Varieties of English world-wide: where we stand*

Manfred Görlach
University of Cologne

September 1997

Abstract

The paper summarizes the state of scholarly research in one of the most recent and most stimulating branches of sociolinguistics. Criteria which help to show whether a variety (or an utterance) *is* English are discussed in detail before the distinctiveness of individual Englishes is focused on. Regular developments of New Englishes —innovation, retention and rejection of linguistic features— are treated with data from the U.S., Canada, Australia and South Africa, with particular attention given to pronunciation and lexis. Forms and functions of English are then treated with regard to second- and foreign-language countries. Finally, there is a critical look at what we have achieved and what remains to be done.

Key words: Varieties of English, World Language, English as a Native Second and Foreign Language, Historical Sociolinguistics.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

For someone who has published various accounts on varieties of English around the world and organized relevant research on the topic (starting with Bailey & Görlach 1982) there appears little new to say. I would like to organize this survey around a few central topics basically summarizing what I have

said in print, and which can be read at leisure, for instance in my two collections *Englishes* (1991a) and *More Englishes* (1995a), and in two papers devoted to similar state-of-the-art accounts (Görlach 1991b and 1995b) as well as in various issues of *English World-Wide*.[1] The present summary considers the following points:

1. The question of whether texts can be classified as English.
2. Types of varieties of English: national, regional, social, acquisitional, diachronic, stylistic, or according to text types.
3. Methodological problems: what *is*, say, Indian English (as against South Asian English (SAsE)) defined on the basis of the four A's, *abstand, ausbau* (see below), *attitude, acquisition*? How important are descriptive as against prescriptive traditions, endonormative as against exonormative speech communities, and what is the relevance of the distinction between societies in which English is used as a native language, a second language, a second dialect or as a foreign language?
4. Sociolinguistic issues: *what* are the salient linguistic variables (pronunciation, lexis and possibly spelling) of individual varieties and what is the social structure that can be correlated with these (education, power, age, sex, religion, and so on) and the prestige based on language? How far does bi/multilingualism complicate the issue?
5. Regional factors, such as: areas of spread, former colonial traditions, substratum influences in particular areas.
6. Historical aspects such as: settlement history, provenance of administrators, local centres of power and administration, education.
7. National identity: What makes New Zealand English (NZE) different from Australian English (AusE)? Does a nation need a language of its own (as for example the newly established Republic of Bosnia)? Why is there no Celtic English, African English and (possibly) no Canadian English (CanE)?

I will conclude my survey with a list of desiderata and attempt to account for the state of affairs in varieties research which is not as satisfactory as it seemed a dozen years ago.

2. And is it English?[2]

2.1.

Linguists have devoted a great deal of attention to describing structures of languages and, more recently, the interrelations of language and society.

---

1. The journal *English World-Wide. A Journal of Varieties of English* started in 1980 (Heidelberg: Groos) and has been published by Benjamins, Amsterdam, from 1982. I handed on the position as General Editor to E.W. Schneider (Regensburg) in July 1997.
2. Section 2 is a drastically condensed version of Görlach (1996).

However, only a few linguists have devoted enough time to defining what a 'language' is, shying away from cases which do not permit neat classifications. These problem cases exist both on the level of utterance and on the level of linguistic systems.

As we will see, an individual *utterance* can be more or less English as the result of incomplete competence on the part of the speaker (due to youth, intellectual or educational restrictions, physical impairment in native speakers, or all these factors combined with limited opportunities for learning English in non-native users); such limitations can relate to spoken or written English or both; or it can be a consequence of deliberate or unintentional mixing of various languages (code-mixing). In addition, the Englishness of language *systems* can be in doubt. Determining the degree of independence from English of the speech form in question will largely depend on the four A's:[3]

— *abstand*: the greater the *distance* of the underlying system from Standard English (StE), the greater is the justification for classifying the speech form as a language (rather than as a dialect);
— *ausbau*: the greater the *homogeneity* of the speech form and the degree to which it has achieved *linguistic norms* on the one hand, and the *range of functions* in written and spoken forms on the other, the greater is its claim to language-ness; an attractive, if misleading, view would tend to attribute the predicate 'language' to a speech form that has a published grammar and a dictionary —and a translation of the New Testament;
— *attitude*: speakers' attitudes can be even more important: if they wish to regard widely divergent speech forms as varieties of one language (as in China), or minimally different ones as distinct languages (as recently in the case of Serbian and Croatian), the linguist cannot tell the speakers they are wrong;
— *acquisition*: incomplete language learning by entire groups of speakers can cause the vernacular to drift away from the initially intended aim so that new norms emerge; compare, for instance, the emergence of Romance languages and the birth of English-related pidgins and creoles. (In most cases such interlanguages do not develop into new systems; see 2.2.1 'broken English' below.)

A few very short quotes will illustrate the problem of whether the excerpts can be classified as English:

1. *The height of the biggins is happit in rauchins o haar* is the first line of a famous poem on Edinburgh («Haar in Princess Street») by the late Scots

---

3. The German terms (coined by Kloss, cf. Kloss 1978) have been widely accepted by English-speaking sociolinguists; they are retained because no succinct alternatives are available and for the alliteration.

poet Alexander Scott. While the syntax and much of the morphology of the specimen is identical with English and its pronunciation will partly depend on the reader's interpretation, the deliberate choice of non-English nouns and the lexical verb used makes the sentence (to be translated as 'the height of the buildings is covered in blankets of fog') unintelligible outside Scotland (and possibly inside much of present-day Scotland, too). The author did not want the poem to be in English, 'enriched' it with Scots lexis, and is likely to have read it out with Scots pronunciation. The text should, then, not be considered English.

2. *One day Jesus jelled into a boat with his mushes, and rokkered to them, «Let's jell over the pani».* This is a sentence from an Anglo-Romani translation of a biblical passage meant for use in school, which means: 'Jesus went into a boat with his disciples and spoke to them, «Let's go over the water».' The case looks very similar to the Scots sentence, with only the four important lexemes being different from English. Historically, the situation *is* different. Present-day Anglo-Romani is acquired by teenagers when their English competence is fully developed; it consists in a set of a few hundred words embedded in an English system. Anglo-Romani is therefore parasitic and not independent; it also largely functions as a secret code. Lacking historicity and full standardization and general acceptance as a language, its status as non-English is therefore much weaker than in the case of Scots. There do not seem to be representative statements of its speakers as to whether they consider it as a language.

3. *Neba kaal halligator big mout sotee yu don kraas di riba* is, as the content will tell you, a proverb from the Caribbean ('Never call an alligator big mouth before you have crossed the river'). Its deviance from English is much slighter than the Anglo-Romani and the Scots specimens, consisting of a few features of grammar and lexis and of course there are many differences in pronunciation.[4] A decision of whether the text can be classified as an utterance in an English dialect or whether it represents a different language, depends entirely on attitude. It is obvious that in such cases political or ideological arguments can produce classifications that are contrary to the linguist's judgement. The old conflict about a proper categorization of American Black English (AmBlE) is a notable example.

4. *Whan that Aprill with his shoures soote,* the beginning of Chaucer's «General Prologue» to the *Canterbury Tales* of around 1390, reminds us that development over time is a decisive factor too; the distance between two historically related systems is likely to increase with time, and there can be, at the ends of a historical continuum, forms of the same language that are so wide apart that the understanding of the early text is precluded.

---

4. Spelling is an easy way to stress the independence of a variety. The use of a quasi-phonemic orthography in 3) —in contrast to 1) and 2)— suggests greater deviance from StE than there is, whereas the Scots text appears more English than it would be if spoken.

It will be obvious that in all these cases classifications can be made but we may still feel somewhat uneasy about them. This unease is increased in cases where there is a more or less of non-Englishness: the first three varieties exist in a sociolinguistic continuum which has Braid Scots, 'deep' Anglo-Romani and basilectal creole as one of its poles, and some kind of modified StE as the other, speakers usually being able to code-switch according to formality. It is also obvious that purely formal characteristics are not sufficient for a decision on language-ness. All these decisions are based on systematic aspects, but to categorize utterances is not any easier as I will try to show. Most of these difficulties result from inadequate language acquisition, i.e., they are utterance-related phenomena.

2.2. Utterance-related phenomena

Various uses of language tend to produce texts which are only marginally English — whether the speaker/writer is aware of the fact or not. Usually the intended norm is not in question, but the competence of the producer is. Linguists may be tempted to disregard these utterances as messy, or be fascinated by such linguistic chambers of horrors; in either case, adequate methods of description are not readily available.

2.2.1. Broken English

There is a long tradition of texts produced by non-English speakers whose butchering of the Queen's English may be considered pitiful or funny, but will certainly restrict successful communication.

Bliss (1979) has collected early attestations of garbled English in the mouths of Irish speakers; although the texts are literary productions by 16th- to 18th-century authors (including Shakespeare, Dekker, Jonson and Swift), they reflect a sufficient degree of realism to be interpreted as caricatures, that is, texts exaggerating linguistic deviance for humoristic purposes, but nevertheless based on a modicum of linguistic fact. Another famous case of unsuccessful English was Pedro Carolino's well-meant attempt at glossing Portuguese texts which were intended as lessons for English learners (Carolino 1883). He produced such gems as the following:

> Cuttler, a very rich man too many avaricious, commonly he was travel at a horse, and single for to avoid all expenses. In the evening at to arrive at the inn did feign to be indispose, to the end that one bring him the supper. He did ordered to the stable knave to bring in their room some straw, for to put in their boots he made to warm her bed and was go to sleep.

What is the *linguistic relevance* of such specimens? They can be valuable in various ways for applied linguistics (error analysis, contrastive studies and

psycholinguistics)[5], but they can also elucidate the processes by which new languages emerge. Mühlhäusler has, among others, pointed to broken speech as the first stage in pidgin genesis, forms which he classifies as 'jargons' (cf. 1986). The reduced input of English in the contact situation (which may well include a great deal of foreigner talk)[6] is characterized by extreme variability and unpredictability, and is likely to produce even more variable utterances in the learners. It is only when conventions about the use of the speech emerge and the structures become more stable, that pidgins arise. Jargons, for all their restrictions and shortcomings, are specimens of defective English; they may continue, or rather be re-created ad hoc when the need arises, over long periods of time. Such is the case with the broken English of India, as illustrated by tourist guides' and shopkeepers' English; apparently no proper pidgin ever developed in the country. On the other hand the broken English used in Old Calabar (as testified by Chief Antera Duke's diary kept in the 1780s) contributed to what later became Nigerian pidgin.[7]

Finally, a survey of utterances of questionable English-ness is not complete without a reference to certain linguistic experiments in literary writings. Any passage from Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* (1950) will do to illustrate the point that while the language used is undoubtedly English, intentional deviances from an expected norm of StE are almost as frequent as matches.

3. Varieties of English

Utterances that according to the criteria discussed above are intended as English and can be understood as such exhibit a wide range of variation, and it will be good to look at this heterogeneity with a view to how it helps us to understand the varieties of world English. Remember that the functions of

5. 'Broken English', so Banda (1996:69) rightly states, can also be used by fully competent speakers because it is more appropriate to the situation. His illustrations of street-sellers' English are to be compared with the avoidance of too correct English which is considered as affected by interlocutors whose English is clearly localized. This situation is frequently encountered by 'England-returned' speakers (and has happened to B. Kachru in his native Cashmere, p.c.). The most recent statement on the phenomenon is by de Klerk (1996:125) who comments on Xhosa speakers' English in Grahamstown: «they owe considerable loyalty to their own groups, and this may ultimately militate against mastering English to any degree of perfection: one doesn't want to sound too much like an English speaker if one is a Xhosa speaker, in case one is seen as putting on airs». Also compare the related phenomenon of foreigner talk. All these varieties are excluded from my discussion below.
6. The term refers to the simplified registers used in contact with speakers whose competence in the language is expected to be minimal - the expectation being that simplified grammar is easier to comprehend.
7. Records by European travellers and merchants of English spoken by Africans along the West African coast from the 16th to early 19th centuries should probably be interpreted as referring to 'broken' forms, especially if it is attested that Africans spoke a little English and Portuguese; for a critical summary cf. Huber (1995).

English may well be restricted by coexisting languages which are regularly used for certain functions and text types, so that a diglossia (or triglossia) determines the linguistic behaviour of members of the respective speech community. Different functions normally lead to one of the languages being more prestigious and more useful; this is called the 'High' language. Whereas the High language today tends to be Standard English in many countries around the world, English was itself dominated by Latin and French during much of its history; note that the dialect/standard contrast is closely related with the topic.

The degree to which a language can be considered as full-fledged can, then, be decided on the basis of its standardization and functional range. Within this system 'dialects' and 'registers' will be distributed in an ordered heterogeneity which is mastered by the users of the language to a greater or lesser extent, depending on their age, education, experience etc. This makes up their communicative competence.

The functional range and the norms of correctness are the essential criteria for a classification of societies as employing English as a native language (ENL), as a second language (ESL), as a second dialect (ESD) and as a foreign language (EFL), so named according to the use they make of the English language.[8] It is much more difficult to show whether and how these societal distinctions are also reflected in linguistic features as we will see. However, it is quite clear that the range of meaningful questions we can ask is largely determined by the type of community, such as:

— ENL: the investigation of settlement history, traditional dialectology, Labovian sociolinguistics, history of linguistic norms and standardization;
— ESL: restriction to certain text types, register misuse, ethnic and first-language based distinctions, degrees of brokenness;
— ESD: the historical and sociolinguistic interrelationship of the low (dialect, creole) and related high (standard, school) language; development of continua and stylistic reordering;
— EFL: contact phenomena on individual levels such as spelling, pronunciation, morphology, lexis and syntax, predominantly the impact English has on the other languages.

4. Distinctiveness of varieties on individual levels

The obvious problem is for the linguist to describe what the interested layman tends to know: listeners are able to classify speakers on the phone not only as old, male, etc. but also as 'American' or 'Indian'. There is, then,

---

8.   The classification does not make any statement on individual competences; it works as a grid well enough even in complex societies such as Nigeria, but is evidently inapplicable when the speech community is as heterogeneous as it is in, for instance, South Africa.

something in the accent, lexis and possibly syntax of an utterance that gives speakers away. Of course, these classifications are not always correct; for instance, it is alleged that people in Belfast when phoned cannot easily tell Protestants from Roman Catholics, or a white US Southerner may be mistaken for a black person (an experience once told to me by Raven McDavid Jr.) *or vice versa,* as happened to a black South African journalist (a story reported in the Cape Times on August 1, 1996). The identification of a variety is often based on few features; sometimes a single characteristic will be enough. Let me illustrate my point with two lighthearted stories.[9]

Many jokes are based on the linguistic divide between BrE and AmE, mostly focusing on the different vowel qualities in the two varieties, and the contrast of stereotypically non-rhotic BrE as against rhotic AmE. A more sophisticated specimen involves phonology, lexis and semantics:

> An American travelling on British Rail and dozing away in his compartment had the shock of his life when he heard a voice from above: «This is your guard speaking». He thought he was having a metaphysical experience.

The misunderstanding was inevitable, not just because BrE 'guard' [gɑːd] would be identified with [gɑd] 'God' by an American in phonetic terms, but also because a railway official in charge of a train is of course a *conductor* in AmE.

Two of the most salient features of Black English, the pronunciation of [ð] as [d] word-initially, and the absence of the copula, were used in the following story:

> The governor of Alabama had died. He went up to the gates of heaven and knocked at the door. «Who dere?» was the response from inside. «All right, I'll try the other place» was the governor's spontaneous reply.

Similar stories can illustrate salient features of English in Africa, Asia and Australia (cf. Görlach 1997a).

Although the identification of a variety can, then, be based on one or on few characteristics, the vital question remains: how many features must there be, and how regularly must they be present, to make up an entity that we would like to call X-ean English? If we look at the contexts in which terms like 'African English', 'Indian English' or even 'European English' are used, it becomes quite clear that 'English in Africa' would be much preferable, and may in fact have been intended. With regard to countries like Canada, such questions have linguistic, but even greater political relevance; there is a long list of quotes to illustrate how uncertain Canadians are about their identity

---

9. The following account is a thoroughly shortened and slightly rephrased form of Görlach (1997a).

(cf. Görlach 1991d), in language as in other matters (note the relevance of the question for New Zealand). Avis and Bailey represent the traditional view:

> Canadian English is a fairly recent hybrid which resembles American English in some respects and British English in others, while exhibiting much that is singularly Canadian. It is, in fact, the composite of these characteristics which gives CanE its unique identity. (Avis, 1973: 43)

> What is distinctively Canadian about Canadian English is not its unique linguistic features (of which there are a handful) but its combination of tendencies that are uniquely distributed. (Bailey 1982: 161)

This raises the following questions which are of universal relevance and not confined to Canada:

1. To satisfy the qualifications of a national variety need the English be homogeneous? Can 'mixtures' fulfil identificational functions?
2. How different in linguistic structure must a variety be to count as a dialect? Is, for instance, a single phonological feature, or a few lexical items, enough?
3. What is the relationship between linguistic and other factors of national identity? Is it possible for a linguistic difference to be completely levelled out while cultural and political independence remain unaffected?

5. ENL societies[10]

When looking at ENL communities we can take a historical fact they share as a starting-point: they are all settler communities: America first, and New Zealand last. Are there any specific linguistic features that can be ascribed to this shared history or features that can lead us to expect similar developments under similar conditions? (cf. Nielsen & Schøsler 1996). A table can help to make these expectations clear (and contrast them with ESL features) before we continue discussing details (see table 1 and table 2).

It is obvious that interdialectal contact tends to speed up phonological change, and new social norms can easily change the acceptability of formerly stigmatized pronunciations: innovation is therefore to be generally expected in ENL communities. By contrast, ESL societies are likely to be characterized by interference phenomena and overgeneralization, and therefore exhibit innovation (of different types), unless these local features are criticized as deviances when compared with an external standard, say the educated speech of the South of England. Innovation (less so, retention) therefore largely depends on the new social set-ups and communication needs the English lan-

---

10. Section 5 is largely condensed from Görlach (1996b).

Table 1. Expected features of emigrant languages (e.g. ENL).

	Innovation	**Retention**	**Rejection**
Pronunciation	Levelling	Fossilization	
Spelling	Webster's reforms		Old traditions
Morphology	Simplification (Afrikaans)	'gotten'	Complications
Lexis	New	Fossilization	Designations for old items
Syntax	Levelling?	?	?
Style	Less diversity and more norm-oriented		

Table 2. Expected features of second languages (e.g. ESL).

	Simplification	**Interference**	**Limited input**
Pronunciation	?	X	_
Spelling	_	?	_
Morphology	X	X	_
Lexis	X	X	X
Syntax	X	X	X
Style	Monostyle	Loanstyles	Register misuse

guage has to serve, and given the extralinguistic determinants of the new situation, the types of innovation in a particular New English are, to a limited extent, predictable. The most important factor in all this is the distinction between native and second-language communities.

The evaluation of these new features depends on whether stable new norms, or explicit and codified standards, develop in the emigrant community or new nation; if they do not, innovations will be called deviances, or even mistakes, and may well be stigmatized when compared with the 'proper' speech of the home country. The emergence of new centres appears to be easier for geographically distinct speech communities, especially if they achieve political independence (Austrian and Swiss German, Scots/Scottish English —by contrast, Ireland always had colonial status); linguistic independence, and thereby a positive and self-confident appreciation of the divergence, is much harder to arrive at for speech communities that start off as colonies. The history of the English in the U.S. and Australia (and, incipiently, Canada and New Zealand), the only former ENL colonies that have completed the development, illustrates the difficulties of freeing new nations from the 'colonial cringe' (cf. Clyne 1992 for comparisons with other European languages).

Innovation is certainly the outstanding characteristic of new ENL socie-ties. Although this is most obvious in lexis it is also found on other levels. For instance, new developments in articulation or in phonemic contrasts are generally based on:

1. the dominance of sociolects of emigrants different from those which were general, or prestigious in the home countries, or
2. specific forms of mergers as a consequence of speakers of different dialects mixing on board emigrant ships, or in the colony, that would have been unlikely to mix back home; this process results in various forms of colonial levelling;
3. the avoidance of extreme forms of pronunciation because these would be difficult to understand, or stigmatized, or both.

It is problematic to decide which of these processes are due to deliberate accommodation, and to what extent speakers are aware of these adaptations.

British commentators on 18th-century speech might well be critical, or even caustic, on pronunciations they heard in the American colonies; possibly they were guided by the metropolitan feeling of superiority and looked down on the morals and speechways of a society which included among its members —at least in Georgia— those transported from England for petty crimes. However, these same observers also noted the more homogeneous character of AmE which, although it lacked the refinement of educated upper-class Lon-don society, was also free from the so-called 'vulgarities' of English dialects. Many also admitted that the standards of education, especially in New Eng-land and Quaker societies in Pennsylvania, were much higher than the British average — two aspects of the 'democratic' character of AmE which was also stressed by many Americans after they had gained independence.

Australia innovated in slightly different ways. There was an enormous distance between the pronunciation of lower-class urban convicts from the South of England and those of the officers, teachers and judges that hap-pened to go or be sent to Australia. In the fusion of the two layers of society, which it took most of the 19th century to achieve, the innovation lay in an increasing acceptance of non-standard pronunciation, where the standard, well into the 20th century, was educated Southern BrE, or Received Pro-nunciation.

The best example of colonial levelling is perhaps the development of the /ai/ and /au/ vowels. Trudgill (1986, based on Chambers) has convincingly shown that the so-called 'Canadian Raising' which makes the quality of the diphthongs depend on the subsequent consonant (*a loud shout* [laud ʃəut], *a nice prize* [nəɪs praɪz]) is an innovation which organized the heterogeneous input by way of new allophonic rules. Although 'Aitken's Law' distinguishes two qualities for these diphthongs in Scots, and Scottish settlers were quite numerous in the colonization of Upper Canada, the linguistic norms were replaced by new Canadian ones, however much the *substance* of the pronun-

ciation input might be preserved. Interestingly enough, different results of such levelling are recorded from AmE dialects and those of a few isolated communities elsewhere, such as in the Bermudas — a clear indication that the same input need not yield identical results.

This is also evident from a comparison of AusE and SAfE. The regional homogeneity of AusE pronunciation is as striking as it is unexplained. Not all Australian states received convicts (cf. Jupp 1988), and connections between the new colonies were infrequent by sea, and practically non-existent overland. So why did the middle-class settlement at Adelaide not yield a distinctively different pronunciation from 'convict' Sydney? This homogeneity is even more surprising since the expected contrast happened in S Africa, where lower-class settlers in the Cape developed a stigmatized dialect which shares many features with AusE, whereas middle-class speakers in Natal, who created a little Victorian England on the Indian Ocean, spoke with a notably different pronunciation.

Nor is it true that under 18th/19th-century conditions colonial speech is uniformly marked by divergence from the metropolis: the norms of educated BrE remained very effective as prestige patterns, as can be illustrated by the social and regional patterning of post-vocalic /r/ in present-day AmE. *r*-lessness became accepted BrE standard around 1800, and it is documented that New England and parts of the American South adopted the new fashion, a pattern strengthened by rich Charleston planters sending their children to be educated in the best British schools, from which they were sure to return without their *r*'s.[11] (The later adoption of this feature by much of the Southern population, including the Blacks, testifies to the impact of this pattern.) In Australia, there is plenty of anecdotal evidence of the continuance of British public school pronunciation among Australians until quite recently, and it is claimed that the most important qualification of a radio announcer was to be British-born until at least 1950.

Innovation was obviously also at work in the formation of various phonological systems of Englishes in the Caribbean, Africa or South Asia, whether mediated by a pidgin stage or not. The pronunciation of ESL or pidgin/creole speakers was often affected by the phonological system of their native languages, most notably where these had only a very limited set of vowel contrasts, say five or six (normally not including vowel length as a distinctive factor). Often, the major problems are in intonation, with syllable-timing rather than stress-timing.

It is of course open to doubt whether all this is 'innovation' in the systematic sense as long as such features have not been accepted in the local standard. However, this is a question of the emergence and acceptance of new

11. There is an 'indigenous' tendency of 'r-dropping' recorded in early AmE documents, but it is not consistent enough, and was probably stigmatized, to explain its widespread adoption as a prestige feature in regional AmE.

endocentric norms, which largely depend, as the example of AusE shows, on the self-confidence of the speech community in question.

5.1. Innovation: the lexicon

The 'colonial levelling' mentioned above is an important, if possibly less conspicuous, factor in the history of New Englishes: thousands of dialect words must have been given up by their speakers who found they were not understood, or smiled or sneered at. This process was most drastic where speakers of a discredited variety, such as IrE, arrived in communities in which colonial norms were well-established and where accommodation was the best, or only, way for survival or upward mobility. Therefore, Irish words are likely to have been dropped even more quickly than a more tenacious Irish accent in mid-19th-century Australia, and even Scots words did not survive to any remarkable extent on the Southern Island of New Zealand, even though there were high concentrations of Scottish emigrants living in relative isolation in the first years of their settlement in which local norms are likely to be established.

Three methods are universally available to adapt the lexicon to the new functions in emigrant societies, *viz.* borrowing, coinages, and changes of meaning of existing words; the negative correlate of this adaptation process is less spectacular and in consequence often overlooked, that is the loss of words not felt to be needed in the new situations. This loss can be enormous (even though parts of the discarded lexis may be recovered later through written, especially literary sources).

5.1.1. Loanwords

Borrowings are the most conspicuous, and therefore most often collected, items illustrating lexical innovation. However, these data are misleading in many ways. Dictionaries incorporating this kind of evidence tend to stress the rare and exotic words, and secondly, the items often designate very specialized phenomena. It does not come as a surprise, then, that modern collections of loanwords in some varieties have much more modest proportions: there are some 400 words from Aboriginal languages in Dixon et al. (1990) and the number of native Indian words in AmE is even smaller.[12] Only

---

12. The major source, Algonquian languages, is reported (by Marckwardt 1980: 31) to have yielded 132 according to a list made in 1902, of which only 37 were still in use in 1958. It is also significant that the early period of contact supplied many more loanwords than later ones, and that early loans are more permanent, becoming more firmly established. This applies to AusE, where some 70% of such loans date to the first fifty years of settlement (Görlach 1994, based on Dixon et al. 1990) as well as AmE, for which Marckwardt (1980: 33) reports that half of the loanwords from Indian languages date to the 17th century.

Hawkins (1984) continues the misleading tradition of a too excessive coverage of rare loanwords: based on the *OED*, he excerpted some 2,000 words derived from Indian languages, but does not say how many of these can be considered current either in India or internationally.

5.2. Word-formation

Therefore the needs to designate new plants, animals, features of the countryside or institutions were expressed, rather, by other means, namely word-formation and expansion of meaning. Emigrant Englishes do not principally differ from mother-tongue varieties in the patterns available for, and used productively in, word-formation. However, we have to remember that the acceptability of coinages is regulated by a societal norm, which can be expected to be more liberal in colonial societies (there being less concern for linguistic correctness and fewer teachers available as word-watchers). On the other hand, a colonial inferiority complex may well make educated users be even more norm-conscious, that is, of metropolitan norms, than in the society 'back home'. The two principles, pulling in contrary directions, make the outcome difficult to predict.

Compounds are most easily produced and understood; in consequence, they appear to be the most frequent solution for the filling of lexical gaps, regardless of whether we have to do with ENL or ESL societies. Lexical innovation even in English-based pidgins is dominated by compounding, apparently because of the high degree of transparency of the new formations. In fact, derivation (which involves more complex morphological processes and yields semantically more opaque results) is less used in ESL countries, and where new suffix formations do occur, they are frequently more 'exotic' as a consequence of a much wider or looser understanding of the underlying word-formation rules. However, the looseness of a norm (or its virtual absence) can in English be best illustrated from zero-derivations: AmE has always been renowned for its 'daring' verbal experiments in this field —a freedom which in fact reminds us of the liberties that the Elizabethan writers took with the English language— and formations duplicating *to signature* for *to sign* were very much disliked in Britain. Again, IndE is conspicuous for some of its unusual zero-derivations: for instance, lectures can be *by-hearted* rather than read out.

5.3. Meaning

Much of the following discussion will be on designation rather than about meaning. Confronted with new surroundings, settlers might well resort to familiar words in order to designate, more or less appropriately, what they saw around them. There has been quite a lot of comment, usually devastating, on this procedure, which is, however, easy to understand (and therefore justify), for the following reasons:

1. Re-use of the old words did not result in ambiguity since the old designata had been left behind at home (obvious in the case of *beech* and *fir*, which do not always designate the 'proper' species in Australia).
2. It meant that loanwords were not necessary; these were often difficult to pronounce and more difficult to remember — and possibly the settlers had not even had an occasion to learn them from Native Indians or Aborigines, the political relations being what they were.
3. Settlers, especially those transported to Australia, often came from urban areas and could not be expected to correctly distinguish species of animals and plants in Britain, and in consequence, less so in strange countries overseas.
4. Retaining the old words for new plants and animals that somehow resembled those left behind helped emigrants feel more 'at home', the new objects probably becoming even more similar to their European 'counterparts' through the use of the same names.

5.4. Retention

5.4.1. Loss

The fact that emigrant societies, in reduced contact with the mother country, tend to preserve features that were lost from the metropolitan society has been frequently stated, and often exaggerated (cf. Görlach 1991b). For, although emigrants may treasure the memory of their ancestral home and try to retain the language that they brought with them, especially if it is supported by religious usage, a moment's reflexion can tell us that innovation must be a much more frequent phenomenon than retention.

5.4.2. Retention of pronunciation features

How far can we assume that emigrant communities retain the pronunciation of the mother country where it is itself superseded by innovation? As far as voice quality, pitch and rhythm are concerned, such claims are pure speculation, as in the hypothesis that the alleged 'whine' of some Americans is part of the Quaker heritage. In cases of vowels or consonants, conservative features often relate to individual words, in others the evidence is controversial as it is in the often assumed conservatism of AmE *dance* [æ] and *fourth floor* [r] pronunciations. In the case of the *dance* vowel both AmE and London-based BrE innovated from EModE [a], a vowel probably much better retained in the regional standard in the North of England. Is the *sécretàry* pronunciation in AmE due to retention of an 18th-century BrE pattern, is it due to a different selection from two alternatives, or is it an innovation by non-English speaking immigrants who learnt their English mainly from books, especially from Webster's, where they would find the rule that all syllables ought to be pronounced properly? The truth is, of course, that all these factors combined to produce the present situation.

AusE pronunciation has usually been characterized as being progressive; it is certainly more advanced in its vowels and diphthongs than BrE R.P., but it still lacks some developments of 20th-century Cockney, like glottal stops and vocalization of [l] in *milk* etc. The probable interpretation is that AusE retains certain features of 19th-century lower-class Sth. BrE ('Cockney' for short) without sharing its more recent innovations, a phenomenon parallelled in lexis.

6. ESL societies[13]

Englishes used in ESL countries tend to be characterized by

1. a wide divergence of individual competences, with only a minority speaking English at all;
2. the restriction of English to certain domains (law, media, administration, education often from primary school on, and notably including creative writing);
3. a restricted input, historically often dominated by administrationese, literary English from Shakespeare to Dickens, and biblical language; its application to other text types can result in register misuse and unusual mixes. There is possibly no other country in the world outside India and Pakistan in which industrial products and management courses would be advertised with quotations from Keats and Sir Walter Scott (see below);
4. a much greater deviance from a standard of pronunciation expected in international communication (often a consequence of the non-availability of native speakers) than in written forms (where users can be monitored more effectively).

Now it is a common experience of a native speaker that the distinctiveness of many ESL varieties is most notable in pronunciation. Where it is striking in written forms, it is usually most conspicuous in certain (often un-English) text types. To explain why a certain text strikes us as peculiar, we will have to determine also

1. which text types are not found in English and never have been;
2. which text types are represented locally only by International English (IntE)[14], either because such books are always imported, or written by expatriates;
3. if local Englishes are used, what present-day regional and social variation is there (as in the metropolitan vs. provincial contrast in many anglophone

---

13. For the following arguments cf. Görlach (1995c).
14. The concept of 'International English' is applicable to syntax and lexis, where it refers to features shared among varieties world-wide, including a few sets of predictable alternates; it is a construct useful for measuring 'deviance' as used in this article.

countries' daily newspapers, which combines with the tabloid vs. quality distinction to form very intricate patterns)?

4. Has there been a historical development within the genre, and in what ways have existing deficiencies been filled (indigenous developments, or through borrowing of styles from BrE, AmE or other forms of English)?

5. How conspicuous are 'misuses' of register found in the individual category, and are these to be explained by the carry-over of features from related text types? How important are stylistic traditions and expectations in the local languages, i.e. how far can deviances from IntE be explained as stylistic calques?

6. What new text types have developed in regional Englishes to satisfy communicative needs, and how do (5.) features in old and new text types compare?

7. What evidence of stylistic 'colonial lag' is found in individual text types in different varieties, i.e. why do some local traditions strike us as markedly 'Victorian'?

For instance, what makes many Indian advertisements sound or look so strange is the use of high-flown language, including quotations from Keats and Sir Walter Scott (Shakespeare is another favourite).

Here are several advertisements, one from India advertising saris by qoting from Keats:

> A thing of beauty is a joy forever
> You are the Joy in Co-oplex polyester

Another from Pakistan quotes from Scott's *Marmion*:

> "O what tangled webs we weave…" that tie up industrialists while importers run free!
> "…When first we practice to deceive"

A third, advertising a state bank, has the following solemn text under a photograph of famous historical Indian leaders:

> … Their goal was nothing but to emancipate the masses who are denied their legitimate rights heretofore. We too have joined the march to tread the path our pioneers have trodden. And at our SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY we vow once again to remove the tears of the down-trodden by bringing about social and economic justice. (see Görlach, 1995: 202, 204)

To explain the phenomenon we will have to take at least three factors into account:

1. The colonial input which laid so much weight on classical English literature, which in fact still dominates English departments in Indian univer-

sities. To quote from such texts has a certain snob appeal —even if it results in notable register misuse.
2. The style of 19th-century advertising in Britain, which is as different from present-day diction as can be imagined.
3. The different cultural context in which the advertisement is intended to be effective. As far as banks are concerned, their function in India was indeed to legalize credits and 'liberate the masses' from the practices of money-lenders.

7. EFL societies

7.1.

The world-wide spread of English has affected EFL countries in particular after 1945. In many countries, educated speakers can now be expected to understand and produce English with reasonable fluency. However, the diglossia which is so characteristic of ESL countries has not arisen so far, the native languages and English being kept distinct, with sloppy interferences often stigmatized. The impact of English affects the mother tongues on all levels (for a thorough analysis of the consequences of the English impact on French language structure see Picone 1996), but in order to make any qualified international comparisons the data have to be selected very carefully, keeping the extralinguistic variables as constant as possible.

In a major scholarly project which has been in progress for some five years (Görlach 1998) I have collected data documenting the *lexical* impact on sixteen European languages. These were chosen because they share a great deal of cultural history, because they are all affected by distant-contact influences and because their typological (and recently, political) affiliations make interesting cross-cultural comparisons possible.

However, I will here concentrate on reporting on one aspect from the other side of the coin and which has been very controversial, namely the question whether we can speak of EFL varieties: is the *English* used by Europeans diverging from native-speaker norms and what evidence can be gathered on this from the English impact on the mother tongues?

7.2. Can recurrent features in EFL varieties lead to nativization?

English loanwords adopted, whatever their number, do not necessarily lead to the nativization of the English used in the respective German-, French- etc. speaking community. We cannot even assume that such items, in their adapted pronunciation or meaning, are automatically transferred to the English used by speakers of these languages. It has to be admitted, though, that many of the non-English uses are below the level of awareness, and these features are likely to be transferred to utterances in English. They include in particular:

1. Articulations (e.g. use of the wrong [l, r]), word stress and intonational patterns;
2. connotations of words;
3. preferences of words in synonymic sets which happen to be learnt first (alternatives not being acquired at all, or for more restricted contexts) or which happen to have a native equivalent resembling the English item; note that by contrast the fear of *faux amis* can also block the use of words which look too similar;
4. overuse of certain syntactical patterns which are correct in English but more variable, alternatives being available to and used by native speakers; transfer of features of word order to express emphasis, etc.; underuse of patterns which have no equivalent;
5. stylistic transfers, such as nominalizations, use of passives, balance of parataxis and hypotaxis, sentence length and depth, degree of abstractness or figurativeness of expression.

All these can stabilize even under the watchful eyes of well-educated and highly motivated teachers, since they come from the same language background as their pupils and introspection does not really help avoid these peculiarities which are evident only to (educated) and language-conscious native speakers.

There is, then, a certainly likelihood that the output of German (or French) speakers or writers will have certain recurrent features which might, if a tradition establishes itself, lead to a national variety of English, at least in certain domains. Such characteristics have long been recognized in, e.g., scholarly writing (Clyne 1984). However, these peculiarities will be confined to specific uses, and they will certainly contain a great number of idiolectal idiosyncrasies not shared among writers. An example is Bartsch (1986); the author felt justified in translating her own book without native-speaker intervention claiming that the world will have to be prepared for this type of non-native scholarly discourse. A comparison of such non-native texts shows that there are various degrees of foreignness in such writers' English productions, but that it is difficult to pin down what is shared, stable and accepted norm to justify an entity 'German English'. The concept of a 'European English', which suggests a certain norm in various registers including more popular and spoken uses, is of necessity even more diffuse; it is little more than a catchphrase, and this is *not* because the data have not been properly analysed.

It is only in very specialised contexts that recurrent features are, or in due course may well be, frequent and homogeneous enough to justify the assumption of a transnational variety. A distinct form of English used at international conferences has been claimed to be about to develop, and similar things may be true for language use in international institutions. Dollerup claims this is true for the European Community officials at Brussels:

> […] delegates of all languages who use English (and to some extent the permanent staff) will develop a kind (or several kinds) of EU-English. The most marked feature about these sociolects will be their vocabulary, and one can make a strong case for calling them 'languages for special purposes'. As far as their syntax is concerned, I would guess that they will have longer sentences than ordinary British English (because of legalese, German, and French influence), but we wait for future linguists to come up with detailed descriptions of these sociolects as they develop and grow (1997: 35).

Statements in the potential mood like these are hunches not necessarily based on facts; even if we agree that such in-group lects may develop, they will never expand to form a basis of 'Euro-English'.

For a Euro-English to develop it would need to have prescriptive school norms discarded and to have a billion-fold increase of international communication events conducted in English. However, it is not a realistic proposition to assume that the French will start talking to each other in English, nor even that they will use English with Germans in unimaginable numbers of speech acts necessary to justify the assumption that a common Continental norm different from BrE is (ever) to develop.

8. Where do we stand?

To conclude, it may be in order to point out a few desiderata that need urgent attention, and follow this up with an attempt to explain the present situation as regards relevant research. I will first name a few topics worthy of a Ph.D. student's dedicated efforts:

1. A contrastive analysis of national varieties in so far as data can be compared (cf. the possibilities offered within the project of the International Corpus of English and the divergence reflected in sets of heteronyms);
2. An analysis of the competition of BrE and AmE worldwide (regions, social values, text types etc.) and resulting levelling;
3. The development of sociolinguistic methods to explain social and linguistic structures of ESL societies (including problems of multilingualism);
4. Justification of the linguistic identity of English as an international language (EIL) as used for communication by non-native speakers: how much regularity/stability is there and under what communicational conditions;
5. The contrastive analysis of the impact of English on other languages (as sketched for the *UDASEL* project);
6. Comparative attitudes research to contrast the effect that positive or negative evaluation of English has on the quality of English in use.

To deal with variation of English around the globe involves various disciplines but there is no doubt that the topic is primarily one of sociolinguistics,

or to be more precise, one of historical sociolinguistics. For reasons very difficult to survey, progress has been much slower than might have been expected some fifteen years ago, when seminal books by Bailey & Görlach, Kachru, Platt, Pride and Trudgill appeared almost simultaneously summarizing the state of knowledge and pointing out many gaps in our knowledge and providing methods how they might be filled. They have not been filled, as I will try to show, partly taking up points made in the sections above:

1. The sociolinguistic aspects of the problem have been sadly neglected. It is still true that the classic studies in the field (say on New York, Norwich, Belfast, Sydney) were all undertaken in ENL communities. Sometimes bilingual members of these were explicitly excluded from the investigation. For ESL countries (with the exception of Singapore) the challenge has hardly been taken up; in fact we do not even know whether Labovian or similar models are descriptively adequate for them. 'Alternatives' suggested by Indian colleagues have been disappointing so far (cf. Dasgupta 1993).

2. This neglect also applies to a discipline which might have been thought to be predestined for an application of sociolinguistics, *viz.* Pidgin/Creole studies, with the exception of Le Page's (1985) model for two Caribbean speech communities (cf. Escure's (1997) more recent analysis of the complex linguistic situation in Belize). However, we still lack elementary information on the social status and range of functions of PC languages in the Caribbean, West Africa or the Pacific regions, scholars having been too much concerned with systemic or typological (lately also historical) questions.

3. The sociolinguistics of *multilingual* communities have, unsurprisingly, been bypassed, including complex problems of the social, psychological and economic determinants of language choice, codemixing and codeswitching. There was some promising work on the Philippines, and there is some exciting research from present-day South Africa, but not enough to draw more general conclusions for other communities. Whoever reads a description of communication in Soweto/Johannesburg involving five languages within a single utterance (cf. Finlayson 1997) will appreciate the difficulties inherent in formal descriptions and sociolinguistic interpretations.

4. There has not been enough comparative work. It is sad to see that the very promising approach formulated in Platt, Weber & Ho (1984) has never been developed. True enough, a team of scholars from different language backgrounds would have been necessary to achieve this, but there does not seem to have been enough interest, either. Which brings me to points five and six.

5. The entire field devoted to the investigation of non-standard dialects and their social implications seems to be declining (and to have been in decline for many years). This is obvious from the decreasing number of dissertations on, say, BrE dialects, Scots, Am BlE, Caribbean creoles, West

African Englishes etc. I have collected data on these in *English World-Wide* over the past 18 years and have seen a remarkable reduction. It is disappointing to see that the topic was not really taken up by colleagues who ought to have had the strongest interest in these problems: native speakers of ESL varieties (again with a few exceptions, most notably in Singapore). So the field has been largely left to expatriates, which adds to its lack of acceptability since it makes it possible to interpret the approach as a neo-colonialist trap.

6. All this neglect may have had some impact on the fact that the methods of description have not been refined to an extent that could be compared with other branches in linguistics. Part of the problem (as in fact in historical linguistics) appears to be that high degrees of abstraction and formalization lead away from the data, thus taking away the very objective and *raison d'être* of the approach.

Thus, the discipline is largely divided between high-powered statisticians concentrating on very limited aspects on the one hand, and what we might be tempted to call narrative linguistics on the other; the latter takes a wider view but fails to convince and to lay proper foundations for comparisons and generalizations, or at least explore how far comparisons are meaningful.

Critics will be eager to point out such deficiencies in my own work, as they will in Kachru's (1986) concepts of 'nativization' and the 'outer circle',[15] or in the methodological basis of Greenbaum's *International Corpus of English* (cf. Greenbaum 1996 and the criticism voiced by Schmied 1996).

The social relevance of the topics treated in the discipline of world Englishes would seem to make it easy for linguists to justify the energy they devote to it. Historical, social, psychological and educational reasons combine to make the quest meaningful —to us. How far they are to the speakers concerned, especially in what used to be called the developing countries, is possibly a slightly different matter.

References

AVIS, W.S. (1973). «The English language in Canada». *Current Trends in Linguistics,* 10: 40-74.

BAILEY, R.W. (1982). «The English language in Canada». In BAILEY; GÖRLACH, 134-176.

BAILEY, R.W.; GÖRLACH, M. (eds.) (1982). *English as a world language.* Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.

15. 'Nativization' refers to the necessary accommodation of English in new cultural contexts; it leads to new linguistic norms, which may be codified (in grammars and dictionaries). The 'outer circle' is seen from the ENL centre, with ESL and EFL societies (which make less use of English) further out on the periphery.

BANDA, Felix (1996). «The scope and categorization of African English: some socio-linguistic considerations». *English World-Wide,* 17: 63-75.

BARTSCH, R. (1985). *Sprachnormen: Theorie und Praxis.* Tübingen: Niemeyer. (author's English translation 1986).

BLISS, A.J. (1979). *Spoken English in Ireland, 1600-1700.* Dublin: Dolmen Press.

CAROLINO, Pedro (1883). *The new guide of the conversation in Portuguese and English.* Boston: James R. Osgood; repr. New York: Dover, 1969.

CLYNE, M. (ed.) (1992). *Pluricentric languages.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

DASGUPTA, P. (1993). *The otherness of English. India's Auntie tongue syndrome.* New Delhi: Sage.

DE KLERK, Vivian (1996). «Use of and attitudes to English in a multilingual university». *English World-Wide,* 17: 111-127.

DIXON, R.M.W., et al. (1990). *Australian aboriginal words in English. Their origin and meaning.* Oxford: University Press.

DOLLERUP, Cay (1997). «English in the European Union». In HARTMANN, R. (ed.). *The English language in Europe.* Oxford: Intellect.

ESCURE, G. (1997). *Creole and dialect continua.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

FINLAYSON, Rosalie; SLABBERT, Sarah (1997). «'I'll meet you halfway with language?': Code-switching within a South African urban context». In PÜTZ, M. (ed.). *Language choices. Conditions, constraints, and consequences,* 381-421. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

GÖRLACH, M. (1991a). *Englishes. Studies in varieties of English 1984-1988.* (VEAW G9). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

— (1991b). «English as a world language - the state of the art». In GÖRLACH (1991a), 10-35.

— (1991c). «Colonial lag? The alleged conservative character of American English and other colonial varieties». [1987]. In GÖRLACH (1991a), 108-121.

— (1991d). «The identity of Canadian English». In GÖRLACH (1991a), 108-121.

— (1994). «Innovation in new englishes». *English World-Wide,* 15: 101-126. [Reprinted in Görlach (1995a), 39-60].

— (1995a). *More Englishes. New studies in varieties of English 1988-1994.* (VEAW G13). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

— (1995b). «Varietas delectat: forms and functions of English around the world». In GÖRLACH (1995a), 10-38.

— (1995c). «Text types and Indian English». In GÖRLACH (1995a), 192-219.

— (1996a). «And is it English?». *English World-Wide,* 17: 153-174.

— (1996b). «The origins and development of emigrant englishes». In NIELSEN; SCHØSLER, 117-140.

— (1997a). «Linguistic jokes based on dialect divergence». In HICKEY, R.; PUPPEL, S. (eds.). *Language history and linguistic modelling. Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak,* 1925-1934. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

— (1997b). «Language and nation: the concept of linguistic identity in the history of English». *English World-Wide,* 18: 1-34.

— (ed.) (1998). *A usage dictionary of anglicisms in selected European languages.* Oxford: University Press.

GREENBAUM, S. (ed.) (1996). *Comparing English worldwide. The International Corpus of English.* Oxford: Clarendon.

HAWKINS, R.E. (1984). *Common Indian words in English.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

HUBER, M. (1995). «Ghanaian pidgin English: an overview». *English World-Wide,* 16: 215-249.

JUPP, J. (1988). *The Australian people.* Sydney: Angus & Robertson.

KACHRU, Braj B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes.* Oxford: Pergamon.

KLOSS, H. (1978). *Die Entwicklung neuer Germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800.* Düsseldorf: Schwann.

LE PAGE, R.B.; TABOURET-KELLER, A. (1985). *Acts of identity. Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity.* Cambridge: University Press.

MARCKWARDT, A H. (1980). *American English.* Revised by J.L. Dillard. New York: Oxford University Press.

MÜHLHÄUSLER, P. (1986). *Pidgin and creole linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

NIELSEN, H.F.; SCHØSLER, L. (eds.) (1996). *The origins and development of emigrant languages.* Odense: University Press.

PICONE, M.D. (1996). *Anglicisms, neologisms and dynamic French.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

PLATT, J.; WEBSTER, H.; HO, Mian Lian, (1984). *The new Englishes.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

PRINGLE, I. (1986). «The concept of dialect and the study of Canadian English». *Queen's Quarterly,* 90: 100-121; repr. in ALLEN, H.B.; LINN, M.D. (eds.). *Dialect and language variation,* 217-236. Orlando: Academic Press.

SCHMIED, J. (1996). «Second-language corpora». In GREENBAUM (1996), 182-196.

TRUDGILL, P. (1986). *Dialects in contact.* Oxford: Blackwell.