Comrie provides illustrative examples of this from Russian, since this language has a rich case system (p149):

234. *Devuška prišla*
girl-NOMINATIVE arrived
'the girl arrived'

235. *devuška, [kotoraja prišla]*
girl who-NOMINATIVE arrived

'the girl who arrived'

236. *Ja videl devušku*

I saw girl-ACCUSATIVE

'I saw the girl'

237. *devuška, [kotoruju ja videl]*

girl who-ACCUSATIVE I saw

'the girl whom I saw'

Thus the relative pronoun *kotor-* explicitly encodes the role of the head noun in the relative clause by its case-marking as, here, *kotoraja* (nominative) or *kotoruju* (accusative). However, Comrie considers this relative-pronoun type to be less explicit than the pronoun-retention type because it involves a "greater deformation of the structure of the embedded sentence: instead of appearing in the basic word-order position for a subject, direct object, or non-direct object, the relative pronoun must occur clause initially" (p150). Comrie notes that those varieties of English which distinguish nominative *who* from accusative *whom* are considered to have this relative-pronoun type of relative clause; but that those without it are not.

The fourth (and final) type of relative clause is the only one which does not overtly indicate the role of the head noun within the relative clause in any way; it is therefore the least explicit in this respect. This "gap type" is found in those varieties of English which do not have a *who/whom* distinction, in the relativisation of subjects and direct objects:

238. *the man who/that gave the book to the girl*

Here, in the relative clause *who/that gave the book to the girl,* the subject role of the head noun *the man* is not encoded. In other languages, the type is still more widespread. In Korean, for example, gap-type relativisation can be used to relativise a variety of non-direct objects (p151):

239. *[hyənsik-i kikä-lil ttäli-n] maktaki*

Hyensik NOMINATIVE the dog ACCUSATIVE beat RELATIVE stick

'the stick with which Hyensik beat the dog'

Since languages with this type of relative clause lack any means of explicitly encoding the role of the head noun within the relative clause, a number of strategies for avoiding ambiguity can be used, relying either on syntactic properties of the

language concerned or on real-world knowledge. In English, for example, knowledge of the basic SVO word-order (subject-verb-object) can be used to infer that, in a construction such as *the man that saw the girl*, it must be the subject that is head of the relative clause, since the object position is already filled by *the girl*, and the subject position is empty.

From the above brief summary, then, it can be seen that standard English relative clauses fall mainly into the (least explicit) gap-type category. However, some varieties of (standard) English also use the relative-pronoun type, since these draw a distinction between *who* and *whom* as case-marked relative pronouns. Comrie notes that it is by no means unusual for even a single variety of a language to make use of more than one of the types: "a given language may have more than one type of relative clause construction in its over-all battery of relative clause formation possibilities" (1989: 148). For example, Persian, as mentioned above, contains both gap and pronoun-retention types, in something approximating complementary distribution: the gap type is usually the only one used with subjects; with non-direct objects only the pronoun-retention type occurs, and with direct objects, either may be used.

Ordered, then, from the most to the least explicit means of encoding the role of the head noun of a relative clause, the types that occur are: non-reduction type; pronoun-retention type; relative pronoun type; and gap type marking. Having placed English within this framework of 'explicitness', Comrie then lists and describes the positions in standard English which are accessible to relative clause formation. These seem to be more numerous than those that are available in many other languages. For example, in "simplex" sentences without further subordination, English shows no evidence of any kind of restriction: it is possible to relativise on subject, direct object, non-direct object, and possessor in a possessive construction, as follows:

240. *the man [who bought the book for the girl]*
241. *the book [which the man bought for the girl]*
242. *the girl [for whom the man bought the book]*
243. *the boy [whose book the man bought for the girl]*

However, Comrie notes that in many languages there are heavy restrictions on relativisation on these positions. The ordering of the above list, in fact, represents the

cross-linguistic hierarchy which defines ease of accessibility to relativisation: subject > direct object > non-direct object > possessor. That is, it appears to be easier to relativise subjects than any of the other positions below it, and so on down the list. A language which can relativise possessors, by implication, must be able to relativise subjects and direct and non-direct objects – all those above possessor-relativisation in the hierarchy – as is indeed the case in (standard) English.

In attempting to extend this hierarchy, by generalisation, to relativisation in complex sentences with subordination, Comrie notes that it is indeed the case – as could be expected - that "it will never be easier to relativise a given constituent of a subordinate clause than to relativise the same constituent of a main clause" (p161), although in English, it is possible to relativise both. However, a further likely extension, that "subjects of subordinate clauses should be more accessible to relativisation than non subjects," (p162) proves to be empirically incorrect: in fact, precisely the opposite is true. In English, while non-subjects of subordinate clauses are freely 'relativisable' (example 244), subjects can be relativised only if no complementiser *that* is present (245):

244. *the girl [that you think (that) I love]*

245. *the girl [that you think (*that) loves me]*

While this feature of English appears to be cross-linguistically unmarked, Comrie notes that there are "apparently no good explanations as to why this should be so" (p162). The hierarchy of accessibility to relativisation appears to be reversed when subordination is involved.

From this hierarchy of positions, in terms of their ease of relativisation, Comrie draws further universal generalisations about the distribution of relative clause types cross-linguistically. It was noted above that in some languages, both more and less explicit types of relativisation (in terms of encoding the position of the head of the relative clause) are used. Comrie further elaborates from this point that "wherever a language has both a more explicit and a less explicit way of forming relative clauses, then the more explicit type will be used lower down the hierarchy and the less explicit type higher up in the hierarchy" (p163). In the case of English, then, Comrie explains: "pronoun-retention is marginal, but is used in some varieties for one of the least

accessible positions, namely subject of a subordinate clause with an overt [complementiser]" (see sentence 230 above).

The generalisation is seen to have a functional basis, in that "the more difficult a position is to relativise, the more explicit indication is given of what position is being relativised, to facilitate recovery of this information" (p163). In section 4.2 below, it will be seen how these generalisations and universal implications are borne out in second-language, New African Englishes.

4.2. Relativisation in African Englishes

Mesthrie (2004), Schmied (2004), Mbangwana (2004), Huber and Dako (2004) and Alo and Mesthrie (2004), in their discussions of relativisation in, respectively, BSAE, EAfE, CamE, GhE and NigE, all report that, effectively, there is little to report as regards relativisation processes in the African Englishes, with the exception of the occasional occurrence of resumptive pronouns. Another slight exception, however, occurs in Mbangwana's description of CamE, where he notes that "preposition chopping" in relative clauses is favoured over preposition stranding (p901). He provides, among others, the following example:

246. *We have produced an album which we want you to buy a copy* ^.

However, this feature is not reported in any other African Englishes. Nevertheless, it has some bearing on the question of resumptive pronouns in the relative clause, which are to be discussed below.

A further exception occurs in Alo and Mesthrie's description of NigE. In the case of non-restrictive relative clauses, they note that for some speakers, *of which* is preferred as a relative marker over *which*:

247. *It was a very horrible experience, of which I hope it will not happen again.*

De Klerk and Gough (2002) also provide an example of this construction from BSAE, as seen in section 3.1 above. This feature, therefore, demonstrates a distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relatives in NigE and BSAE, which is not reported in other African Englishes. However, since for other Englishes it is noted that their relativisation processes differ little from those of standard English, it is perhaps not surprising that the issue of this distinction is not mentioned. The

distinction in standard English is marked syntactically only by the range of relativisers that may be used: for restrictive relative clauses, either *wh-* forms (*who(m/se)*, *which*), *that*, or zero may be used (248); while for non-restrictive, only *wh-* forms are permitted (249):

248. *The man who/that/Ø I saw yesterday left this morning.*

249. *Fred, who/*that/*Ø I saw yesterday, left this morning.*

(Comrie, 1989: 138-139)

NigE appears to be innovative in this respect only in its use of *of which*; however, how the other relative markers are distributed across restrictive versus non-restrictive relative markers is not noted.

NigE, GhE and KenE contain one further innovation concerning relative clause markers: in lower (less-educated) sociolects, the use of *what* rather than *that* following *all* has been noted:

250. *All what he said was false*

Since this is only mentioned as occurring after *all*, this appears to be lexically conditioned, and therefore not of great significance as far as broader processes of relative clause construction are concerned.

The occurrence of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses does, however, appear significant, particularly in the pattern of occurrence that they exhibit. Several authors have noted that the resumptive pronouns occur only, or much more frequently, when the head of the relative clause is a non-subject. Alo and Mesthrie report that NigE "allows resumptive pronouns in non-subject relativisation" (2004: 818); and Huber and Dako comment that in GhE there is a "tendency for the underlying nominal of the relative clause to surface as a resumptive pronoun, especially in non-subject positions" (2004: 858). Bokamba (1991: 503) mentions that in 'West African English,' resumptive pronouns occur "especially in object and locative positions." Mesthrie (2003a: 17) analysed the occurrence of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in BSAE, and found that "resumptive pronouns do not occur as subjects within the relative clause." Mbangwana (2004) and Schmied (2004) do not refer to non-subject relativisation in CamE and EAfE specifically, but the examples given do not include any of subject relativisation with a resumptive pronoun. Bokamba (1982) also claims that in GhE, Kenyan English (i.e. an East African variety) and NigE, only

non-subject relativisation gives rise to resumptive pronouns. It is perhaps also of minor significance that examples of subject-relativisation without the use of a resumptive pronoun occur:

251. *We have names like Nathana, Clara and Joel which are familiar names* (CamE)

252. *... he was one of those who travelled to Sokoto for the sports competition* (NigE)

Since, however, the occurrence of resumptive pronouns in any position is variable in all varieties, their non-occurrence in these sentences cannot, alone, be taken as evidence for their general non-occurrence.

According to Comrie's (1989) cross-linguistic assessment of the ease of relativisation of various syntactic positions (see 4.1, above), subject roles are the most accessible to relativisation. Since, furthermore, a language which has both a more and less explicit means of *marking* the role of the head of a relative clause, will use the less explicit means for those positions that are most accessible, we can see that in general African Englishes do encode subject roles with the least explicit means available to them. By the non-use of resumptive pronouns in subject relativisation, African Englishes follow the standard English "gap type" head-marking construction, which, as discussed in section 4.1 above, is in fact the least explicit means available to any language (Comrie, 1989). Thus far, then, African English relative clause construction accords with the cross-linguistic pattern, in that easily relativised positions are not explicitly marked, in contrast to more difficult positions.

Following Comrie's hierarchy, the next most accessible position to relativisation is the direct object. Since this is more difficult to relativise than the subject, a more explicit means of marking the direct-object role of the head might be expected, where this is available in a language. This is indeed the case in the African Englishes: examples of direct-object relativisation with a resumptive pronoun taking up the head of the relative clause are common. In the collected descriptions in Kortmann et al (2004), examples of this construction are given from all five varieties. One from each is shown here:

BSAE:

253. *...there's these things which you call it* isifanekisazwi *in Xhosa.* (Mesthrie, 2003a: 17)

EAfE:

254. *There is our glue which we are getting them near.*

CamE:

255. *There are some students whom I am teaching them to write.*

GhE:

256. *The book that I read it.*

NigE:

257. *The guests whom I invited them have arrived.*

The use of resumptive pronouns in these constructions is identified by Comrie as a more explicit means of marking the (direct object) role of the head of the relative clause than "gap type" marking. As discussed in 4.1 above, he refers to this type of construction as the "pronoun-retention" type. Although, in standard English, the construction is ungrammatical, cross-linguistically it is in fact fairly common. More significantly, Bokamba (1982: 84) has pointed out that:

> "relative clauses with resumptive pronouns are a typological characteristic of many African languages ... One finds them in West African and East African English as well. This deviation can, therefore, be best explained as a transference error."

It should not be surprising, then, that this available L1 construction is occasionally transferred into L2 Englishes when it allows a more explicit means of extracting the role of a (less accessible) head noun from the relative clause. As Comrie (1989: 163) states, it is a linguistic universal that "the more difficult a position is to relativise, the more explicit indication is given of what position is being relativised, to facilitate recovery of this information". Explicitness in a second language is in fact likely to be even more important than in the first, since recovering the role of the head of a relative clause may be slower to process in a second language. Thus Williams, in discussing the cognitive and psycholinguistic motivations for the use of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in general, points to second-language acquisition research which shows that this usage, by increasing both the transparency and the salience of

the relative clause construction, may "ease the processing" required to interpret it (1987: 190). She therefore concludes that, since the occurrence of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses can be seen as direct or typological transfer, then "the fact that they are such strong candidates for language universals and that they are so frequently transferred, strengthens the contention that resumptive pronouns are helpful in the processing and production of syntactically complex material" (1987: 190).

Gass and Selinker (1994) also discuss research findings from the field of second-language acquisition, which indicate that resumptive pronouns are used by second-language learners particularly when the relativised position is a less accessible one. Referring explicitly to Comrie's hierarchy of accessibility (as presented in section 4.1 above), they link the occurrence of resumptive pronouns with the hierarchy as follows:

> "There is an inverse relationship between the hierarchy and resumptive pronouns, such that it is more likely that resumptive pronouns will be used in the lower hierarchical positions than in the higher ones."
> Gass and Selinker (1994: 113)

Following Comrie's implicational hierarchy, then, the use of a more explicit construction for the relativisation of a direct object in the African Englishes implies its use also in the relativisation of still less accessible non-direct objects, and of possessors in a possessive construction. Examples of relativisation in these positions are less easily found in the available literature. However, examples of the following kind suggest that the implicational hierarchy may be confirmed in African Englishes:

258. *You are going to do your course in a country where you have never been <u>there</u> before*
('African English' – Bokamba, 1982: 83)

259. *Taking a course in a country <u>which her</u> language you did not know is a big problem*
('African English' – Bokamba, 1982: 83)

260. *The other teacher that we were teaching English with <u>her</u> went away*
(CamE – Mbangwana, 2004: 906)

261. *I know the person <u>who his</u> father has died.*

(NigE – Jowitt, 1991: 122)

262. *Adult education* <u>*which its*</u> *main purpose is to help adults to learn how to read and write faces many problems.*

(EAfE – Schmied, 2004: 932)

The use of a resumptive pronoun with a non-direct object as head of the relative clause is only shown in 258 and 260 (for an unspecified 'African English[3]' and CamE respectively). However, the occurrence of resumptive pronouns in both direct object- and possessor-headed relative clauses suggests, following Comrie's hierarchy, that the use of resumptive pronouns/pronoun retention is likely to occur fairly frequently in such relativisation contexts.

The use of a *wh-* relativiser plus possessive resumptive pronoun in 259, 261 and 262 can be seen purely as a simplification of the standard English inflected form *whose*. However, a further analysis is possible, based on Comrie's description of pronoun retention in such positions. Although, unfortunately, he does not provide an example of such a construction from any language, it is difficult to see what other construction but RELATIVE PRONOUN + POSSESSIVE PRONOUN could be meant. Further support for this analysis is found in the fact that Bokamba (1982) includes this particular usage under the relative constructions that he claims are transferred from the various background African languages. If this is so, then pronoun-retaining African varieties use just this construction. Jowitt (1991:121-122) more explicitly claims that, for NigE, "examples of these kinds [i.e. the use of a relative + possessive sequence] can clearly be traced to [mother tongue] usage."

Variability within the varieties with respect to possessor-relativisation may be related to the relative explicitness of the inflected form *whose*. The use of inflected relative pronouns, Comrie states, indicates the use of 'relative pronoun type' head-marking, which is more explicit than the gap-type marking found in many Englishes without a *who/whom* distinction – though less explicit that pronoun-retention. Implicit in his argument, then, is the fact that the use of *whose* is more explicit than the mere use of *who* in both subject and non-subject relativisation; which indicates that the standard-

[3] However, Bokamba earlier comments that his features and their examples are drawn from Kenyan, Ghanaian and Nigerian English.

like use of *whose* in African Englishes does not imply a complete breakdown of the implicational hierarchy by a return to the least explicit type of marking. In terms of second language acquisition, Gass (1979) found that relative pronoun *whose* does not always fit into Comrie's hierarchical order, as appears to be the case here. Instead, it appeared that "[the genitive] proved easier than predicted by its position in the hierarchy" (Ellis, 1985: 203). Gass and Selinker (1994) report that it therefore appears that *whose* is more salient to learners than uninflected relative pronouns; and hence more easily acquired in its standard form. This finding, supported by the notion of relative explicitness, may explain the shortage of examples of *who/which/that* + POSSESSIVE PRONOUN in data from African Englishes: *whose* is perceived as sufficiently explicit and salient by speakers to allow its processing without the addition of a resumptive pronoun. Thus, the non-occurrence, or at least non-reporting, of *who/which/that* + POSSESSIVE PRONOUN in some of the varieties does not strongly negate the notion of hierarchical distribution of resumptive pronouns, since the (standard-like) use of *whose* too is understood as a highly explicit marker of the role of the head of the relative clause.

A possible counter-example, however, occurs: in CamE, the following is reported:

263. *He is being followed by an old man which the name is not given Ø.*

Mbangwana cites this example as an illustration of preposition chopping, indicating that the preposition (presumably *of*) has been deleted from the end of the relative clause. It could, however, be argued that *which the* replaces inflected *whose*, removing the need for the preposition – and indeed, in the standard English gloss, *whose* is given. If this is so, then CamE does not here appear to use an explicit means of marking the possessor role of the head of the relative clause. However, Mbangwana's analysis of this sentence as an example of preposition chopping suggests that he views the underlying structure as containing *of*. It is therefore possible that *the name of (the old man)* is idiomatically acceptable in CamE where other varieties would prefer *the old man's name/his name*, which may overrule the need for a possessive-pronoun construction entirely. In support of this analysis, Mbangwana (1992) provides *the wife* as a CamE alternative to *his wife*. Since, however, (263) is the only example of this kind, it is not of course possible to draw any conclusions; this merely indicates the inherent variation in relative clause use.

It is, nevertheless, important to note that any such variability within the African Englishes' relative clause constructions is only to be expected. Allowing for competition between the standard English, target-language system, and the substrate-influenced system, it can be expected that the distribution of resumptive pronoun use will not be as clear-cut as Comrie's hierarchy predicts. Additionally, Gass's (1979) findings have indicated that the genitive/possessive position is more easily relativised by learners of English, suggesting that it is in this position that the most variability may occur.

Taking into account all examples of relative clauses found in Mesthrie (2004) and (2003), Schmied (2004), Mbangwana (2004), Huber and Dako (2004), Alo and Mesthrie (2004), Bokamba (1982), Bokamba (1991), Schmied (1991) and Jowitt (1991), a table can be constructed for the purpose of gaining a clearer view of the distribution of resumptive pronouns across relative clause types. The following (variable) occurrences of resumptive pronouns in African English varieties are attested (Table 2):

Table 2: Contexts of resumptive pronoun use (pronoun-retention) in relative clauses

Position relativised	**BSAE**	**EAfE**	**CamE**	**GhE**	**NigE**	**'AfE'** (Bokamba 1982)
subject	0	-	-	0	0	-
dir. object	+	+	+	+	+	+
non-dir. object	-	?	+	?	+	+
possessor	-	+	-	?	+	+

Key:

+ The feature has been reported and/or exemplified in the variety

- The feature has not been reported or exemplified in the variety

0 The feature has specifically been reported as *not* occurring, or almost never occurring, in the variety

? The feature has not been reported or exemplified for the specific variety, but there is some indication that it may exist. This category basically covers those varieties which Bokamba (1982) refers to as part of 'African English', where the source of his example is not given.

Only in NigE, then, is there sufficient exemplification for the full implicational hierarchy to be confirmed. For the other four varieties, there are no examples to

confirm the occurrence of pronoun retention for the full range of relativised positions (excepting, of course, subject relativisation – where, for the most part, the occurrence of pronoun retention in subject position has been explicitly denied). However, it may be significant that, where a position below subject in the hierarchy has not been confirmed as requiring a resumptive pronoun, neither has it been explicitly denied. Bokamba's (1982) description of 'African English', too, in which he includes East and West African varieties, exemplifies resumptive pronouns in the full range of positions. However, without information on where each of his examples was found, this cannot be taken as strong evidence. Nevertheless, although further corpus-based research would be required to confirm the full hierarchy in other African Englishes, these two factors can at least be taken as an initial indication of its existence and functioning.

Two further factors relating to relativisation with pronoun retention emerge from the data. The first of these is noticeable in the CamE example in 255, reproduced here as 264:

264. *There are some students* <u>*whom*</u> *I am teaching* <u>*them*</u> *to write.*

The use of the case-marked accusative relative pronoun *whom* in this example (which is the only one of its kind) demonstrates the relative-pronoun type of head-marking in CamE. As discussed in 4.1, the relative-pronoun type is viewed by Comrie as a less explicit[4] means of encoding the role of the head of the relative clause than the pronoun-retention type, but is more explicit than the gap type employed in many varieties of (standard and non-standard) English. In sentence 264, CamE demonstrates the use of both the relative-pronoun *and* the pronoun-retention type within the same relative clause. This strategy, by its double marking of the role of the head of the relative clause, therefore appears to make CamE in some cases even more explicit than the other varieties, for which no such examples are cited.

The second point with relation to pronoun-retention arises also in the CamE data. As briefly discussed (above, this section) preposition-chopping occurs in CamE in preference to preposition stranding:

[4] The full hierarchy of explicitness, from most to least explicit, is: non-reduction type; pronoun retention type; relative pronoun type; gap type (Comrie, 1989: 147-155).

265. *We have produced an album which we want you to buy a copy ^.*
(reproduced from 246)

The deletion of the preposition here, in fact, results also in the deletion of the appropriate context for pronoun retention. Were the preposition not deleted, the sentence would be constructed as in 266; and would then allow for non-direct object pronoun retention as in 267:

266. *We have produced an album which we want you to buy a copy of.*

267. *We have produced an album which we want you to buy a copy of it.*

The tendency towards preposition-chopping in CamE, then, may work to counteract the tendency towards pronoun-retention. Since both tendencies are, however, variable, the occurrence of one does not preclude the occurrence of the other. Nevertheless, preposition-chopping may well serve to limit the proportion of pronoun-retention in CamE relative to that in the other African Englishes.

In sum, therefore, there is evidence that the interaction of the hierarchy of explicitness (in terms of head-marking within the relative clause), with the hierarchy of ease of relativisation of syntactic positions, operates in several, if not all, of the five African English varieties here discussed. It is therefore possible to summarise the above argument and findings by the following hypotheses:

1. An African English (where the term is currently restricted to BSAE, EAfE, CamE, GhE and NigE) will most commonly use the least explicit gap-type head-marking within the relative clause, if the position relativised is an accessible subject position.
2. An African English will use either gap-type or the more explicit pronoun retention-type marking in a relative clause, if the position relativised is a non-subject position.
3. An African English can be expected to show more explicit means of marking, or greater frequency of the more explicit type of marking, on other 'oblique' headed relative clauses, proportional to their position on Comrie's (1989) accessibility hierarchy. Greater frequencies of explicit marking are expected the lower the hierarchical position. However, (in CamE) this tendency may be tempered by the use of preposition-chopping in a relative clause; and the salience of inflected *whose* may affect the proportion of resumptive genitive pronouns that occur.

Before these hypotheses can be confirmed, however, statistical analyses of the proportional occurrences of resumptive pronouns in African English relative clauses, as against their non-occurrence, are needed. There is also a need for corpus-based research into African Englishes, in order to confirm or deny the use of resumptive pronouns for many of the lower positions of the hierarchy, as seen in table 2. These issues, along with others raised in section 3 above, are taken up in section 5 below.

5. Conclusions, limitations and suggestions for further research directions

The comparison of features of the five African English varieties – BSAE, EAfE, GhE, CamE and NigE – presented in section 3 (particularly 3.3) has identified significant similarities between the varieties. Although the features compared are, with few exceptions, those that occur in BSAE, this does not negate the implication that the similarities which have been noted, and the specific features which occur in the majority of the varieties, can be considered as some of the most general structural features of 'African English', if such a variety can be said to exist.

The prevalence of such common features may be related to theories of second-language acquisition, a point partly raised in section 4.2. Williams' (1987) study of common features of what she refers to as "non-native institutionalised varieties of English (NIVEs)" (here referred to as New Englishes, following Platt et al, 1984), has found similarities between the relatively stable features of these varieties, and the interlanguage forms that occur in learners' English. Although NIVEs can no longer be classified as learner varieties, "certain [NIVE] forms... strongly resemble forms found in learner languages, and at one time may, in fact, have been the result of individual language acquisition" (1987: 163). Basing her analysis on second language acquisition research, therefore, Williams describes strategies of language acquisition that could account for the similarities evident across NIVEs/New Englishes and hence, for our purposes, across the African Englishes. It has already been mentioned (see 4.2) that the occurrence of resumptive pronouns in the relative clause has been found to be related to second-language acquisition strategies for increasing both salience and transparency; but Williams' conclusions are further applicable to New English features in general. The occurrence of features such as the reclassification of certain non-count nouns as countable, for instance, is related by Williams to general regularization strategies, reducing the number of irregularities in a language system, which in turn stems from the need for economy of production on the part of speakers. Following Long (1982), Williams notes that such regularization can account for both the addition and the deletion of linguistic elements within the target language. In the case of the (frequently semantically countable) non-count nouns, their reclassification as countable regularizes the number system such that syntactic distinctions rely on semantic criteria. Williams also notes that the generalisation of progressive BE + *-ing* to stative verbs regularises the tense system, allowing speakers to utilise the same

construction. Regularisation, then, can be defined as the occurrence of "any changes which result in surface forms which are less diverse or contain fewer exceptions to the basic, canonical pattern of the target system" (1987: 170). In this particular instance, the similar lack of such a syntactic distinction in Bantu languages, as demonstrated by Makelela (2004), is likely to have strengthened the motivation for such a regularization in African Englishes. The use of invariant tag questions, too, can be attributed to the need for regularization. The result of all such regularisation processes, then, is that "a reduced number of forms has been generalised to a wider variety of contexts" (Williams, 1987: 170).

Also related to the general principle of economy of production is what Williams refers to as the selective production of redundant markers. This selectivity, in NIVEs, often results in the elimination of one such redundant marker in favour of another, more salient form. In the variable deletion of third person singular present tense *–s*, for example, this less salient redundant marker is deleted in favour of the more salient subject pronoun. Williams also demonstrates that the principles of reducing redundancy and regularisation may operate together, as in this case: the loss of (redundant) *–s* extends the more common Ø ending to all regular present tense verb forms, regularising the verbal paradigm.

Counter to this cognitive drive towards economy of production, resulting in the regularization of linguistic systems, runs the need for maximum transparency in order to be understood by the hearer. Transparency can be defined as the "one-to-one mapping of form and meaning", such that semantic relations are marked overtly (Williams, 1987: 179). It is this requirement that can be seen to operate in the relative clause construction, where resumptive pronouns are used as explicit indication of the role of the head of the relative clause; as well as in the common use of left dislocation, and the occurrence of double and combined conjunctions in several African English varieties. Maximum salience, too, is closely related to the principle of maximum transparency: this principle allows for the (transparent) placing of important grammatical or semantic markers in perceptually salient positions. In left dislocation, for example, the sentence-initial position of the topic of the sentence not only makes its role as the topic transparent, but it has also been found to be, cognitively, a particularly salient position (Williams, 1987).

Although the needs for maximum salience and transparency (together, the principle of hyperclarity), and that for economy of production, work in opposition to each other, Williams notes that the constraints this places upon the linguistic system "[prevent] production which is either extremely reduced or extremely unwieldy" (1987: 180). Her use of the principles of second language acquisition to explain the origin of common NIVE/New English features, therefore, provides a framework within which they can be understood, and a basis for understanding the sometimes conflicting processes of deletion and undeletion which occur within many varieties. These guidelines, she claims, "may begin to account in a very general way, for the similarities which are found across NIVEs" (1987: 191). Furthermore, she provides an explanation for the fact that, despite regularisation processes, NIVEs/New Englishes often show considerably more variability than native speaker varieties. This she relates to the competition between old and new systems which results when NIVE speakers have access to a variety of different sociolects. As an example, she provides the highly variable use of third person singular present tense *–s*: in basilectal varieties, she claims, its deletion is often almost categorical, while in acrolectal speech it is almost always present. However, speakers who draw on a variety of sociolects, or whose range within the continuum of sociolects is broad (as is common), may - in drawing on both more and less acrolectal and basilectal forms - produce highly variable usage. Thus "modifications which result in more regular production may be masked by sociolinguistic variation" (1987: 174).

A recent application of Williams' principles to a specific (African) New English variety is found in de Klerk (2003). Based on an analysis of her corpus of Xhosa English (a significant sub-variety of BSAE – henceforth XE), she found that both of the "conflicting functions of productive efficiency and clarity" were evident (Williams, 1987). In Xhosa English, then, Williams' claims appear to be borne out:

> "... there is a significant set of linguistic features resulting from the economy principle which pervade XE, and a similarly large set which result from the principle of hyperclarity"
> (de Klerk, 2003: 239-240)

De Klerk's 540 000-word corpus of Xhosa English represents an important step towards recognising and analysing the prevalent features of an African English variety. Although the corpus in 2003 was incomplete, and close syntactic analysis of

complex structures such as the relative clause (and hence resumptive pronouns) was not yet possible, its existence allows for future quantitative analysis of the features that have previously been identified but whose prevalence and social acceptability have not yet been established.

A major drawback in any comparative study of the type presented in sections 3 and 4 has been the absence of quantitative data on the features themselves. In 1987, Williams commented that "[descriptive studies of NIVEs] offer usually anecdotal data on production almost incidentally, and within no particular explanatory framework." Moreover, "information on actual speech is by example only, [and] rarely is any quantitative evidence offered in support of these descriptions" (1987: 165). With the exception of quantitative data on undeletions from a limited (12 speaker) corpus of BSAE in Mesthrie (2003a), de Klerk's (2003) corpus work appears to be the only syntactic[5] study of an African variety of English that sets out to rectify this problem. Drawing explicitly on Williams (1987) as a theoretical base, de Klerk has noted frequencies of occurrence of certain features of XE in her data base, providing "an indication of a quantitative perspective on features occurring in this variety, and showing that they actually occur regularly, rather than only occasionally" (2003: 229).

However, without such data from other African Englishes, the embryonic implicational scale provided in section 3.3, as well as the hypothetical implicational hierarchy underlying resumptive pronoun use, cannot be confirmed. Several previous authors (see e.g. Banda, 1996; Skandera, 1999; Mesthrie, 2003b) have commented on the lack of reliable data concerning either the frequency of features' occurrence or their social distribution; but until such data is collected and analysed, no detailed comparative work can be undertaken. Mesthrie (2003b) deals with this issue in some detail, and it is useful to summarise his argument here as support for my own conclusions. Firstly, he notes that in order to obtain a truly comparative data base, the data must be gathered in similar situations, and that particularly, spoken and written data should not be mixed. In the descriptions of the African English varieties that form the basis of the comparison in sections 3 and 4, this is by no means always the

[5] By contrast, data on the phonology of African varieties seems much more advanced. See for example the work of van Rooy and van Huyssteen (2000) and van Rooy (2000) for BSAE; and Simo Bobda (1994b, 1995, 1999, among others) for West African Englishes.

case. Several authors note that they draw their examples from both spoken and written sources, despite the fact that, as Mesthrie (2003b: 450) comments, "writing often has its own conventions, some of which have little connection with features of speech." In the case of BSAE, only in the work of both Mesthrie (2003a) and de Klerk (2003) is it explicitly stated that only recorded spoken data is used. De Klerk in particular strongly justifies this choice with relation to XE, stating that "because XE resides primarily in the oral mode, a spoken corpus could claim to be an authentic database for linguistic description" (2003: 229). While in countries such as Nigeria, this may not be the case, there is nevertheless a need to separate spoken from written data in order to provide a reliable basis for comparison.

In addition, Mesthrie (2003b: 451) notes that the spoken data "should ideally be gathered along uniform lines," under similar conditions. As an established means of data collection, he suggests that the "principles well-established in variationist sociolinguistics be followed, with modifications as warranted." Despite dissimilarities between the contexts of use of L1 urban vernaculars and L2 English varieties, he concludes that, as the best-known and most reliable means of gathering spoken data, "overall, there seems to be no reason why the approach by 'variationist' interviewers would be inappropriate for World English research," with the exception of research into true learner varieties. However, he notes that in many countries in which World Englishes/New Englishes are found (and this is particularly relevant to Africa), there may not be sufficient resources for large scale studies. Nevertheless, he suggests that "smaller scale studies adhering to the same principles could be undertaken, eventually leading to the desideratum of an in-depth, comparable data base" (Mesthrie, 2003b: 452).

De Klerk's corpus of Xhosa English represents a reasonably large data base on one particular variety of BSAE, and will doubtless prove to be an important source of quantitative analyses based on spoken data. However, until such data bases for other African Englishes are assembled, comparative work on these varieties will remain severely limited by these considerations. The *Global Synopsis* of syntactic information provided in Kortmann et al (Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi, 2004) provides a very broad classification of the frequency of occurrence of English features, but the frequency calculations are based on contributors' impressions of the frequency

(pervasive, not frequent, or non-existent) of certain features in the variety, many of which are not based on quantitative data. There is therefore a need for more detailed, quantitative, speech-based research into New Englishes, and particularly for my purposes here into African Englishes, before further comparative work can be undertaken.

Thus while Williams (1987) provides an explanatory framework for the occurrence of various NIVE/New English syntactic features, further research is required in order to determine the prevalence of these features in different varieties. This dissertation has attempted a comparison of the features reported in five African English (L2) varieties, based on their reported occurrence; however, further research data is required before a fuller picture of similarities and differences between the varieties can be constructed. The more detailed examination of resumptive pronouns in the relative clause suffers from the same limitations, in particular with reference to the hypothesis that resumptive pronouns are more common when the role of the head of the relative clause is in a less accessible position; nevertheless, it is hoped that it will provide a basis for further empirical, quantitative research.

References and Bibliography

Abdulaziz, Mohamed H. 1991. East Africa (Tanzania and Kenya). In Jenny Cheshire (ed). *English Around the World-Sociolinguistic Perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (391-402)

Alo, M. A. and Rajend Mesthrie. 2004. Nigerian English: morphology and syntax. In Kortmann, Bernd; Kate Burridge; Rajend Mesthrie; Edgar W. Schneider and Clive Upton (eds). *A Handbook of Varieties of English 2: Morphology and Syntax.* Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. (813-827)

Bailey, R. and M. Görlach (eds). 1982. *English as a World Language.* Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.

Bamgbose, Ayo. 1982. Standard Nigerian English: Issues of Identification. In Kachru, Braj B. (ed). *The Other Tongue: English across cultures.* Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd. (99-111)

Bamgbose, Ayo; Ayo Banjo; Andrew Thomas (eds). 1995. *New Englishes: A West African Perspective.* Mosuro: Ibadan.

Banda, Felix. 1996. The scope and categorization of African English: Some sociolinguistic considerations. *English World Wide* 17 (63-75)

Banjo, Ayo. 1995. On codifying Nigerian English: research so far. In Ayo Bamgbose; Ayo Banjo; Andrew Thomas (eds). *New Englishes: A West African Perspective.* Mosuro: Ibadan. (203-231)

Bickerton, D. 1975. *Dynamics of a Creole System.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bickerton, Derek. 1977. Pidginization and creolization: language acquisition and language universals. In Albert Valdman (ed). *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (49-69).

Bokamba, Eyamba B. 1982. The Africanization of English. In Kachru, Braj B. (ed). *The Other Tongue: English across cultures.* Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd. (77-98)

Bokamba, Eyamba G. 1991. West Africa. In Jenny Cheshire (ed.). *English Around the World-Sociolinguistic Perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (493-508)

Buthelezi, Q. 1995. South African Black English: lexical and syntactic characteristics. In R. Mesthrie (ed.) *Language and Social History*. Cape Town: David Phillip. (242-250)

Cheshire, Jenny (ed). 1991. *English Around the World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology – syntax and morphology* (2nd edition). Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

de Klerk, Vivian and David Gough. 2002. Black South African English. In Rajend Mesthrie (ed). *Language in South Africa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (356-378)

de Klerk, Vivian. 2003. Xhosa English as an institutionalised variety of English: in search of evidence. In *English world-wide: a journal of varieties of English* vol. 24:2. (221-244)

Dolphyne, Florence. 1995. A note on the English Language in Ghana. In Ayo Bamgbose; Ayo Banjo; Andrew Thomas (eds). *New Englishes: A West African Perspective.* Mosuro: Ibadan. (27-33)

Ellis, Rod. 1985. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gass, Susan. 1979. Language transfer and universal grammatical relations. *Language Learning* vol. 29 (327-344)

Gass, Susan and Larry Selinker, 1994. *Second Language Acquisition: an introductory course.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Görlach, Manfred. 1991. *Englishes: studies in varieties of English 1984-1988.* John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Gough, David. 1996. Black English in South Africa. In Vivian de Klerk (ed.) *Focus on South Africa* (vol. 15: Varieties of English around the world). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (53-77).

Hancock, I. F. and R. Angogo. 1982. English in East Africa. In R. Bailey and M. Görlach (eds). *English as a World Language.* Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press. (306-323)

Hickey, Raymond. 2004. Englishes in Asian and Africa: origin and structure. In Raymond Hickey (ed). *Legacies of Colonial English: studies in transported dialects.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (503-535)

Huber, Magnus and Kari Dako. 2004. Ghanaian English: morphology and syntax. In Kortmann, Bernd; Kate Burridge; Rajend Mesthrie; Edgar W. Schneider and Clive Upton (eds). *A Handbook of Varieties of English 2: Morphology and Syntax.* Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. (854-865)

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2003. *World Englishes: A resource book for students.* London: Routledge.

Jowitt, David. 1991. *Nigerian English Usage: an introduction.* Longman Nigeria: Ikeja, Lagos state

Kachru, Braj B. (ed) 1982. *The Other Tongue: English across cultures.* Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.

Kadeghe, Michael Y. 1992. Establishing educational bilingual programmes in Tanzanian classrooms. In Josef Schmied. *English in East and Central Africa 2.* Bayreuth African Studies series 24. Bayreuth University press: Bayreuth (46-56)

Kortmann, Bernd and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi. 2004. Global Synopsis: morphological and syntactic variation in English. In Kortmann, Bernd; Kate Burridge; Rajend Mesthrie; Edgar W. Schneider and Clive Upton (eds). *A Handbook of Varieties of English 2: Morphology and Syntax.* Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. (1142-1202)

Kortmann, Bernd; Kate Burridge; Rajend Mesthrie; Edgar W. Schneider and Clive Upton (eds). 2004. *A Handbook of Varieties of English 2: Morphology and Syntax.* Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin.

Long, Michael. 1982. Foreigner Talk as early interlanguage. Paper presented at EUNAM Cross-Second Linguistic Second Language Research Workshop, Görhde, West Germany.

Makelela, Leketi. 2004. Making sense of BSAE for linguistic democracy in South Africa. In *World Englishes* vol 23:3. (355-366)

Mbangwana, Paul. 1992. Some grammatical signposts in Cameroon standard English. In Josef Schmied. *English in East and Central Africa 2.* Bayreuth African Studies series 24. Bayreuth University press: Bayreuth (93-102)

Mbangwana, Paul. 2004. Cameroon English: morphology and syntax. In Kortmann, Bernd; Kate Burridge; Rajend Mesthrie; Edgar W. Schneider and Clive Upton (eds). *A Handbook of Varieties of English 2: Morphology and Syntax.* Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. (898-908)

Mesthrie, Rajend. 1992. Syntactic variation: the relative clause. Chapter 3 in *English in Language Shift: The history, structure and sociolinguistics of South African Indian English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (71-100)

Mesthrie, Rajend. 1997. A sociolinguistic study of topicalisation phenomena in South African Black English. In Schneider, E. (ed) *Englishes around the world* vol 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (119-140)

Mesthrie, Rajend. 2002. Endogeny versus contact revisited: aspectual *busy* in South African English. *Language Sciences* 24. (345-358)

Mesthrie, Rajend. 2003a. *Towards descriptive adequacy in second language studies: undeletions in Black South African English.* Paper presented at Linguistics Society of South Africa Conference, Rand Afrikaans University, 2003.

Mesthrie, Rajend. 2003b. The world Englishes paradigm and contact linguistics: refurbishing the foundations. In *World Englishes* vol. 22:4. (449-460)

Mesthrie, Rajend. 2004. Black South African English: morphology and syntax. In Kortmann, Bernd; Kate Burridge; Rajend Mesthrie; Edgar W. Schneider and Clive Upton (eds). *A Handbook of Varieties of English 2: Morphology and Syntax.* Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. (962-973)

Morreira, Kirsten. 2002. An examination of the omission and use of articles in Black South African English. Unpublished essay, Linguistics section, University of Cape Town.

Mülhäusler, Peter. 1997. *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics: expanded and revised edition.* Westminster Creolistics Series – 3. Westminster: University of Westminster Press.

Platt, J; Weber, H; Ho, M. 1984. *The New Englishes.* Routledge: London.

Rickford, John R. 2002. Implicational Scales. In J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds). *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. (142-167)

Schmied, Josef. 1991. *English in Africa: An Introduction.* London: Longman.

Schmied, Josef (ed). 1992. *English in East and Central Africa 2.* Bayreuth African Studies series 24. Bayreuth University press: Bayreuth

Schmied, Josef. 2004. East African English (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania): morphology and syntax. In Kortmann, Bernd; Kate Burridge; Rajend Mesthrie; Edgar W. Schneider and Clive Upton (eds). *A Handbook of Varieties of English 2: Morphology and Syntax.* Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. (929-947)

Sey, K. A. 1973. *Ghanaian English.* London: Macmillan.

Simo Bobda, Augustin. 1994a. Lexical Innovation Processes in Cameroon English. *World Englishes* vol. 13:4. (245-260)

Simo Bobda, Augustin. 1994b. *Aspects of Cameroon English phonology.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Simo Bobda, Augustin. 1995. The Phonologies of Nigerian English and Cameroon English. In Bamgbose, Ayo; Ayo Banjo; Andrew Thomas (eds). *New Englishes: A West African Perspective.* Mosuro: Ibadan. (248-268)

Simo Bobda, Augustin and B. S. Chumbow. 1999. The Trilateral Process in Cameroon English Phonology. *English World Wide* vol. 20:1. (35-65)

Simo Bobda, Augustin. 2000. Research on New Englishes: A critical review of some findings so far with a focus on Cameroon English. *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* vol. 25:1. (53-70)

Skandera, Paul. 1999. What do we *really* know about Kenyan English? A case study in research methodology. In *English World Wide* 20:2 (217-236)

South African Statistics 2003. 2004. Statistics South Africa: Pretoria

Spencer, John (ed).1971. *The English Language in West Africa.* Longman: London

Statistics South Africa, 2004. 2004. Sept. vol. 38: 3. Statistics South Africa: Pretoria

Todd, Loreto. 1982. The English Language in West Africa. In *English as a World Language* ed. R. Bailey and M Görlach. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press. (281-305)

Unesco World Languages Survey. 2005. Accessed 24 January, 2005. http://www.dac.gov.za/reports/unesco_report/unesco_world_languages_survey.htm.

van der Walt, Johan and Bertus van Rooy. 2002. Towards a norm in South African Englishes. *World Englishes* 21. (113-128)

van Rooy, Bertus. 2000. The consonants of BSAE: current knowledge and future prospects. *South African Journal of Linguistics* Supplement 38. (35-55)

van Rooy, Bertus and Gerhard van Huyssteen. 2000. The vowels of BSAE: current knowledge and future prospects. *South African Journal of Linguistics* Supplement 38. (15-33)

Wade, R. 1997. *Arguments for Black South African English as a distinct 'New' English.* Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on World Englishes.

Williams, Jessica. 1987. Non-native varieties of English: a special case of language acquisition. *English World Wide* 8. (161-199)

Zuengler, Jane. 1982. Kenyan English. In Kachru, Braj B. (ed). *The Other Tongue: English across cultures.* Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd. (112-123)