

REVIEWS

Roberta d’Alessandro, Susann Fischer and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (eds). 2008. *Agreement Restrictions*. Berlin · New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 325 pp.

Reviewed by Oana Săvescu*

The volume *Agreement Restrictions*, edited by Roberta d’Alessandro, Susann Fischer and Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, puts together a collection of 10 papers presenting state-of-the-art research on agreement restrictions in the past decade. Couched in the framework of recent advances in minimalist syntax and Distributive Morphology, the papers deal primarily with three main topics: (i) the Person Case Constraint (PCC), which bans accusative weak elements other than 3rd person in the presence of a weak dative argument, (contributions by Anagnostopoulou, Bonet, and to a certain extent by Boeckx, López and Rivero), (ii) the person restriction in dative-nominative constructions (papers by Richards, and Sigurdsson and Holmberg), and (iii) lack of agreement or Anti-Agreement restrictions (Arregi and Nevins, Ouali, and Wiltschko)

The volume opens with Anagnostopoulou’s paper, “Notes on the Person Case Constraint in Germanic (with special reference to German” (pp. 15-49), the first in the series of papers dealing with the PCC. In her contribution, Anagnostopoulou shows that some varieties of German exhibit PCC effects in certain environments, namely when pronouns occur in the Wackernagel position, preceding the subject. The presence of the PCC in these varieties is linked to yet another constraint: specifically, the word order of the weak pronouns has to be accusative dative. Building on earlier proposals in Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005) that the PCC arises when the indirect object (IO) is higher than the direct object (DO), the author extends her previous analyses to German and shows that the underlying order of German objects is IO > DO (the usual configuration in which the PCC obtains). The reverse, DO IO order, is the result of different types of movements the two arguments are subject to: IOs move as heads, and DO as phrases, therefore reaching a higher position.

In “The Person Case Constraint and repair strategies (pp. 103-129), Eulalia Bonet – who, in her seminal (1991) PhD dissertation gave the name of the Person Case Constraint and showed that it is operative in a wide range of genetically related and unrelated languages – focuses on repair strategies of the Catalan PCC, in particular, the use of the clitic *hi* to obviate otherwise ungrammatical structures in the languages. The author proposes that the clitic *hi* should not be regarded, as previously argued, as a locative clitic, but rather, as a dative clitic, and shows, contra Adger and Harbor (2007), that the PCC cannot simply be formulated as a condition on the (+/- animate) features of the direct object alone.

By investigating a number of restrictions generally taken to fall under the PCC, Boeckx’s paper, “The Person Case Constraint and patterns of exclusivity” (pp. 87-103) proposes some empirical refinements and a theoretical re-evaluation of the phenomenon, in terms of a reflex of asymmetric checking in situations of potential symmetry. As such, the author argues that the PCC should be no different from other phenomena such as: superiority effects with *wh* items, conditions on extraction domains, or McGinnis’ (2004) Lethal Ambiguity condition.

* University of Bucharest, Department of English, osavescu@yahoo.com. This work was supported by the strategic grant POSDRU/89/1.5/S/62259, project “Applied social, human and political sciences”, co-financed by the European Social Fund within the Sectorial Operational Program Human Resources Development 2007-2013”.

While not specifically dealing with the PCC in ditransitive structures per se, López's paper "The [person] restriction: why? And, most specially, why not?" (pp. 129-159) focuses, however, on a somewhat related set of facts, and addresses a contrast between Icelandic quirky subjects and Spanish *se* constructions, on the one hand, and Spanish quirky subjects, on the other hand. Although I find some of theoretical assumptions employed in this work to be controversial, for instance the assumption that 3rd person is lack of person, or singular is lack of number, López's overall syntactic mechanism developed in the paper is put to work nicely to derive the contrast above in terms of a new concept, namely a "complex dependency". This arises when two elements, which are in a Match relation of unvalued features, enter Agree with a third element, which values their unvalued features together. Through a thorough investigation of Spanish and Icelandic facts, López shows that Spanish *se* constructions and Icelandic quirky subjects exhibit person restrictions when the external argument is licensed by finiteness and there is a complex dependency between T, the external and the internal argument. In contrast, Spanish quirky subjects are not licensed by finite T, and hence do not meet all the requirements for person restrictions.

Rivero's contribution, "Oblique subjects and person restrictions in Spanish: a morphological approach" (pp. 215-251), discusses a set of psych verbs with dative/quirky subjects in Spanish, and which disallow 1st/2nd person nominative objects, a restriction which she calls the Quirky Person Restriction (QPR). While noting certain similarities between the QPR and the PCC, Rivero notes that the QPR, unlike the PCC, cannot be repaired. She argues that QPRs are also unlike Icelandic quirky subject restrictions (see also Lopez's contribution, this volume), and are instead the result of clitic conflicts in the morphological cluster. The author shows that previous syntactic analyses of the PCC or of the QPR are not amenable to the Spanish facts, and proposes instead a morphological treatment, couched in the framework of Distributive Morphology. Specifically, her proposal rests on three key ideas: (i) the clitic *se* is underspecified for person; (ii) the ban on 1st/2nd person plural clitics in these constructions is the result of the fact that they have the most complex feature in the paradigm, and hence they cannot combine due to markedness; (iii) dative clitics which denote experiencers carry a [+m] (= mental state) feature which would prevent them from co-occurring with an argument (clitic) that bears a [+Participant] feature.

The person restriction in dative-nominative constructions, first discussed by Sigurdsson in the 1990s for Icelandic, bans agreement between the verb and a 1st and 2nd person nominative object, and has thus led some researches (Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005, a.o) to argue that the restriction is subsumed under the Person Case Constraint. In this volume, Richard's paper "Quirky Expletives" (pp. 181-215) continues the minimalist investigations in the spirit of Anagnostopoulou's approaches to the PCC (single probe, multiple goals), and unifies the person restriction on quirky subjects in Icelandic with definiteness effects in English existential constructions and the genitive of negation in Russian. The central ingredient to the unifying analysis of these three apparent distinct phenomena is the notion of defectivization (partially deactivated) probes. For Icelandic, the relevant probe is rendered inactive by a quirky expletive; with existential definiteness restrictions, the relevant probe is made defective by a pure expletive; in the case of Russian there is a default T-agreement strategy.

The idea that the person restriction in dative-nominative constructions should be dissociated from the PCC is argued for by Sigurdsson and Holmberg in "Icelandic dative intervention: Person and Number are separate probes" (pp. 251-281). The authors distinguish three varieties of Icelandic dative-nominative constructions, which differ in terms of number agreement with a postverbal object when a dative argument is intervening, but are similar in that they are all subject to person restrictions. It is shown that both lack of number agreement and the person restriction follow as the result of dative intervention, together with the following three proposals: (i) Person and Number are separate probes; (ii) in one variety which allows number agreement the

dative argument moves out of the intervening position between Number and the object; (iii) the dative never moves high enough to feed agreement between Person and the Nom object

Three papers in the volume focus on languages that display lack of agreement or anti-agreement effects that is, the usual subject-verb marker is either replaced by another marker, or dropped in the context of subject *wh* extraction. Arregi and Nevins' paper "Agreement and clitic restrictions in Basque" (pp. 49-87) shows that (lack of) agreement effects in the Biskaian variety of Zamudio, spoken in the Basque country, constitute direct evidence for the interaction between syntax and morphology in the language. The authors argue that both clitic and agreement restrictions in Biskaian arise as the result of hierarchical structure, on the one hand, and morpho-phonological sensitivity and deletion of featural combinations, on the other hand. Agreement markers on the auxiliary verb are reanalyzed as pronominal clitics, and, thus, agreement restrictions in Biskaian are re-thought of in terms of the PCC. The ban on certain combinations of clitics arises when two clitics (ergative and dative) target the same head, which is impossible in the language. The authors go on to offer a complete account of the realization of argumental clitics for ergative, dative and absolutive, by relying on postsyntactic rules, such as impoverishment, fusion, or metathesis.

Ouali's contribution "On C-to T transfer: the nature of Agreement and Anti-Agreement in Berber" (pp. 159-181) builds on Chomsky's (2000, 2001, 2004) proposal that T inherits its phi-features from C and examines three logical possibilities that emerge from this hypothesis: (i) DONATE – C transfers all its features to T, (ii) C does not transfer its features to T (KEEP), and (iii) C transfers *its* phi-features, but keeps a copy (SHARE). These operations are argued to be ordered in terms of principles of economy, computation efficiency and Minimal Search, with DONATE being the most economical. Ouali also nicely shows that all these theoretical options are actually empirically attested in Berber: DONATE is exemplified in simple declarative clauses, when C does not have a *wh* feature, KEEP applies to yield Anti-Agreement effects, and finally, SHARE applies as last resort in Berber long distance extraction clauses.

The last paper in the volume, "Person – hierarchy effects without a person hierarchy" (pp. 281-315), belongs to Wiltschko and discusses two predicate argument restrictions found in Halkomelan Salish. These seem to exhibit sensitivity to the grammatical person of the argument, and have been argued to be the result of person hierarchies: the first type of restriction regards intransitive subjects which do not trigger 3rd person agreement (split ergativity), and the second type regards the incompatibility between 3rd person subject agreement and 2nd person object agreement. Wiltschko takes a stand against the idea that the two phenomena are the result of person hierarchies, and argues instead that they arise as the result of their morpho-syntactic distribution, which takes into account paradigmatic gaps.

Spanning genetically related and unrelated languages and language families (Romance, Germanic, Salish, Berber and Basque), the collection of papers in this volume manages not only to offer an extensive empirical coverage of agreement phenomena, but to also provide new and challenging theoretical ideas which have developed in recent years. Taken individually, each paper honestly and critically discusses previous relevant approaches to the empirical data addressed, and offers novel, carefully worked out hypotheses, which open fresh avenues of research in the field.

References

- Adger, D. and Harbour, D. 2007. Syntax and syncretisms of the Person Case Constraint. *Syntax* 10: 2-37.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. 2003. *The Syntax of Ditransitives. Evidence from Clitics*. Berlin · New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. 2005. Strong and weak person restrictions: A feature checking analysis. In L. Heggie and F. Ordóñez (eds.), *Clitic and Affix Combinations*, 199-235. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Bonet, E. 1991. Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance Languages. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89-156. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1-52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2004. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In A. Belletti (ed.), *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3, *Structures and Beyond*, 104-131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McGinnis, M. 2004. Lethal Ambiguity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 47-95.

Lisa Lim and Nikolas Gisbone (eds.). 2011. *The Typology of Asian Englishes*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins. VII + 120 pp.

Gabriela Anidora Brozba*

This book is part of the *Benjamins Current Topics* series. This series includes a number of special issues of various journals containing both hotly debated and sometimes debatable topics of research with the aim of finding new audiences for topically interesting material, bringing such material to a wider readership in book format. This book represents a collection of six papers which constituted the substance of a workshop of the same name organized by Lisa Lim at the 1st International Conference for the Linguistics of English (ISLE1). The contributions to this collection were originally included in *English World-Wide* 30 (2), in 2009. The volume gathers analyses of four Asian varieties of English, i.e. Singapore English (SgE), Indian English (IndE), Hong Kong English (HKE) and Thai English (ThaiE), in which some similarities and dissimilarities thereof are delineated from a clearly typological perspective, based on judicious and well-argued assessments of quantitative and qualitative data.

In the opening chapter, "The typology of Asian Englishes. Setting the agenda" (pp. 1-9), Lisa Lim and Nikolas Gisbone explain the need for a typological approach in assessing the state and features of the New Englishes, by looking at the structural features of the substrate languages and the ecologies in which they have emerged. Additionally, the editors of the book bring forward some of the reasons for which Asian Englishes should be treated as a challenging and thought-provoking topic for research: (i) the diversity of the substrate languages, all of which are unrelated to English, which reinforces the appropriateness of a perspective which takes into account the influence of the substrate typology; (ii) the ecologies of Asian Englishes are dynamic, in the sense that great changes have taken place in the country in a matter of decades; (iii) Asian Englishes certainly are at different evolutionary stages, i.e. nativization or stabilization for the varieties at issue in terms of Schneider's (2003, 2007, 2011) developmental model, due to factors such as the date of independence, language and education policies, as well as the proportion of population having access to the language. The last part of the paper provides an overview of the papers to follow, highlighting their thrusts and foci.

Umberto Ansaldo, in "The Asian typology of English: Theoretical and methodological considerations" (pp. 11-25), underscores the importance of an evolutionary approach to language change rather than treating it as a departure from the norm or as a result of system-internal processes, especially when one deals with contact language formation. Umberto Ansaldo, points

* Romanian-American University, Department of Foreign Languages, brozba.anydora@gmail.com.

out that language change is a product of competition, selection, and replication, and that English has never been the only target in the evolution of Asian English varieties. SgE has a wide pool of features (Mufwene 2001) to select from with so many “contact languages” (p. 16) around, and considering all the linguistic layers that have been predominant and/or added at different phases of its evolution (e.g. Bazaar Malay¹, Baba Malay², Hokkien, Cantonese and Mandarin). Such delimitations become clear when the focus is shifted to some grammatical features of SgE (zero copula, predicative adjectives and topic prominence – all consistent features of the isolating non-English languages in the ecology), whose selection is based on their numerical and typological frequency in the dominant substrate languages (Sinitic and Malay).

As the title of the third paper by Nikolas Gisbone shows, “Aspects of the morphosyntactic typology of Hong Kong English” (pp. 27-47), based on the ICE-HK corpus data, a central aspect of HKE morphosyntax is covered, namely finiteness, in relation to the absence of copula and the blurred lexical boundaries between verbs and adjectives. The claim for non-finiteness in HKE is not an absolute one as there is some degree of variability, seeing that HKE is at the third stage of its developmental cycle (nativization), according to Schneider’s (2007) dynamic model.

Devyani Sharma, in “Typological diversity in New Englishes” (pp. 49-74), looks into the behavior of three of the so-called “angloversals” (p. 50), in light of Bernd Kortmann and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi’s (2004) classification, in IndE and SgE. A closer analysis of past tense omission, over-extension of the progressive and copula omission reveals that in most cases one deals only with surface similarities, because there are systemic differences in imperfectivity-marking (substrate-sensitive) and copula omission (grammatically conditioned by the substrate languages as well).

In chapter five, the instrumental study of Priyankoo Sarmah, Divya Verma Gogoi, and Caroline Wilshire, “Thai English: Rhythm and vowels” (pp. 75-96), the emphasis is laid on the rhythm and vowels of ThaiE. By comparing these segmental and suprasegmental phonological aspects with those of the substrate language (Thai), British English (BrE) and the ones of two other Asian Englishes (HKE and SgE), the authors manage to highlight the distinctiveness of ThaiE. As Thai has mixed prosodic characteristics, the traditional rhythmic categories, “stress-timed” and “syllable-timed”, are not appropriate for the study of Thai and Thai English. Therefore, %V (Ramus, Nespore, and Mehler, 1999) and nPVI (Grabe and Low, 2002) are used in this paper. The former measures what percentage of an utterance consists of vowels and the latter compares the duration of a vowel to an adjacent vowel, reflecting vowel reduction and variation in syllable structure. A total of 12 Thai speakers were recorded reading English words, sentences, and a short paragraph, and then an interview was conducted. The results show that at the prosodic level, ThaiE rhythm closely resembles BrE when compared to that of SgE (as a transfer of the peculiar rhythmic characteristics of Thai), whereas in terms of vowel systems the Asian varieties at issue are more alike, as a reflex of the typological commonalities in their substrates.

Finally, Lisa Lim, in “Revisiting English prosody: (Some) New Englishes as tone languages?” (pp. 97-118), approaches a topic which has seldom been touched upon in research on Asian Englishes: the inappropriateness of treating Asian varieties of English from a stress/intonation traditional viewpoint, and a need for the shift to their interpretation as tone languages, given the structural features of the substrate languages. This claim is supported by evidence – the use of tones in discourse particles, words, and phrases – from SgE, where both the internal ecology (dominance of tone substrate languages) and the external ecology (high proportion of L1 users of such languages) favour such an interpretation.

¹ A blend of Malay and Chinese features.

² A blend of Hokkien and (Bazaar) Malay.

This book is a valuable addition to the field of New Englishes, and Asian Englishes in particular, as it offers a unitary typological perspective in approaching similarities and dissimilarities between contact varieties of English. So far, researchers have mentioned or explained differences/“deviations” in non-native varieties of English as transfer phenomena or universal L2 acquisition strategies. The extra emphasis on substrate languages (which are in fact the mother tongues of the second language variety users, upon which the new variety is built), multiple ecologies, and language evolution sheds light on multiple aspects which may seem unrelated or can even pass unnoticed at a first glance. Also, words of caution appear several times throughout the book, such as the presence of determinants other than the substrates’ typology, and the by now far-fetched view of New English formation as a deviation from native varieties. Despite being a collection of conference papers with different themes, there is theoretical uniformity which ensures that the papers comprised in it are comparable so that the reader can easily find the common thread. The fact that the authors look into only four Asian Englishes does not minimize the usefulness of the book for researchers of New Englishes. Comparisons and references are made throughout the book to various languages of the world, e.g. Caribbean Creoles for the lack of morphological processes (chapter 2), South African English for the use of language universals (p. 52) or Nigerian English and Jamaican English as representatives of the syllable-timed extreme (p. 79). The five studies abound in quantitative and qualitative analyses, so that they can serve as starting point for further research or replica studies.

However, a few additional remarks are in order. The choice to include ThaiE among the four varieties under focus (IndE, HKE, SgE) seems to be an infelicitous one. First of all, the authors themselves mention that “Thailand belongs to the Expanding Circle for English, rather than the Outer Circle” (p. 77), in line with Kachru’s (1985) delimitation. Secondly, even if one can admit that varieties which were originally included in the Expanding Circle category have moved into the Outer Circle category, e.g. Zimbabwe English, this is clearly because English has a certain status in the countries where this has actually happened: it is more often than not one of the official languages used in administration and it has become, therefore, an “institutionalized variety” (Kachru 1982: 37). None of the sociolinguistic conditions above apply to ThaiE. Thirdly, maybe a look at the other levels of the language can legitimate the claim for a newly emerging variety in Thailand if consistent features are to be found and considered acceptable or at least used by a majority of speakers. The phonological analysis cannot stand alone in treating ThaiE as a variety in its own right. The claims that it resembles more BrE in terms of rhythm and the other Asian varieties of English in terms of vocalic systems can be both dismissed as an influence of Thai (which has a different rhythm when compared with the Asian varieties discussed, but a similar vowel system). The way the English variety spoken by Thai speakers sounds can be explained as an effect of second language learning which can be accounted for in terms of the Speech Learning Model (Flege 1987). The difficulties that L2 learners experience with non-native phonetic categories are explained in terms of the interference from the speakers’ source language. Thus, the L2 phonemes are perceived through the sieve of the native phonetic system. In particular, the degree of similarity between the L2 and the closest L1 phonetic category triggers the success of the L2 speaker in being able to perceive and produce the non-native phonemes more accurately. Therefore, the formation of new phonetic categories is directly dependent on the similarity of the L1 and L2 phonemes: the more similar the phonemes are, the more it is likely that the learner will not create a new phonetic category for L2 phonemes, and the less similar the phonemes are, the more likely it will be that a new category will be created. Finally, the book is carefully proofread and beautifully edited, except for a truly minor omission in justifying the text of the abstracts.

In conclusion, the book edited by Lisa Lim and Nikolas Gisbone constitutes an invaluable resource for researchers interested in New Englishes, more precisely in Asian Englishes.

References

- Flege, J. 1987. The production of new and similar phones in a foreign language: Evidence for the effect of equivalence classification. *Journal of Phonetics* 15: 47-65.
- Grabe, E. and Low, E. L. 2002. Durational variability in speech and the rhythm class hypothesis. *Papers in Laboratory Phonology* 7: 515-546.
- Kachru, B. B. (ed.). 1982. *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*, first edition. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. G. Widdowson (eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*, 11-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kortmann, B. and Szmrecsanyi, B. 2004. Global synopsis: Morphological and syntactic variation in English. In B. Kortmann, K. Burridge, R. Mesthrie, E. W. Schneider, and C. Upton (eds.), *A Handbook of Varieties of English*, vol. 2, *Morphology and syntax*, 1122-1182. Berlin · New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mufwene, S. S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramus, F., Nespore, M., and Mehler, J. 1999. Correlates of linguistic rhythm in the speech signal. *Cognition* 73: 265-292.
- Schneider, E. W. 2003. The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language* 79 (1): 233-281.
- Schneider, E. W. 2007. *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, E. W. 2011. *English around the World: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daniel Schreier & Karen Lavarello-Schreier. 2012. *Tristan da Cunha and the Tristanians*. London: Battlebridge Publications. VII + 136 pp.

Reviewed by Andrei A. Avram*

Daniel Schreier and Karen Lavarello-Schreier's book consists of a "Prologue" (pp. 1-12), three chapters (pp. 13-121), "A Tristan glossary" (pp. 125-130), a "Select bibliography" (p. 131), "Further information" (p. 132), and an "Index" (pp. 133-136). It builds on the authors' earlier book (Schreier and Lavarello-Schreier 2003), compared to which it contains some 50% more pages.

The "Prologue" (pp. 1-12) includes information on how to get to Tristan da Cunha, on the places of interest, and a plan of the Settlement.

Chapter 2, "The history of Tristan da Cunha" (pp. 13-50) deals with the history of the island, from its discovery by the Portuguese in 1506. Included is a detailed account of the demographic evolutions on the island, from the first permanent settlement in 1816 until the present day.

In chapter 3, "Life on Tristan da Cunha today" (pp. 51-88), the authors address the challenges posed by the socio-economic changes that have affected the island since World War II. Particular attention is paid to the impact of modernization on the traditional Tristanian "way of life" and on the local customs and traditions.

Chapter 4, "The language of Tristan da Cunha" (pp. 89-121) focuses on Tristan da Cunha English³, a variety of postcolonial English⁴, spoken on the island since the 1820s. The main issues discussed in this chapter are the origin of the language and the reconstruction of its linguistic past.

* University of Bucharest, Department of English, andrei2.avram@gmail.com.

The origin of Tristan da Cunha English is discussed with reference to the so-called “founder effect”⁵, i.e. on the assumption that “the dialects spoken by the founders of a new colony leave a permanent imprint and influence the future development of the newly forming variety” (p. 100). Four founding groups were instrumental in the emergence of this variety of English: British, American, European non-British and a group of women from St Helena. Of the eight pre-1850 British settlers, two came from Southwest England, one from London, one from Sussex, one from Yorkshire and one from the Scottish Lowlands, while the exact origin of the remaining two is unknown (pp. 101). Except for one of the pre-1850 American settlers, from Massachusetts, the origin of the other five is not known, but the authors suggest (p. 101) that “they may have come from areas with a strong whaling tradition (i.e. coastal New England)”. The most important “founder effects” are attributed to the eight pre-1850 British settlers (p. 101). The linguistic influence of the settlers of European non-British descent appears to be mainly lexical (p. 102). Finally, a linguistically influential group is that of the women who arrived from St Helena in 1827 (pp. 103-104), which may have spoken a creolized variety of English (p. 117).

The authors proceed to a feature analysis in reconstructing the history of Tristan da Cunha English, i.e. they attempt to “pinpoint some structures to different areas of origin” and to “speculate [...] which of the various input dialects was more influential than others” (p. 107). The authors illustrate (pp. 108-110) the extent to which the vocabulary of Tristan da Cunha English reflects the social history of its speech community. The examples given include archaic British English words, e.g. *qualmish* ‘sick in the stomach’. A number of Afrikaans and / or Dutch lexical items are also briefly discussed, e.g. *kooibietjie* (< Afrikaans *kooi* ‘bed’, *bietjie* ‘a little bit’) ‘take a little nap, sleep a little while’, *molly / mollyok* (< Dutch *malle mok* ‘albatross’) ‘albatross’. The authors note (p. 109) that “existing English words are re-used for new terms in Tristan English” and that “words were also reused in the domain of the household”. The following are the examples of American English lexical influence (p. 109-110): *gulch*, *mad* ‘angry’, the verb *guess* ‘to reckon’, the contracted form *tater* ‘potato’ and the second person plural pronoun *y’all*. A selected number of phonological, morpho-syntactic features are analyzed. The phonological characteristics are: [h] insertion (p. 96) in e.g. *hegg* ‘egg’; the pronunciation of e.g. *hair* or *share* “as if they were here or sheer” (p. 96); the absence of post-vocalic /r/ (p. 110); the occurrence of [a:] in the BATH lexical set (p. 110); the the reduction of word-final consonant clusters (pp. 113-115), e.g. *des* ‘desk’, *lif* ‘lift’; the replacement of /θ/ with /s/ in e.g. *think*, *throw* (p. 117); the substitution of /b/ for /w/ in words such as *flour*, *hour* (p. 117). The morpho-syntactic features discussed are: the so-called “perfective *be*”, i.e. the use of *be* as an auxiliary instead of *have* (p. 110), e.g. *I’m checked the parcels already*; the present tense concord system with no overt marking (p. 113), e.g. *she wait outside*; the combination of perfective *be* and completive *done* (pp. 115-116), e.g. *I’s done eat my supper*; the use of *used to* and *had to* followed by past tense forms⁶ (pp. 116-117), e.g. *we never used to kep’ records in days or we had to wen’ out*; the omission of the copula, e.g. *I hittin’*; the omission of the auxiliary *be*, e.g. *the cattle more wilder*.

The following are a few comments on some of the features of Tristan da Cunha English, their counterparts in other varieties of English, and their possible origin.

The authors list the pronunciation of e.g. *hair* and *share* like *here* and *sheer* among the examples of “archaic pronunciations” and claim that “a similar usage also survives in New

³ Also known as “Tristan Slang”, as it is called by some of its native speakers, and as “Tristianian English”, e.g. in P. Trudgill (2004).

⁴ For the term “postcolonial English” see e.g. Schneider (2007: 3).

⁵ In the sense of Mufwene (2001).

⁶ The phenomenon is sometimes referred to as “double past tense marking” or “past tense infinitive construction”. See e.g. P. Trudgill (2004: 6).

Zealand English” (p. 96). While this pronunciation – known as the NEAR and SQUARE merger – is widely recorded in New Zealand English, it is certainly not a retention, but a recent innovation, typical of young speakers (Bauer and Warren 2008: 52, Hay et al. 2008: 40).

The re-use of existing English words for new terms is illustrated with, among others, *cooler* ‘refrigerator’ (p. 109). This is not an exclusive feature of Tristan da Cunha English. It also occurs in e.g. American English (*Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* 1993: 255).

According to the authors “an American heritage is found in words like [...] the contracted form *tater* (for ‘potato’)” (p. 109). However, this form is not necessarily of American English origin. Indeed, numerous similar contracted forms are recorded in 19th century British English dialects (Wright 1905, vol. VI: 38-40). These include *tater*, attested in Devon. Contracted forms are found today in various locations (Upton et al. 1994: 308-309), e.g. Scotland, Devon [tɛdi], Sussex [tɛtə] and Yorkshire [tɛ:tr], [tɛtɪ] and [tɛtɪ]. Consequently, both the British and the American pre-1850 settlers may have used a contracted form of *potato*.

With respect to the perfective auxiliaries *be* and *have*, English grammar is said to have “varied between *be* and *have* for a long time” (p. 110). In fact, this was not a matter of variation, but rather of selection: up to the 19th century *have* was used with transitive verbs and *be* with certain intransitive, such as verbs of motion (van Gelderen 2006: 172 and 215).

The authors write about the use of past tense forms after *used to* that “such a usage is unknown elsewhere” (p. 116) and conclude that “it is quite plausible that [it] represents the influence of non-native varieties of English on TdCE [= Tristan da Cunha English]” (p. 117). Firstly, similar usages are actually attested in other natively spoken varieties of English: Ozarkian English *It useta didn’t matter whether you walked in late or not* (Murray and Simon 2008: 416); Appalachian English *It came out like it used to did* (Montgomery 2008: 436). Secondly, it cannot be claimed, as the authors do (p. 116-117), that an L2 acquisition error such as *I didn’t meant it* “resembles the Tristanian usage strongly”.

The “*t* realization of the English /th/ sound” (p. 106) should read “the [t] realization of the English /θ/ sound”; “before the following th sound” (p. 114) should read “before the following /ð/ sound”. Similarly, the English “<th> and <dh> sounds” (p. 117) should read /θ/ and /ð/ respectively. Slightly confusingly, the authors write (p. 117) that these sounds are replaced by native speakers of other languages with /s/ or /z/ and /t/ or /d/. A more exact formulation would have been: /s/ or /t/ are substituted for /θ/, while /ð/ is replaced with /z/ or /d/.

Consider next some of the entries in “A Tristan glossary” (pp. 125-130).

Cool drink ‘Soda, soft drink’ (p. 125). The authors write that “***Cool drink*** is similarly used in India and some other Asian countries”. While this is true, none of these can possibly be the source of the Tristan da Cunha English form. Rather, the latter can be traced back to South African English *cooldrink* ‘soft/cold drink’ (Kromhout 2002: 74), itself most probably a loan translation of Afrikaans *koel drank* ‘soft drink’.

Garnsey ‘Knitted pullover’ (cf English *guernsey* ‘a thick, knitted, closely fitting vest or shirt (...) worn by seamen’) (p. 126). The Tristan da Cunha English form points to Northern dialects of British English. Consider the following examples: [ganzɪ] ‘vest’ in Lincolnshire (Upton et al. 1994: 165), *ganzee* ‘jacket’ in Cumbrian (Cumbrian dictionary n. d.), *ganzie* ‘a thick woolen jersey, especially worn by fishermen’ in Geordie (Geordie dictionary n. d.). The Tristan da Cunha English form could be therefore traced back to the two pre-1850 settlers from Yorkshire and the Scottish Lowlands respectively.

Haul out ‘To change (of the weather and / or wind)’ and *Heish up* ‘To hoist’ (p. 127). These forms may reflect nautical usage. As noted by the authors, “almost all the male settlers had a strong nautical background” and “it is perfectly possible that they underwent language shift and modified their native dialects” (p. 107).

Jinny ‘Female donkey, cf English *Jenny-ass*’ (p. 127). The source of the Tristan da Cunha English form is rather *jinny* [dʒini], typical of Northern British English dialects, attested in the 19th century in Northumberland, Cumbria, Durham, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Cheshire; *Jinny* ‘a female ass’ is recorded in the 19th century in Yorkshire and Lancashire (Wright 1905, vol. III: 356-357). *Jinny* [dʒɪni] ‘a female donkey’ still occurs in Yorkshire (Upton et al. 1994: 226).

Sing out ‘To holler or shout’ (p. 129). The authors note that “this is [...] particularly common in Australian English and in Pacific varieties of Pidgin English” (p. 129). However, no connection has ever been established or suggested between these varieties and Tristan da Cunha English. On the other hand, this meaning of *sing out* is also attested in at least three Atlantic pidgins and creoles, Vincentian, Antiguan and Bahamian⁷. A possible source is the creole which appears to have been spoken on St Helena, which may also have used *sing out* with this meaning.

Teem ‘Pour out’ (p. 130). The geographical distribution of *teem* ‘pour out’ is significant. The locations where *teem* occurs with this meaning in the 19th century include Scotland, Durham, Cumbria, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Cheshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Shropshire and Gloucestershire (Wright 1905, vol. VI: 52). Moreover, this meaning of *teem* is still attested in Northumberland, Durham, Nottinghamshire, Cumbria, Yorkshire, Cheshire, Derbyshire (Upton et al. 1994: 419, Upton and Widdowson 2006: 186, map 87). To conclude, *teem* ‘pour out’ in Tristan da Cunha English can be safely traced back to two of the pre-1850 settlers from the Scottish Lowlands and Yorkshire respectively.

Tissick ‘mild bronchitis’ (< English *phthisic* [tɪzɪk]) (p. 130). Variants of this form are attested in a number of 19th century British English dialects, including those of Devon, Sussex and Yorkshire (Wright 1905, vol. VI: 65). Thus, at least four of the pre-1850 British settlers may have shared this lexical item.

Touch up ‘Drunk, tipsy’ (p. 130). It is perhaps worth mentioning that *touched* with the meaning ‘slightly intoxicated’ is recorded in 19th century in Scotland and west Yorkshire (Wright 1906, vol. VI: 204). Arguably, *touch up* ‘drunk, tipsy’ may represent yet another contribution of the two pre-1850 settlers who came from the Scottish Lowlands and Yorkshire respectively.

Wait on ‘Wait for’ (p. 130). The authors write that “this is very common in Scottish English” (p. 130). However, Scottish English is not the only possible source of the Tristan da Cunha English use of the preposition *on*. One other candidate is American English: in the entry for the verb *wait*, the editors of *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* (1993: 1328) note that “*wait on* is less common than *wait for*”, but “seems natural”.

The preceding remarks do not detract in the least from the value of the work. To sum up, the authors deserve ample credit for their contribution to the literature on lesser-known Englishes.

References

- Avram, A. A. 2003. Pitkern and Norfolk revisited. *English Today* 19 (3): 44-49.
 Baker, P. and Huber, M. 2001. Atlantic, Pacific, and world-wide features in English-lexicon contact languages. *English World-Wide* 22 (2): 157-208.
 Bauer, L. and Warren, P. 2008. New Zealand English: Phonology. In K. Burridge and B. Kortmann (eds.), *Varieties of English*, vol. 3, *The Pacific and Australasia*, 39-63. Berlin · New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
 Cumbrian Dictionary n. d. <<http://www.gonmad.co.uk/cumbria>>.

⁷ Therefore, contra Baker and Huber (2001: 204) – who classify it as a Pacific diagnostic feature – *sing out* is, in fact, a world-wide feature, i.e. occurring in both the Atlantic and the Pacific varieties. Note also that *sing out* is also attested in Pitkern (Avram 2003), a Pacific variety which exhibits a significant number of Atlantic features (Baker and Huber 2001: 186-187).

- van Gelderen, E. 2006. *A History of the English Language*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Geordie Dictionary n. d. <<http://www.geordie.co.uk/dictionary/g.htm>>.
- Hay, J., Maclagan, M. and Gordon, E. 2008. *New Zealand English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kromhout, J. 2002. *Afrikaans-English. English-Afrikaans Dictionary*. New York: Hippocrene Books.
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*. 1993. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Montgomery, M. B. 2008. Appalachian English: Morphology and syntax. In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English*, vol. 2, *The Americas and the Caribbean*, 428-467. Berlin · New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mufwene, S. S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murray, T. E. and Simon, B. L. 2008. Colloquial American English: Grammatical features. In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English*, vol. 2, *The Americas and the Caribbean*, 401-427. Berlin · New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schneider, E. W. 2007. *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schreier, D. & Lavarello-Schreier, K. 2003. *Tristan da Cunha. History, People, Language*. London: Battlebridge.
- Trudgill, P. 2004. *New-dialect Formation. The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Upton, C., Parry, D. and Widdowson, J. D. A. 1994. *Survey of English dialects. The Dictionary and the Grammar*. London, Routledge
- Upton, C. and Widdowson, J. D. A. 2006. *An Atlas of English Dialects*, second edition. London: Routledge.
- Wright, J. 1905. *The English Dialect Dictionary. Being the Complete Vocabulary of All Dialect Words Still in Use, or Known to Have Been in Use during the Last Two Hundred Years*. London: Henry Frowde.

Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics (BWPL)

ISSN: 2069-9239

Commenced publication: 1999

BWPL is published twice a year by the Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication, Department of English, University of Bucharest. It publishes work of current interest in all areas of theoretical and applied linguistics.

Contributions

Articles should be in English and must contain work which has not been previously published. They are peer-reviewed, and authors will be informed within three months of receipt of manuscripts whether these are accepted for publication.

Authors are requested to submit their papers electronically. Detailed *Guidelines for Authors* are available at <http://bwpl.unibuc.ro>.

Address for correspondence

Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication,
Department of English, University of Bucharest, 7-13 Pitar Moş Str., Sector 1,
010451 Bucharest, Romania.

Back issues

Single issues from previous volumes are available from the Centre for the Study of Language Development and Linguistic Communication.

Tiparul s-a executat sub c-da nr. 3118 / 2012
la Tipografia Editurii Universității din București
