

REVIEWS

Pingali Sailaja. 2009. *Indian English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. X + 172 pp.

Reviewed by Gabriela Anidora Brozba*

The book at issue is part of the *Dialects of English* series published by Edinburgh University Press. It is the fourth in a series whose aim is to document varieties of English around the world, both native and non-native. The book is made up of seven chapters: an introduction, four main chapters, an annotated bibliography and a selection of sample texts.

In chapter 1, "Introduction" (pp. 1-16), the author presents the current situation of English in India, a country fostering the largest population of ESL speakers in the world. Hence, geographical, demographic and cultural aspects which are paramount for the understanding of the complex multilingual and panethnic situation in the subcontinent and which have shaped the local variety of English as known today are delineated in this introductory part. Sailaja also discusses the high status assigned to English as she points out that "although the official language of India is first Hindi, English is given equal, if not more importance. Incidentally the Constitution itself was written in English and an authorized Hindi translation is now available" (p. 5). Towards the end of this chapter, she also addresses the issue of the *cline of bilingualism*¹ which proves helpful in operating distinctions along a lectal continuum which ranges from acrolectal standard Indian English to pidginized varieties such as *Babu English* (p. 16).

Chapter 2, "Phonetics and phonology" (pp. 17-38), focuses on the features of Indian English (henceforth IndE) pronunciation both at the segmental and suprasegmental levels. Therefore, the main aspects related to consonantal and vocalic phonemes, stress, rhythm and intonation, as well as other significant phenomena (e.g. spelling pronunciation) are reviewed and illustrated in this chapter.

In chapter 3, "Morphosyntax" (pp. 39-65), previously researched morphosyntactic characteristics of IndE are summarized. Aspects such as verb complements and particles (pp. 43-47), the use of the progressive (pp. 48-49), the use of articles (pp. 52-53), topicalization (pp. 53-54) or the use of invariant question tags (p. 59) are well researched and presented.

There is a shift in focus in chapter 4 on "Lexis and discourse" (pp. 66-94), as the title indicates. The discussion of the lexis highlights the areas overlapping with both British and American English, and, at the same time, it documents some of the lexical items which have undergone semantic shift, e.g. *stir* 'strike' or *hotel* 'restaurant' (p. 68), as well as the influence of various Indian languages on English. In as much as word-formation processes are concerned, the author includes some which seem very productive in IndE such as: compounding, affixation², and the use of acronyms. The discourse features discussed include, among others, linkers, address forms, aspects of politeness and a code-switching.

Chapter 5, "History and changes in progress" (pp. 95-119), addresses the issue of the development of the IndE variety from its early phases (i.e. 17th century) until the present day. Sailaja distinguishes within the life cycle of the variety four developmental periods, namely "the

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

¹ Introduced by Kachru (1965: 393-396).

² Which very frequently gives rise to hybrid forms, in the sense that either English suffixes are added to local terms (e.g. *Delhiite*, *Keralite*, p. 81) or local suffixes are added to English roots (e.g. *vegetablewala*, *presswala*, p. 81).

pre-British period (1498-1600)" (p. 96), "the pre-Macaulay period (1600-1835)" (p. 97), "the pre-independence period (1835-1947)" (p. 106), and "the post-independence period (1947-2006)" (p. 110), each of which are discussed in terms of the socio-political and historical events which have marked and shaped the ongoing process of structural nativization in IndE. At the end of the chapter, the author shifts the focus to the lectal variation in India, providing examples from pidginized IndE varieties such as *Babu* (or *Baboo*) *English*, *Butler English* and *Boxwallah English*³ (p. 112).

As mentioned earlier, chapter 6, "Survey of previous work and annotated bibliography" (pp. 120-132), consists of six sections which briefly discuss books on IndE grouped as follows: general books; works on phonetics and phonology, on morphosyntax, on discourse and lexis, on history, education and politics, and, finally, some organized around samples and corpora.

Finally, chapter 7, "Sample texts" (pp. 133-158), includes, as the title indicates, a variety of different text types, i.e. literary texts, official documents and letters, newspaper articles and letters to the editor, advertisements, lectures, as well as the orthographic transcription of two (out of six) audio samples of spoken IndE of two subjects (Ira and Deepti), all of which are available online⁴. Worth mentioning is the wide timespan that the sample texts cover: the earliest one is from 1794 (p.133), while the latest are from 2007 (pp. 144-145).

The book is an invaluable addition to the field of non-native varieties of English, and it is, to my knowledge, the first major contribution⁵, in the form of a book, to the study of English in India as a second language variety in its own right. The volume is beautifully edited and almost typo-free, with the exception of *bye-laws* (p. 5) which should be *by-laws*.

The author clearly states in the preface that the target readership should be "students who are just beginning to be familiar with linguistic terminology" (p. viii) and "people who may be generally interested in language and (Indian) English" (p. viii) so that the terminological complications are avoided and the general presentation "has been kept to the minimum" (p. viii) in order to be "simple and accessible" (p. viii). This notwithstanding, a few remarks are in order regarding some aspects of the analysis which are inconsistent or which, at least, need clarification. Firstly, the phonetic transcription of the aspirated stop "/ph/" (p. 23) is an infelicitous one because the usual convention for aspiration is to place the symbol which represents it at the superscript of the stop, i.e. [p^h]. Then, aside from the inappropriate transcribing convention for the aspiration, there are some inconsistencies in the use of slashes and square brackets which may be misleading for an inexperienced readership: the aspirated realization is clearly allophonic, as the author herself points out⁶, hence the word *why* should have been transcribed [w^hai] or [v^hai] and not /whai/ or /vhai/ (p. 23). Similarly, we are told a bit earlier (p. 21) that the dental fricative /θ/ may be replaced in IndE by dental stops /t/ or /t^h/. Clearly, they should be transcribed as [t] or [t^h] since these are phonetic realizations. Also, it is pointed out that "[p] in *pin*, *upon*, *suppose* is aspirated" (p. 23), but since this is the sound whose realization is being discussed it should be /p/ rather than [p]. Thirdly, the definition of an *extra heavy syllable* as "a long vowel followed by at least one consonant" (p. 30), which is paramount in establishing the stress rule (i.e. "stress falls on the first

³ Probably what Kachru (1983: 70) refers to as "Bearer English", since the agentive suffix of the type "wallah" attached to the word should read as 'the one who carries boxes'.

⁴ The two samples, as well as those of the other four subjects (Aman, Arijit, Rahul and Vamsi), can be accessed online at <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/dialects/india.html>.

⁵ It appeared in February 2009, a year which was very rich in works dedicated to this variety if we only think of the contributions of Sedlatschek and Balasubramanian, which appeared later on the same year, in April and November, respectively.

⁶ "In IE [Indian English], aspiration does not work the way it does in RP [Received Pronunciation]. It is *non-contrastive* [...]" (p. 23, my emphasis)

syllable of a bisyllabic word unless the second syllable is extra heavy” p. 30), and the stress rule itself are obscured by the subsequent examples chosen for illustration ‘*mistake*, ‘*monsoon*, ‘*concrete*. A user who is accustomed to the RP pronunciations [mɪsteɪk], [mɒnsu:n] and [kɒŋkri:t], could infer that there may be a monophthongization in the first of the three words, but cannot possibly guess that in IndE the other two are pronounced as [mO:nsu:n] and [kO:nkri:ɔ]. This pronunciation may seem obvious to the author who is probably a “native” speaker⁷ of IndE, but I had to resort to Gargesh (2008: 241) for clarification. Thus, a phonetic transcription would have been useful in this case.

Due caution is evident in much the book (e.g. the discussion of IndE as a variety at the syllable-timed or stress-timed end of the intonational continuum). Nonetheless, the author is quite categorical when she classifies the IndE accent as a non-rhotic one (p. 19). However, earlier studies such as Nihalani et al. (2004) claim the opposite. In the same vein, Wiltshire (2005) shows that speakers with a Tibeto-Burman linguistic background clearly opt for the rhotic realization of the variable⁸, i.e. [r] in postvocalic position. Similarly, Chand (2010) finds that the speakers in the (urban) Delhi area also exhibit postvocalic [r] in almost two thirds of the tokens they produce⁹. Maybe more caution would have been called for in the discussion of the rhoticity of IndE, given the high degree of variation – appropriately highlighted by the author herself – and given that we are dealing with a variety which has not reached maturation yet.

Another aspect that I find troubling is that some features are claimed to be IndE, when in fact they are attested in other varieties of English, native ones included. Such an example is *maths* (p. 83), given as a clipping from *mathematics*, which is exactly the same as in native varieties of English. Another example is the discussion of consonant cluster reduction (p. 29): we are told that in words such as *fast* and *missed* the consonant cluster undergoes simplification if the following word begins with a consonant, but this holds both for other non-native varieties and for native varieties of English.

Finally, the book fails to make use of the examples from the speech samples available in order to illustrate various features of IndE. For example, we are told that “[ð] is almost completely missing” (p. 21) and a plosive is used instead. Clear examples of such a rendition would include the pronunciation of two tokens of the word *that* in the sample of Ira, which are only a few milliseconds apart, at the start of the sound file. The monophthongization of the GOAT¹⁰ vowel to the long vowel [o:], for instance, is illustrated with words such as *no*, *go*, and *groan* (p. 25), when such examples could have been provided by words like *notice* (two tokens in the first 4 seconds of the sound file) in the recording of Ira or *spoke* (at about 22 seconds from the start) in the recording of Deepti. In fact, there is only one reference to the audio recordings, in the chapter on discourse, in relation to the use of *and* (p. 85). While it is true that the two speech samples transcribed orthographically in the last chapter amount to about 3 minutes and a half, and that together with the other four which are not transcribed amount to only a little over 8 minutes, which would certainly prove insufficient to illustrate all the relevant features discussed in the book, some of them could have been put to a better use, especially in the chapter on the phonetics and phonology of IndE.

On the other hand, even in such a compact description, further explanations would have been necessary to account for certain phenomena. For instance, we are told that “there is an overall tendency in all varieties of IE [Indian English] to use the progressive form” and that “sentences

⁷ In the sense that she has (had) a first-hand experience with IndE, as one cannot actually speak of native speakers of a second language variety since it is acquired via formal education exclusively.

⁸ The figures vary between 83% and 91% (Wiltshire 2005: 286).

⁹ The exact percentage is 62.4% (Chand 2010: 18).

¹⁰ One of the lexical sets proposed by Wells (1982).

with the progressive form are more commonly used than the one without [...]” (p. 49). A substratist explanation such as the one in Bickerton (1984: 175-176), according to whom “native speakers of Hindi frequently make mistakes such as **I am liking it...* Hindi speakers apparently commit [this mistake] because in Hindi imperfective marking can be used with statives.”, would shed more light on the phenomenon and explain why such generalizations are possible. Moreover, Sharma (2009: 185) shows that the overuse of imperfective marking is the result of the interaction between the grammar of the substrate and the superstrate, but “IndE speakers have a pervasive substrate pressure to mark imperfectivity overtly” (see also Table 7 in Sharma 2009: 185).

In spite of its shortcomings, and bearing in mind the intended readership, Sailaja’s book contains valuable information which has been carefully put together and attentively analyzed. Overall, while the book does not provide very many new insights into the features of IndE, but rather summarizes earlier research, this contribution is a pioneering overview of the variety as a whole and it may serve as a very helpful introduction to the study of non-native varieties in general, and IndE in particular.

References

- Balasubramanian, C. .2009. *Register Variation in Indian English*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bickerton, D. 1984. The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7: 173-221.
- Chand, V. 2010. Postvocalic (r) in urban Indian English. *English World-Wide* 31 (1): 1-39.
- Gargesh, R. 2008. Indian English: Phonology. In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English*, vol. 4, *Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin · New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kachru, B. B. 1965. The Indianness of Indian English. *Word* 21: 391-410.
- Kachru, B. B. 1983. *The Indianization of English: The English Language in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Nihalani, P., Tongue, R. K., Hosali, P., and Crowther, J. 2004. *Indian and British English: A Handbook of Usage and Pronunciation*, 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sedlatschek, A. 2009. *Contemporary Indian English: Variation and Change*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sharma, D. 2009. Typological diversity in New Englishes. *English World-Wide* 30 (2): 170-195.
- Wells, J. C. 1982. *Accents of English*, vol. I, *An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiltshire, C. 2005. The “Indian English” of Tibeto-Burman language speakers. *English World-Wide* 26 (3): 275-300.

Ruxandra Drăgan. 2012. *Aspects of Lexical Structure: Verbs in Locative Constructions in English and Romanian*. București: Editura Universității din București. 258 pp.

Reviewed by Imola-Ágnes Farkas*

The book under review here, the published version of the author’s doctoral dissertation defended at the University of Bucharest, stands out as a comprehensive survey of English and Romanian change-of-location (i.e. directed and located motion) constructions, with particular interest in the syntactic composition of Manner and Motion in intransitive-based Goal of Motion constructions.

From the point of view of its structure, the discussion in this book, divided into four chapters, is preceded by some introductory remarks and at the end of the book the reader finds an evaluation of the findings, four appendices and an extensive list of references.

* “Babeș-Bolyai” University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature, farkas_imola_agnes@yahoo.com, farkas.imola.agnes@gmail.com.

Chapter 1, “Theoretical approaches to Goal of Motion” (pp. 13-30), opens with a brief overview of the main issues involved in the derivation of motion constructions and discusses the most representative approaches proposed for their analysis: the lexical approach, the syntactic approach and the relational syntactic and semantic approach. Throughout the chapter, the author does not only present these approaches as they appear in the literature, but she critically reviews them focusing both on their advantages and on their drawbacks and gives reasoned argumentations explaining why Mateu’s (2002) relational syntactic and semantic approach – despite being debatable and deficient from certain points of view – is to be preferred over the other analyses discussed in the chapter.

Chapter 2, “Motion verbs and change of location in English” (pp. 31-92), looks more closely into the class of English motion verbs and investigates the properties of the two major classes of motion verbs: inherently directed motion verbs and manner-of-motion verbs. Many researchers argue for splitting English motion verbs into these two large classes and at first sight the discussion in this book follows the idea of a clear-cut distinction between them. However, after discussing the syntactic, semantic and aspectual properties of these verb classes, examining the occurrence of motion verbs with directional phrases, and extending Levin’s (1993) list of inherently directed motion verbs, the author uncovers some interesting properties of motion verbs. These are: (i) motion verbs can display properties of both inherently directed motion verbs and manner-of-motion verbs; (ii) verbs can belong to several categories; (iii) some features of motion and patterns of meaning span two or more verb classes; (iv) other features apply to these two major classes, but also to exceptions to other classes; (v) some manner-of-motion verbs always co-occur with PathPs, others can be accompanied by directional PPs, and still others resist occurrence with such prepositions; (vi) some verbs show peculiar behaviour (they do not generally appear in Goal of Motion constructions, but combine with dynamic locative phrases headed by *around/about* or they select obligatory directional phrases and never occur in isolation or with locative phrases). In view of such a variation within the class of motion verbs, the general conclusion is that English motion verbs cannot uniformly be classified into one of the two major classes of verbs involved in the expression of motion to/towards a goal. Therefore, employing some relevant semantic and syntactic criteria, the author proposes a so-called Directionality Squish which captures the fact that English motion verbs form a continuum or a hierarchy ranging from pure inherently directed motion verbs which always express directed motion to pure manner-of-motion verbs which never express directed motion. Between these two poles we find the rest of the motion verbs that display mixed properties of the two prototypical classes: verbs of inherently directed motion with a Manner component, verbs of manner of motion which require an obligatory directional preposition, and variable behaviour verbs that express located motion in the presence of PlacePs and directed motion in the presence of directional PathPs.

Chapter 3, “A syntactic analysis of change-of-location structures in English” (pp. 93-137), examines the syntactic derivation of English change-of-location structures along the lines of analysis proposed in Zubizarreta and Oh (2007), drawing upon the lexical syntax elaborated in Hale and Keyser’s (1993, 2002) seminal works. Adopting Zubizarreta and Oh’s (2007) approach, the author claims that English derives transitive and intransitive directed motion by the composition of syntactic categories (light verbs and prepositions). Goal of Motion, a variant of the directed motion construction, is thus derived by a syntactic rule, called Compound Rule, which combines (or merges) a lexically realized, atelic unergative verb of manner of motion or sound emission with the phonologically empty/null verbal head of the unaccusative/causative directed motion construction, creating a verbal compound which can function as the head of the directed motion construction. The arguments in favour of opting for this proposal are straightforward: (i) Compound Rule accounts for the variable behaviour of verbs of manner of motion – which evince the syntactic properties of unergative verbs in their purely locative use, but which exhibit

unaccusative behaviour in their directed motion use – without resorting to verbal polysemy; (ii) it explains the large productivity of Goal of Motion in English; (iii) it makes it possible to relate this syntactic structure to other, closely related constructions (i.e. resultative constructions) and linguistic phenomena (i.e. compounding) in Germanic languages, as well as to account for their cross-linguistic variation in Germanic and Romance languages. These properties cast light on the preferred strategy used in English motion constructions: Goal of Motion constructions are largely productive in this language due not only to the rich class of unergative manner-of-motion verbs, but also to the fairly well-developed class of directional prepositions, an argument also sustained in an extremely interesting and valuable section of this chapter dedicated to the historical investigation of the origins of Goal of Motion and the evolution of dynamic prepositions.

Chapter 4, “Expressing change of location in Romanian” (pp. 138-176), provides a detailed account of the means used by Romanian to express change-of-location structures, with particular focus on Goal of Motion constructions. The analysis is conducted within the theoretical framework put forth in Zubizarreta and Oh (2007) and along the lines of analysis introduced in the previous chapter; hence, the reader is offered a comparative account of these constructions in these two languages. The chapter starts with the inventory of the two major classes of motion verbs (verbs of inherently directed motion and verbs of manner of motion), commenting on their syntactic, semantic and aspectual properties; it continues with a detailed presentation of the class of spatial prepositions in this Romance language and then it investigates change-of-location structures from a syntactic perspective.

The term “Goal of Motion” is used in its broad sense, which hence “refers to any syntactic configuration semantically interpreted as motion to/towards a Goal in a specific manner” (p. 165). The author considers that Direct Object NPs can be interpreted as Source or bounded Path. She takes into account unbounded directional PathPs and complex directional PPs expressing Source, Path or Goal, and agrees that inherently directed motion verbs can combine with Manner Adverbials expressed by PPs, AdvPs or gerunds (i.e. AspPs). Also discussed are some “temporal adjuncts” (p. 152). The author summarizes her most important conclusion by stating that “Romanian and English exhibit the same change-of-location patterns, but employ them in different degrees, depending on the lexical and syntactic means at their disposal” (p. 173-174). In other words, there are no significant differences between the two languages with regard to directed motion constructions built on pure inherently directed motion verbs and located motion constructions built on pure manner-of-motion verbs. On the other hand, there are significant differences in the strategies these languages employ to express Goal of Motion, as different linguistic resources are available in the two languages. In particular, while English applies the syntactic Compound Rule and freely combines or merges unergative manner-of-motion verbs with the phonologically empty/null verbal head of the unaccusative/causative directed motion construction; Romanian cannot make use of the same rule, as compounding is restricted and, hence, not productive in this language. Instead, Romanian uses Adjunction and combines inherently directed motion verbs with manner adverbials or it instantiates motion constructions with the help of verbs of inherently directed motion, verbs of variable behaviour or verbs of manner of motion in combination with complex directional PPs. The choice of these strategies is explained by the fact that Romanian has an extensive class of inherently directed motion verbs and its prepositions are mostly locative.

The book ends with a section, entitled “Concluding remarks” (pp. 177-183), which outlines the most important findings on the expression of change of location in English and Romanian and suggests some issues for future research.

A book like this was no doubt long overdue to fill in the gaps left by the huge number of books and articles dedicated to the expression of change of location in Romance languages. The book shows that, from the perspective of motion verbs and change-of-location constructions,

Romanian shares many properties with Romance languages, but it also sheds light on some interesting peculiarities that set it apart from the other languages of this family.

Due to the amount of information and illustrative data, one thing that is surely extremely helpful is the large number of tables and figures summarizing the facts. These help the reader have a general overview of the phenomena described and keep track of what material has been covered. Another point involves the vast quantity of carefully selected examples. Special mention must be made of the examples brought in from diverse English and Romanian literary texts (novels, short stories) which make for highly fascinating and interesting reading.

The final point worth mentioning involves the four appendices at the end of the book. Appendix 1 “Verbs of inherently directed motion in English” and Appendix 2 “Verbs of manner of motion in English” contain not only lists of inherently directed motion verbs and manner-of-motion verbs, but also details about the syntactic nature of these verbs, their definition, their Romanian equivalent(s), as well as illustrative examples in English. Appendix 3 “Verbs of inherently directed motion in Romanian” and Appendix 4 “Verbs of manner of motion in Romanian”, again, contain large amount of data: inherently directed motion verbs and manner-of-motion verbs are followed by their English correspondent(s) and representative examples in Romanian.

In general, *Aspects of Lexical Structure: Verbs in Locative Constructions in English and Romanian* is worth having close at hand as a reference for any kind of information on English and Romanian (Romance) motion constructions. This is not only an indispensable reference tool to a range of specialists (theoretical and applied linguists), but also a valuable contribution to the grammatical structure and lexicalization pattern of Romanian.

References

- Hale, K. and Keyser, S. J. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20. Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 53-109. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hale, K. and Keyser, S. J. 2002. *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levin, B. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations. A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mateu, J. 2002. *Argument Structure: Relational Construal at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. PhD dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Zubizarreta, M. L. and Oh, E. 2007. *On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Marcin Walczyński. 2012. *A Living Language. Selected Aspects of Tok Pisin in the Press (on the Basis of Wantok Newspaper)*. Nysa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Zawodowej w Nysie. 309 pp.

Reviewed by Andrei A. Avram*

Marcin Walczyński's book looks at some characteristics of standard written Tok Pisin as reflected in the weekly *Wantok*. The book consists of a “List of figures” (p. 12), a “List of tables” (p. 12), an “Introduction”, six chapters, the “Concluding remarks”, a “Summary in Polish” (pp. 289-292), the “References” (pp. 293-308) and “Internet sources” (p. 309).

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

The aims and the organization of the book are outlined in “Introduction” (pp. 15-21).

Chapter 1, “Pidgins and creoles – definitions, approaches and genesis theories” (pp. 23-76), introduces the reader to the field of pidgin and creole linguistics. First, the definitions of a number of key terms are discussed in some detail: pidgin, pidginized language, creole, creolized language, lingua franca and creoloid. This is followed by a brief historical overview of the field of pidgins and creole studies. The longest section in this chapter is a critical review of the main theories regarding the origin of pidgins and creoles. The theories considered are, in order, the following: monogenesis with relexification; polygenesis or independent parallel developments; the language bioprogram hypothesis; the semantic transparency hypothesis; substratum theory; baby talk and foreigner talk; the superstrate hypothesis; common core hypothesis; the gradual development theory; nautical jargon theory; pidgin and creole speakers’ explanations. Also discussed are the two highly controversial cases of Middle English and African American Vernacular English respectively. As is well known, the former is regarded by some as having been a creole, why the second is believed by others to have developed out of a creole.

Chapter 2, “Pidgins and creoles: Distribution, typologies and development” (pp. 77-120), starts with an overview of the geographical distribution of pidgins and creoles, with various lexifier languages. Next, the main typologies of pidgins and creoles are discussed: sociolinguistic classifications, in terms of the social context of their origin and of the social situation in which these languages are used, and those in which these varieties are assigned to a particular stage in the so-called “pidgin-to-creole life cycle”. There is a very interesting section on the phenomenon of language death in the case of pidgins and creoles. It is shown that, in principle, language death can occur in any of their developmental stages, via various mechanisms.

In chapter 3, “Pidgins and creoles in selected social contexts” (pp. 121-146), the author looks into issues such as the standardization of pidgins and creoles, their use in education, bi- and multilingualism in pidgin- and creole-speaking societies, the use of pidgins and creoles in literature and the media.

The next three chapters focus on Tok Pisin. Chapter 4, “Tok Pisin: An overview of history, development and function” (pp. 147-199), opens with two sections on the external and respectively the internal history of Tok Pisin. The next section compares the status of Tok Pisin to that of the indigenous languages, of the indigenous pidgins of Papua New Guinea – such as Hiri Motu, Pidgin Dobu / Gosiagu Talk and Yimas Pidgin – as well as that of the local variety of English. One other section variation in Tok Pisin. It is first shown that, in terms of developmental stages, both pidginized and creolized varieties Tok Pisin are found. In addition, regional variation also occurs: on the one hand, there are three main dialects – Highlands Tok Pisin, Lowlands Tok Pisin and Tok Pisin as spoken in the (smaller) islands; on the other hand, there is a distinction between the rural and urban varieties of Tok Pisin, believed by some to be more significant than regional differences. Finally, there is also social variation. The author discusses four such sociolects: *Tok Masta*, the now virtually extinct variety, previously used by the white colonialists; *Tok bilong bus* [lit. ‘the language of the bush’] / *Tok bilong kanaka* [lit. ‘the language of the natives’] “‘Bush’ Pidgin”; *Tok bilong ples* [lit. ‘the language of the village’] ‘rural Tok Pisin’; *Tok bilong skul* [lit. ‘the language of the school’] / *Tok Pisin bilong taun* [lit. ‘the language of the town’] ‘urban Tok Pisin’. The next topic is the constitutional status of Tok Pisin. Together with English and Hiri Motu, Tok Pisin is an official language of Papua New Guinea, besides being the country’s *de facto* national language. Also discussed are past and current users’ attitudes towards Tok Pisin. These are shown to have undergone a significant evolution, from an essentially negative one in the past to a positive one at present; indeed, in the process of nation building, Tok Pisin has become a marker of Papua New Guinean identity. The last issue addressed in this chapter is the emergence of standard Tok Pisin, discussed within the larger context of language policies and language planning in Papua New Guinea. Standard Tok Pisin is based on a rural variety, spoken in the

province of Madang, and its pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and orthography are essentially those codified in Mihalic (1971).

In chapter 5, “Tok Pisin in *Wantok*: Selected aspects of lexicon and grammar and their standardization” (pp. 200-233), the author assesses the extent to which the language used in the weekly newspaper *Wantok* complies with the norms of standard written Tok Pisin. A first set of topics includes: the orthography; the vocabulary; plural marking on nouns; the tense, aspect and modality markers; the personal pronouns; the adjectives and adverbs; the prepositions. The subsection on the expansion of the vocabulary discusses the borrowings from English, the main word-formation processes – suffixation (in particular of *-im*, to form transitive verbs), reduplication, compounding and conversion – as well as the use of abbreviations and acronyms. Also illustrated are five registers: the language of politics, church and religion, medical issues, education and sport. These are rightly considered by the author as relevant evidence for the emergence of specialized registers in Tok Pisin. Particular attention is paid to the influence of English on Tok Pisin, as used in *Wantok*. The outcome is an anglicized variety of Tok Pisin, characterized primarily by a rather large number of English loanwords, but which also exhibits traces of English influence in its morphology and syntax. The latter include: the plural marker *-s*, as in *opisols* ‘officials’ (p. 217); the preposition *ov*, in e.g. *Stet ov origin* ‘State of origin’ (p. 223); compounds following the English pattern, such as *polis bos* ‘police boss’ (p. 230).

Chapter 6, “Tok Pisin in *Wantok*: Language functions and language choice” (pp. 234-284), deals with the functions of language in Tok Pisin and the use of Tok Pisin or English. In his analysis of the functions of language the author draws on Jakobson (1960) and Duranti (1997). The emotive, referential, poetic, phatic, metalinguistic and conative functions of language are amply illustrated with a large number of Tok Pisin texts. A second section is devoted to textual diglossia as reflected in the selection of either Tok Pisin or English in advertisements, public notices and announcements as well as in supplements of *Wantok*. The author convincingly shows that the choice of the language is mainly dictated by the targeted readership. Thus, Tok Pisin is preferred when the intended audience consists of average, i.e. mostly rural readers, whereas English is favoured in texts aimed at an international audience.

The findings are summarized in the “Concluding remarks” (pp. 285-288).

The following are a few points on which I take issue with the author. The examples illustrating the diphthong /oi/ include *droim* ‘to draw’ (p. 207), in which /o/ and /i/ are actually distributed over two syllables: /o/ is part of the root (cf. English *draw*), which is the first syllable, whereas /i/ belongs to the transitive suffix *-im*, which forms the second syllable.

Graphemes are written between slashes instead of angle brackets (e.g. pp. 207 and 213).

The author states (p. 207) that “/b/, /d/ and /g/ when used word-finally are written as /p/, /t/ and /k/ respectively”. In fact, the examples given – *bilip* ‘to believe’, *sait* ‘side’ and *pik* ‘pig’ – illustrate the devoicing of obstruents in word-final position¹¹. It is also stated (p. 207) that “it happens quite often that what in English is pronounced and spelt with /p/ in Tok Pisin becomes /f/ as in *laip* (“life”), *pela* (“fellow”), *pren* (“friend”)”. It is the other way round, and the correct formulation should have been that the reflex of English /f/ in Tok Pisin is /p/, orthographically represented by <p>.

The author writes (p. 207) that in his corpus only two words exhibit an epenthetic vowel breaking up an etymological onset cluster, *kilok* (< English *clock*) ‘clock’ and *silip* (< English *sleep*) ‘sleep’. Actually, there are three other such forms in the samples, in which the vowel [i] is epenthesized into an onset cluster¹²: *pilai* ‘play, game; to play’ (< English *play*), which occurs five

¹¹ The earlier Tok Pisin reflex of English /v/ is /b/, which undergoes devoicing to [p] in word-final position, as in *bilip* (< English *believe*).

¹² For the phonological status of the epenthetic vowel see Avram (2005: 211, 212-213 and 214-216).

times (pp. 217, 219, 220, 229 and 247), *pilaia* ‘player’ (< English *player*) (p. 220), and *bilasim*¹³ ‘to adorn’ (< English *flash*) (p. 240).

The author writes (p. 211 and 221) that polysyllabic adjectives do not take the suffix *-pela* when used attributively. While this is generally the rule, there are a number of exceptions, including some of the examples given: *yelo* ‘yellow’ (p. 211), *hevi* ‘heavy’ and *liklik* ‘little’ (p. 221). Thus, Verhaar (1995: 164-167) lists *dotipela* ‘dirty’, *hevipela* ‘heavy’, *isipela* ‘easy’, *kliapela* ‘clear’, *liklikpela* ‘little’ and *yelopela* ‘yellow’. Three of these are also found in Steinbauer (1998: 26, 40 and 116): *dotipela* ‘dirty’, *isipela* ‘easy’ and *yelopela* ‘yellow’. Smith’s (2003: 64) corpus also includes two such adjectives¹⁴ *isipla* ‘easy’ and *yelopla* ‘yellow’. Moreover, one such form is attested in the author’s own samples: *isipela* ‘easy’ (p. 254).

Two uses of reduplication are identified: “to create an additional semantic effect such as emphasizing intensity or frequency”, and “to distinguish [reduplicated forms] from similar-sounding words” (p. 214). This would imply that the second type of reduplication emerged as a means to avoid homophony, which is not the case. Thus, of the four pairs of examples of reduplicated and non-reduplicated forms illustrating the second type (pp. 214-215), three show that reduplication actually expresses a different meaning: *lukluk* ‘to look for, to seek’ vs. *luk* ‘to see, to look at’; *tingting* ‘to consider, to think about’ vs. *ting* ‘thought’; *toktok* ‘to converse’ vs. *tok* ‘to say’. In the fourth one, *liklik* ‘little’ vs. *lik* ‘to leak’, the reduplicated item is an instance of what Verhaar (1995: 8) calls “phonetic reduplication”, i.e. of words which are not derived from a simplex form¹⁵.

As can be seen, the remarks above are concerned with matters of detail. They should certainly not be seen as detracting in any way from the general value and usefulness of the book.

To conclude, the book under review is a fine example of application of the methods of corpus linguistics to the study of pidgin and creole languages and a welcome contribution to the study of modern written Tok Pisin, for which the author is to be commended.

References

- Avram, A. A. 2005. *On the Syllable Structure of English Pidgins and Creoles*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.
- Duranti, A. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jakobson, R. 1960. Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, 350-377. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mihalic, F. 1971. *The Jacaranda Dictionary and Grammar of Melanesian Pidgin*. Milton: The Jacaranda Press.
- Smith, G. 2002. *Growing up with Tok Pisin. Contact, Creolization and Change in Papua New Guinea’s National Language*. London: Battlebridge Publications.
- Steinbauer, F. 1998. *Neo-Melanesian-English Dictionary. New Guinea Pidgin English*. New York: Hippocrene Books.
- Verhaar, J. W. M. 1995. *Toward a Reference Grammar of Tok Pisin. An Experiment in Corpus Linguistics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

¹³ The earlier Tok Pisin reflex of English /f/ is /p/ and, occasionally, /b/.

¹⁴ Which exhibit the phonologically reduced variant [pla] of the suffix *-pela*.

¹⁵ For a list of phonetically reduplicated forms see Verhaar (1995: 8-9).

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. 3202/2012
la Tipografia Editurii Universității din București
