(A COMPILED COURSE-BOOK FOR TEACHING AND EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY)

Faculty of Arts

3rd year Arts

English Dept.

Contrastive Linguistics: Linguistic Variation

AY 2023-2024

(A COMPILED COURSE-BOOK FOR TEACHING AND EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY)

Contrastive Linguistics: Linguistic Variation

(A COMPILED COURSE-BOOK FOR TEACHING AND EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY)

3rd YEAR ARTS

Compiled by Dr. Heba Abdelraheim Alkady

A Y (2023-2024)

Contrastive Linguistics:

Linguistic Variation

(A COMPILED COURSE-BOOK FOR TEACHING AND

EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY)

Contrastive Linguistics is a sub-discipline of linguistics which is concerned with the comparison of two or more (subsystems of) languages. It has long been associated primarily with language teaching. Apart from this applied aspect, however, it also has a strong theoretical purpose, contributing to our understanding of language typology and language universals. The study of two languages in contrast, here called contrastive analysis, has been referred to by a variety of names, not all of which mean the same to all writers. One can find the following terms used: contrastive studies, contrastive language studies, contrastive linguistics, applied contrastive studies, contrastive description and others. contrastive analysis investigates the differences between pairs (or small sets) of languages against the background of similarities and with the purpose of providing input to applied disciplines such as foreign language teaching and translation studies. With its largely descriptive focus contrastive linguistics provides an interface between theory and application. It makes use of

theoretical findings and models of language description but is driven by the objective of applicability.

Contrastive studies mostly deal with the comparison of languages that are ‘socio-culturally linked’, i.e. languages whose speech communities overlap in some way, typically through (natural or instructed) bilingualism . Much progress has been made in classifying the languages of the earth into genetic families, each having descent from a single precursor, and in tracing such developments through time. The result is called "comparative linguistics." Of even greater importance for the future technology of thought is what might be called "contrastive linguistics." This plots the outstanding differences among tongues - in grammar, logic, and general analysis of experience.

Differences between Micro-contrastive linguistics and Macro-contrastive linguistics Macro-linguistics and micro-linguistics are both fields of study of linguistics that focus on language and its form and meaning and the changes that occur to that form and meaning due to other factors. According to the microlinguistics view, languages should be analysed for their own sake without reference to:

 Their social function

 The manner in which they are acquired by children The psychological mechanisms that underlie the production and reception of speech

 The literary and aesthetic or communicative function of language, etc.

In contrast, macrolinguistics embraces all of these aspects of language. Various areas within macrolinguistics have been given terminological recognition:

- Psycholinguistics
- Sociolinguistics
- Anthropological linguistics
- Dialectology
- Mathematical and computational linguistics
- Stylistics
- Discourse analysis

Subsequently, macro-contrastive linguistics takes a broad view of linguistic phenomena of the languages being compared or contrasted, studying the contexts in which the languages are used and their development over time, while micro-contrastive linguistics focuses on the details of the languages being compared, including their sound features, grammatical structures, syntax, and meanings.

Language Contact and Multilingualism

Language changes and its important source is contact between different languages and resulting diffusion of linguistic traits between languages. Language contact occurs when speakers of two or more

languages or varieties interact on a regular basis. Multilingualism is likely to have been the norm throughout human history, and today, most people in the world are multilingual. Before the rise of the concept of the ethno-national state, monolingualism was characteristic mainly of populations inhabiting small islands. But with the ideology that made one people, one state, and one language the most desirable political arrangement, monolingualism started to spread throughout the world. When speakers of different languages interact closely, it is typical for their languages to influence each other. Through sustained language contact over long periods, linguistic traits diffuse between languages, and languages belonging to different families may converge to become more similar. In areas where many languages are in close contact, this may lead to the formation of language areas in which unrelated languages share a number of linguistic features. Multilingualism is the use of two or more languages, either by an individual speaker or by a community of speakers. Multilingual speakers outnumber monolingual speakers in the world's population.

Multilingualism is becoming a social phenomenon governed by the needs of globalization and cultural openness. Owing to the ease of access to information facilitated by the Internet, individuals' exposure to multiple languages is becoming increasingly frequent, thereby promoting a need to acquire additional languages. A multilingual person is someone who can communicate in more than one language, either actively (through speaking, writing, or signing) or passively (through listening, reading, or perceiving). More specifically, the terms „bilingual" and „trilingual" are used to describe comparable situations in which two or three languages are involved. A multilingual person is generally referred to as a polyglot. Multilingual speakers have acquired and maintained at least one language during childhood, the so-called first language (L1). The first language (sometimes also referred to as the mother tongue) is acquired without formal education, by mechanisms heavily disputed.

Contrastive Linguistics: Theoretical Background

Contrastive linguistics is dependent on theoretical linguistics since no exact and reliable exploration of facts can be conducted without a theoretical background, providing concepts, hypotheses, and theories which enable the investigator to describe the relevant facts and to account for them in terms of significant generalizations. But contrastive linguistics is also dependent on descriptive linguistics since no comparison of languages is possible without their prior description. In brief, then, contrastive linguistics is an area of linguistics in which a linguistic theory is applied to a comparative description of two or more languages, which need not be genetically or typologically related. The success of these comparisons is strictly dependent on the theory applied. As will be seen later, in extreme cases, the linguistic framework itself may preclude comparison. Therefore, contrastive linguistics imposes certain demands on the form and nature of the linguistic theory which is to be “applied” in

such comparisons. In many less extreme situations the results of comparisons are strictly dependent on the theoretical framework adopted in the comparisons.

Contrastive linguistics is a subfield of linguistics under the guidance of linguistic philosophy, having its aim to determine language universals, large (bilingual or multilingual) text corpora and computer search tools, which can open up new fronts of research in the fields of linguistic description (at all levels), computational linguistics, machine translation or information retrieval. Contrastive linguistics has often been linked to aspects of applied linguistics, e.g., to avoid interference errors in foreign-language learning, to assist interlingual transfer in the process of translating texts from one language into another, and to find lexical equivalents in the process of compiling bilingual dictionaries.

Polyglots (people in multicultural and multilingual environment) including second languages students, tourists, language teachers,

translators, linguists, etc are the agents of contrastive studies. They are „naive" or professional contrastive linguists.

Contrastive descriptions can occur at every level of linguistic structure: speech sounds (phonology), written symbols (graphology), word-formation (morphology), word meaning (lexicology), collocation (phraseology), sentence structure (syntax) and complete discourse (textology). Various techniques used in corpus linguistics have been shown to be relevant in intralingual and interlingual contrastive studies.

Contrastive linguistic studies can also be applied to the differential description of one or more varieties within a language, such as styles (contrastive rhetoric), dialects, registers or terminologies of technical genres.

Contrastive Analysis

Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis states that the structure of the learners' L1 affects the acquisition (the two terms acquisition/learning interchangeably) of their L2, in the sense that whenever there are similarities the L2 learning is facilitated, and whenever there are differences the learning process is difficult. The term Contrastive Hypothesis implies the theory itself, while the term Contrastive Analysis implies the methodology. Hence, the term Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis implies both theory and methodology.

CAH came into existence in the 1960's. It originated from Lado's Linguistics across Cultures:

The plan of the book rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the patterns that will cause difficulty in learning, and those that will not cause difficulty, by comparing systematically the language and the culture to be learned with the native language and culture of the student (1957, p. VII).

CAH is based on the assumption that second language learners tend to transfer L1 features to L2 utterances as stated by Lado (1957):

Individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture (p. 2).

Accordingly, Ellis (1965) suggested that the psychological foundation of CAH is transfer theory. In fact, CA's assumption that L1 interferes with the learners' L2 acquisition/Learning leads us to the notion of transfer; be it positive or negative. Transfer refers to the application of native language knowledge when trying to speak the target language. Positive Transfer (facilitation) occurs when the structure of the two languages is the same; hence no errors will crop up. However, negative transfer (interference) occurs when the structure of the languages is different, and here errors will crop up and so the difficulties in tackling the target language. All in all, the more the similarities the more the learning process is facilitated, and the more the differences the more the learning process will be difficult. The

aforementioned statement reflects linguists' belief that a comparison of learners' L1 and L2 will reveal problematic areas for L2 students, as stated by Lado (1957):

In the comparison between native and foreign language lies the key to ease or difficulty in foreing language learningâ€¦ Those elements that are similar to (the learner's) native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult. (p. 1-2)

Levels of Analysis

Contrastive analysis can be conducted at different levels of language, for example it can be carried out at the phonological level, grammatical level, as well as the lexical level.

Phonological Contrastive Analysis

When comparing the sound system of two languages, the contrastive analyst has to go through four basic steps. Firstly, he should draw up the phonemic inventory (describe and compare vowels and consonants) of the two languages under study. Secondly, the contrastive analyst should compare the phonemes in the two

languages interlingually. At this stage, the contrastive analyst should apply the minimal pair test. Here is an example of the minimal pair test between the phonemes /k/ and /g/ in English and Arabic:

English: came /Keim/ vs. game /geim/

Arabic: /kelb/ ‘dog’ vs. /gelb/ ‘heart’

In Algerian Arabic /q/ and /g/ are phonemes and allophones:

/gern/ ‘horn’ vs. /qern/ ‘century’ â†’ phonemes

/gma::r/ ‘moon’ vs. /qma:r/ ‘moon’ â†’ allophones

Thirdly, the contrastive analyst should state the allophones of each phoneme of the two languages being compared. And fourthly, he should state the distribution restrictions of the phonemes and allophones of both languages.

Grammatical Contrastive Analysis

In a grammatical contrastive analysis, the contrastive analyst compares and contrasts between the grammatical systems of two languages. The comparison may take different forms, for example, in

English; word order is used to differentiate between an affirmative sentence and an interrogative one: you are a teacher/are you a teacher? In Spanish, however, the same distinction is indicated via the use of intonation; while in Arabic, the same distinction is expressed through the addition of functional words like 'Ù‡Ù„' at the beginning of sentences. Another kind of grammatical contrastive analysis may investigate how a given linguistic category functions in two different languages, such as the case of adjectives in English and French. In English, adjectives tend to be pronominal, however, in French; they tend to be post nominal, for example: The narrow door – La porte etroite.

Lexical CA

Contrastive lexicology is carried out between the vocabulary system(s) of two languages. It is concerned with the way lexical items in one language are expressed in another language. This can be done through identifying both the semantic fields and the semantic properties in order to specify the divisions and sub-divisions of the

lexicon. Lexical CA may result in complete, partial, or nil equivalence between languages.

Language variation:

What does it mean?

Language is a manifestation of human behaviour. Therefore, it cannot remain static or unchanging. As with other aspects of human existence, the idea of change is an inevitable component of language. We all know that the way we spoke or wrote our different languages decades ago is not the same as the languages are being utilised in everyday interactions today. Many things have come and gone in our language practices. Take simple every day greetings for example. Many people, young and old, have added more items of greeting that were not used before. Greetings that begin with the word 'Happy' were normally reserved for special occasions like birthdays, weddings, and anniversaries. Today, the 'Happy' greetings have become so commonplace in the daily interactions of Nigerians that we often hear people say: "Happy New Month", "Happy New Week"!

Also, in written communication, language users, especially the younger generation, have imbibed new spelling forms which were unthinkable some fifty years ago. The influence of digital technology has brought new currency and popularity to spelling forms like ‘gr8t’ (great), ‘lil’ (little), ‘U’ (you), ‘lol’ (laugh out loud), among others. Similarly, a page from a newspaper in the Victorian period would be unreadable to anyone in this generation because of the archaic spellings and vocabulary that characterise writing in that period. Therefore, the idea of change is quite normal in language as it is in other spheres of existence.

Change in language is so inevitable that only those languages which yield to change have continued to exist till today. The changes in languages are of course, motivated by the users who constantly ‘recreate’ and ‘reinvent’ the language to suit the demands of usage changes in space and time. In fact, it is often said that a language is as vibrant as the people who use it. Therefore, languages which no longer serve the usage needs and purposes of their speakers soon

become extinct. This validates the point that it is the users of a language that give life to the language. In other words, language growth is determined by the vitality of its functions in the social interactions of its users.

The change that takes place within a language over time and space is called variation. This means that language varies from time to time and from place to place, based on the dynamism of its uses. But change does not occur on its own. It is often motivated by events, happenings or developments in the society. Therefore, language seems to be in a state of continuous transition as it is passed on from generation to generation or from one culture to another. With each transition, language takes on a new elements or redirects the old ones to suit the moment. This is why language is regarded as a living entity. 3.2 The Social Context of Language Change

Some of the changes that occur in Language can be linked to social and political happenings such as wars, invasion, disasters, and others.

These events often bring about major changes in the patterns of communication in speech communities.

It is also a reality of language that it must naturally evolve and regenerate as it travels through time. In this case, Language is frequently recreated or restructured to fit into the current usage of different periods (as in the case of Old English, Middle English and Modern English).

The added reality of cultural and generational transmission of language is yet another factor in the inevitability of change. Each generation has to devise ways of understanding the language of past generations. All of these factors affect language at all levels of analysis: phonology, syntax/grammar, morphology, semantics, etc.

Phonology:

i)The front vowels are not rounded in Modern English whereas most back vowels are rounded. However, in the Old English period, there were front rounded vowels.

Old English Middle English Modern English [r ạ d] [r ∂: d] [r ∂ ʊ d] [h ạ m] [h ∂: m] [h ∂ ʊ m]

ii) The loss of / r / medially before consonants and finally (unless the next word begins with a vowel) took place in the 18th century although / r/ was retained in spellings like arm, heard, order.

iii) Initial / k / and /g /, followed by /n/, disappeared in pronunciation in the late 17th century in words like: knave, gnaw, gnat, gnash.

b) Spelling: The overwhelming influence of the French language during the Norman conquest led to massive changes in English spelling, in the following examples: i) The sequence ‘e o’ remained in spellings but became a monophthong as in ‘people’ ii) ‘y’ was often used to represent ‘i’ in words like: ‘mythe’ (might), ‘wys’ (wise). iii). The advent of the Modern English period witnessed reforms in spelling, such as the dropping of final ‘e’ in many words.

c) Vocabulary: Many significant changes in the English language are attributed to changes in vocabulary. This occurred in many ways:

i) Lexical change: the meaning of a word may be changed based on repeated use in a specific context. The change may be only in the meaning of the word while it retains its original form. Such change in meaning may be informed by the fact that the object it stood for had undergone change, e.g. the word ‘pen’ originally referred to ‘feather’. But when the word feathers came to be used for writing, as in ‘quill pen’, the word ‘pen’ acquired new meaning.

ii) Meaning Extension: A large number of English words have had their meanings extended over time. An example is the word ‘journey’ which originally means ‘a day’s walk/ride’. Similarly, the word ‘journal’ referred to a periodical that appeared ‘every day.’ Now, a ‘journey’ refers to a trip that takes one away for at least a week, while a ‘journal’ in present- day English would refer to a weekly, monthly, or half yearly publication.

iii) Conversion of proper name to common noun / word. This process is a prominent example of lexical change. For example, the word ‘boycott’ is derived from a certain Englishman named Captain

Charles C. Boycott (1832 – 97) who was a land agent of Lord Erne's estate. In an attempt to get Captain Boycott to reduce rents, citizens reduced patronage of his business, and this came to be termed "boycott", after his name. A similar example is the word 'dunce', coined from the name of a medieval writer, Duns Scotus, who fell into disrepute. Consequently, anyone whose writing did not please the public was referred to as a 'dunce'. Other examples are: The word "Odyssey" coined from the war exploits of the medieval Roman soldier, Odysseus, who travelled for many years and led his troops to several conquests. The expression "Archilles' heels" meaning 'weakest point' (of a person), coined from the tragic story of the valiant Roman warrior, Archilles, who could only be killed by an injury to his heels; The expression "waterloo", meaning point of defeat or nemesis, coined from the place where the battle of Waterloo was fought in 1815. A French army under the command of Napoleon Bonaparte, was defeated by English troops at Waterloo, a place in present-day Begium, then part of the United Kingdom.

iv) Euphemism: This is a means by which speakers seek to disguise the actual nature of an unpleasant word or expression by substituting it with an alternate, inoffensive word. Many lexical changes have occurred in English as a result of such usages. For example, the use of words like: 'bathroom', 'restroom', 'convenience', 'ladies' room' or 'Gents' for 'toilet' or 'latrine.

Accents

● Everyone has an accent!

● If English is your first language, you have an L1 accent. ● If not, you have an L2 accent. ● Common (though false) claim: *I* don't have an accent.

Dialect vs. Accent

● Two speech-type varieties are divided by an accent when differences are restricted primarily to phonology. ○ My southern CA "valley" /a/ is a strictly phonological difference and therefore

accentual. ○ Mergers: ■ “cult” vs. “colt” → LA area ■ “pin” vs. “pen” → Southern, Carolinas ■ https://aschmann.net/AmEng/

Determining Dialects

● If two speech-type utterances also differ in morphological structures, syntax, lexicon, and semantics, then they are different dialects of the same language. ● Gym shoes, sneakers, or tennis shoes? ● Grinder, hero, hoagie, or sub?

Distinguishing Languages

● And if in addition they have distinct literary histories, distinct orthographies, and/or geopolitical boundaries, then they are called different languages.

What about ‘mutual intelligibility’?

Mutual intelligibility: ● is a relationship between languages or dialects in which speakers of different but related varieties can readily understand each other without prior familiarity or special effort.

Non-rhoticity

● Non-rhotic varieties only pronounce /r/ when it immediately precedes a vowel. ○ Most English varieties from England and Wales (but not Scotland) ○ Australian and New Zealand English ○ Boston English and Southern English

R - Dropping

● Car, yard, Barbie, party, wear ○ four ≠ fou poor ≠ poo beer ≠ bee

● R is retained in: road, carry, Darrin, parrot, wearing ○ r à /ə/ in the end of syllable, when no vowel comes after it ● tuner and tuna are pronounced identically as: /ˈtjuːnə/ (or /ˈtuːnə/) ● R-Drop rule: ○ r → [ə] (“uh”) / V __ C (or end of word)

Linking R

● A final r does get pronounced sometimes if immediately followed by a vowel: ○ water or tea ○ batter up ○ butter and toast ○ So tuner amp may be pronounced [ˈtjuːnər æmp].

Intrusive R

/r/ is inserted as a linking R between vowels ● the boy from cuba (r) is ● spa (r) on the corner ● law (r) and… ● Intrusive R rule: ○ [ə] → r / V__V (between 2 vowels)

"I have no idear if the movie begins at nine or ten," but, "Does the movie begin at 9 or 10? I have no idea."

Dialects?

● In contemporary British prestige dialect, r-dropping is considered "correct" and "educated-sounding" ● In contemporary American English, r-dropping in Boston is considered "incorrect" and "uneducated sounding" (to some) ● Why?

Prescriptivism of Dialects

● "correct" dialect = the dialect of those in power. ○ Which dialect is "standard" is a matter o fashion (and power), not of logic, completeness, "correctness" or comprehensibility

Varieties Influenced by Dialect

One of the reasons for the initial lack of interest by linguists in the exploration of the social aspect of language was the inadequate understanding of the important difference between language and dialect. Synchronic studies of language however distinguish language from dialect in terms of relative number of speakers, prestige and mutual intelligibility. In this Unit, it suffices to tell you that the description of language according to the user's social and geographical background is known as Dialect. In other words, a dialect identifies a speaker in terms of where the speaker comes from; his/ her geographical origin. The recognition of dialect functions on the assumption that language may vary on the geographical plane from one region to another. This is the basis of geographical varieties of language (see Unit 4) and their regional components. Thus, we have within British English, many varieties representing regions of England where varieties of English are spoken such as the Scottish dialect, Welsh dialect, Cockney dialect, Lancashire dialect, and

Yorkshire dialect, among others. American English has similar regional varieties.

Apart from the regional criteria, dialectal variations in language may also be determined by social hierarchy and social class. An example of variety by social hierarchy is the fact that in London, the variety of English used by aristocrats differs from that used by members of the lower class. While members of the upper class characteristically speak the standard variety known as Received Pronunciation or RP, the less privileged speakers use a less sophisticated and enlightened variety. Although RP is now accessible beyond its social and regional boundaries, it is generally considered the dialect of the educated and the aristocrats. Dialects may also be determined by religion and caste system, as in the case of the Hindu dialect, where dialectal differences are conditioned by caste, even within the same religion.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that within a given language, we may have a number of dialects, each with its distinct grammatical,

lexical and phonological differences, while they still share the same core system with the main language.

For instance, many books have documented the major differences between British English and American English at different levels of the language system. Some of these differences are highlighted below:

1. Phonological Differences:

	RP	General American
Last	/ la : st/	/ læst /
Dance	/ da: ns /	/ dæns /
Direct	/ dairekt /	/ direkt /

2. Vocabulary (lexical differences):

British	American
Biscuit	Candy
Freeway	Highway
Bonnet	Hood
Jelly	Jam
Petrol	Gas

3. Morphological Differences:

British	American
Sneak / sneaked	sneak / snuck
Dive / dived	Dive / dove

4. Graphology (Spelling):

British	American
Programme	Program

Register

Register variations are determined by differences in the situational uses of language. Language use according to the situation is called Register. Registers are commonly associated with the usage

peculiarities of certain groups in society, such as professions (medicine, law, journalism, academia,) Registers may also be viewed as distinct situational usages such as the language of classroom interaction, the language of family life, the language of legal documents, the language of medical diagnosis. These different situational categories are said to have distinct sets of vocabulary which clearly distinguishes each from others. These differences in vocabulary constitute unique registers for each subject or field. Registers may be formal or informal depending on the nature of the situation in which they are used. For instance, a student will use a formal register when speaking to a professor in his school, but an informal register will be preferred for a discussion with his family members in a home setting.

In order to understand registers in more detail, we shall now examine their contextual features by discussing their classification as components of Field, Mode and Tenor of Discourse.

a) Register according to field of discourse: Field of discourse refers to the subject matter or topic of communication. In some cases, it may also be viewed as the Purpose of communication. This means that every field of human endeavour has a unique register which includes the vocabulary items which identify or describe the field or subject. Here are some examples of subject registers The Register of Law: The defendant shall forthwith and in accordance with the extant provisions of Section 12, Sub section 5 of the Constitution, herewith, accordingly witness this declaration. The Register of Religion: Oh Lord, Heavenly father, King of Kings, we worship you, we adore thee and pray thee, have mercy on our souls. The Register of Science: Equal volumes of all gases, under similar temperatures and pressure, contain molecular value of specified elements. The Register of Journalism: Senate Passes Anti –Grazing Law in 36 States-Police to Arrest Offenders.

b) b) Register according to mode of discourse: Mode of discourse refers to the specific medium through which communication is enacted. Mode of discourse is generally categorised into Spoken and Written Media. Each medium specifies a wide range of communication possibilities which may define the discourse Spoken medium includes telephone conversation, radio or television interview, dialogues, radio or television news broadcasts, a classroom discussion, office meetings, lunch –hour fellowships, speeches, among others. Most spoken media have the feature of immediacy and less formality than written variety. Written medium includes letters (formal and informal), job application, student essays and projects, books, novels, reports, memoranda, legal documents, among others.

c) c) Register according to tenor of discourse: Tenor of discourse refers to the style of communication or mood of communication. It involves a consideration of the role relationship between the interlocutors or participants in a

discourse, otherwise called the Addresser and the Addressee. The specific tenor of the participants' relationship determines the nature of the discourse, that is, formal, informal, casual, colloquial, intimate, friendly, hostile or frozen, as the case may be.

English Dialects and Accents in the United States

A dialect is a form of language that is peculiar to a specific region. The dialect you hear in Pittsburgh is different from the dialect you will hear in Louisiana or California.

There are 24 dialect regions in the United States!

Boston

Boston Accent Pattern

Rule: “r” sounds like “ah”

Mark sounds like Mahk

park sounds like pahk

car sounds like cah

Other Examples:

b’daydas = potatoes

foddy = forty

potty platta = party platter

Boston Vocabulary

barrel = garbage can

carriage = shopping cart

tonic = soda/pop

What's doin? = How are you?

bubbler = water fountain

gawker blocker = traffic accident

grinder = sub sandwich

zoo on = to make fun of

New York New York Accent Pattern

Rule: "o" sounds like "aw"

dog sounds like dawg

coffee sounds like cawfee

boss sounds like baws

Other Examples:

Forget about it! (Fuhgeddaboudit!)

Get out of here! (Get outta hea!)

All right, already! (ahrite ahready!) New York Vocabulary

wedge = sub sandwich catty corner = at an angle to a corner

schlep = to make a long trip

on line = in line

johnny pump = fire hydrant

schmear = cream cheese

Southern Southern Accent Pattern Rule: vowels are drawn out

glass sounds like gla - yus

this sounds like thi - yus

pen sounds like pe - yun

Other Examples:

ask sounds like ax

sink sounds like zink

buffet sounds like boo - fay Southern Vocabulary

y'all = you all

fixin' to = about to

coke= any carbonated beverage

supper = dinner

buggy = shopping cart

raisin cane = causing trouble Contact Linguistics

As the term implies, contact linguistics is the interdisciplinary branch of multilingual research which relies on the tripod of language, language user and language sphere. Contact linguistics generally explores issues in language use beyond the individual and community level. It deals with larger issues in the inter-cultural applications of language, especially those connected with the sociology of language (Joshua Fishman), ethnography of communication (Dell Hymes), and issues in language contact, such as the sociolinguistic consequences of bilingualism and multilingualism across cultures.

The term "contact linguistics" was first introduced according to Nelde (1997: 287) at the First World Congress on Language Contact and Conflict, held in Brussels in June 1979. However, there have been earlier works on language contact. For instance, the language situation in the Balkans, a Peninsula in South Eastern Europe received the attention of scholars as early as in the 1911 century with Kopitar

(1829), Schuchardt (1884) and others. Moreover, Trubetzkoy (1928) also provides a definition of a linguistic area or "a union of languages" which he termed "Sprachbund".

The major turning point however in the study of language contact was the works of Weinreich (1952) and Haugen (1950, 1953). Both scholars emphasize the importance of studying language contact from both a linguistic and a socio-cultural perspective, Michael Clyde (1987: 456) observes that: “Despite all the previous research, there was before Weinreich (1953), no systematized theory of language contact”. Moreover, the work of Thomason and Kaufman (1988) has given much impetus to research in language contact.

Language Maintenance

This refers to the preservation by a speech community of its native language from generation to generation. Preservation implies that the language changes only by small degrees in the short run owing to internal developments and/or (limited) contact with other languages. The various subsystems of the language - the phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and core lexicon - remain relatively intact. Maintenance also implies borrowing and interference that is, the native language borrows words and structures from the external or foreign language, Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 37) also argue that borrowing is "the incorporation of foreign features into a group's native language by speakers of that language.

In explaining interference, Weinreich (1953: 1) defines it as:

Deviations from the norm of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language.

All these show the linguistic behaviour of the bilingual since according to Mackey (1968: 55): “Bilingualism is not a phenomenon of language but of its use.” It becomes clear therefore that it is in the bilingual's use of language that such phenomena as interference, borrowing, code-switching, etc. are observable.

Language Shift

In another situation, language contact can also lead to language shift. This refers to the partial or total abandonment of a group's native language in favour of another. In many cases, language shift may be accompanied by varying degrees of influence from the group's first language to the target language. Language shift may lead to language death when there is a complete abandonment of the native language in favour of the target language. The native language slowly decays and dies off.

Pidgins and Creoles

And finally, language contact may lead to the creation of new languages such as pidgins and creoles. A pidgin is a highly reduced language with minimal vocabulary and grammar whose functions are restricted to informal settings. Pidgins can become Creoles when they assume the role of mother-tongues for an entire speech community. In

all, the ultimate consequence of all contact situations is bilingualism. In other word it all begins with bilingualism and may end in monolingual if there is a case of language death over successive generations.

Bilingualism

As one of the major consequences of language contact, bilingualism is a topic which has attracted the interest of scholars for decades. The field has amassed a body of literature that cover the broad scope and depth of its dynamics in contact linguistics. Much of this literature attest to the nature of bilingualism as a normal phenomenon, while affirming that it is actually monolingualism which represents a special case (Romaine 1996).

Bilingualism thus stands in opposition to the 'asocial' view of language which was a major spur for the development of the social perspective of sociolinguistics. But far from the view of Jacobson

(1953) who opined in the pre-sociolinguistic era that: "Bilingualism is for me the fundamental problem of linguistics", researches in the social dimension of language in the past six decades have shown that bilingualism and its cohorts indeed stand at the heart of language use in society.

This section will examine some crucial literature on this subject which are pertinent to our study and which relate directly to the Nigerian experience. Let us examine bilingualism in relation to language contact which is the catalyst for its existence.

Bilingualism and Language Contact

A common parlance in language studies is the reality of change in all aspects of its investigation – phonology, morphology, syntax, grammar, etc. These changes may be a function of the interplay of factors that can be related to the use of language in different situations. This is because man cannot exist in isolation. He must

belong to a society to which he contributes ideas in his language. In this regard, Ghosh (1972:234) argues that: A social man cannot live in isolation; he must contribute to and communicate with the society he lives in. He must speak, work...

Thus, a study of language or language contact would not be separated from a study of both the speakers and the society in which they exist. The contact of languages therefore presupposes the contact of the speakers. In essence, language contact basically recognizes the contact of the different speakers of different languages and the resultant effects of such interaction.

In examining language contact therefore, one must look at the ultimate or resultant effect of it, which is bilingualism. The word 'bilingual' primarily describes someone with the ability to speak two languages. According to Li Wei (2000:7), the term can also be taken to include the many people in the world who have varying degrees of proficiency in more than two languages, which they may use interchangeably. Again, the language behaviour of the speakers of the

different languages in contact is also the focus of a study of language contact. This is in line with Weinreich's (1968) view that: "The bilingual individual is the ultimate locus of contact."

There has been in linguistics, a systematic study of language contact and bilingualism. This is because according to Sankoff (2001: 638) "language contact is part of the social fabric of everyday life for hundreds of millions of people, the world over". This phenomenon has attracted so much attention that it has been assigned a field of study known as "contact linguistics."

Despite all the previous research, there was before Weinreich (1953), no systematized theory of language contact.

Moreover, the work of Thomason and Kaufman (1988) has given much impetus to research in language contact. Studying a wide variety of contact phenomena, they (Thomason and Kaufman) attempted to lay the foundations for both a typology of contact outcomes and a theoretical framework for analyzing such outcomes. Thus, the field of contact linguistics has come a long way in providing

useful analytical frameworks for the understanding of global-scale issues in language, from establishing the nature of lexical borrowing, transfer, interference, to analysing the linguistic contacts of classical languages, inter-ethnic contacts, language conflicts, among other directions.

Bilingualism: Typologies

Bilingualism as a consequence of language contact has been variously defined by many scholars as we noted earlier. Because bilingualism does not have a universally accepted comprehensive definition, scholars have considered the typology levels and degrees of bilingualism. Typologies basically present us with descriptive labels for the content of the bilingual's competence, and the variety of social functions to which bilingual behaviour is

usually applied. To this end, we shall now examine two sets of typologies put forward by two foremost scholars – Weinreich and Haugen:

Uriel Weinreich (1953)

Weinreich (1953) discussed three types of bilingualism in terms of the ways in which it was thought that the concepts of a language were encoded in the individual's brain. These types according to him are: the coordinate, compound and subordinate bilingual.

The coordinate bilingual acquires the two languages just like the native speakers of each language. In other words," he/she performs like a first language speaker in both languages at all levels" (Dadzie, 2004: 142). An example of this bilingual is a Nigerian who has acquired both English and his native language for instance, Hausa, in such a way that he can be mistaken as an English man when he speaks English; and when he switches to his native language, he speaks it well with the same ability. This type of speaker is called a "perfect bilingual." He is also referred to as an ambilingual by Halliday,

Mckintosh and Strevens (1970). The ambilingual is capable of functioning equally in either of his languages in all domains of activity without any traces of the one language in his sue of the other. This kind of bilingual is not commonly found.

Weinreich's second typology is the compound bilingual. The compound bilingual does not function like a native speaker in either of the languages; "the two languages are sourced from the same reference" and they therefore serve principally to express the same background and culture. This is common with children who are exposed to two languages at the same time especially those whose parents do not, share the same first language.

The third typology is the subordinate bilingual who is proficient in his first language and learns the second language in order to meet his other communicative needs. Most Nigerians are in this category. There is usually a heavy interference of the native language on English. This results in transliteration such as: I hear the smell of

pepper" This is a literal or direct translation form the mechanism of the first language.

Eina Haugen (1983)

Haugen (1983) gave a different classification of bilingualism from what Weinreich explained. He (Haugen) identified the supplementary, complementary and replacive bilingual.

The supplementary bilingual is one who makes use of the second language occasionally. It may be for travel or tourist purposes. A good example is a Yoruba corps member going to serve in the North where the predominant language is Hausa. All he/she needs to learn is the rudiments of the language and pleasantries so that he/she will not feel completely left

out. As Dadzie (2004: 146) puts it: "what is done here is simply to tailor the approach to the needs of the individual, based on his reason for the acquisition of the language. This type of acquisition has its own strategies for the learning and teaching of language and may just be acquired for a period of time only.

On the other hand, the complementary bilingual is born out of the need to acquire another language, say for education, advancement in career or to increase one's status. In most cases, the language is imposed. This is the case for individuals who have their mother tongue and first language in Yoruba/Hausa/lgbo but now have to learn the English language in school as a means of communicating across ethnic boundaries. The former colonies of both the British and the French play a dominant role in this typology. In Nigeria for example, English is used for official purposes while the four hundred and fifty or more native languages are relegated to the homes. But given the diverse ethno-linguistic background of the people, the imposed language serves as a unifying force since it is not the language of any of the language groups in the country.

The replacive bilingual occurs in a situation of language decay and language death when the second language takes over all the functions of the first language. In this case, the first language is not passed down to successive generations but is gradually and completely

abandoned until it dies off. A good example is an African-American with a Nigerian origin who has lost all trances of his/her mother-tongue that may have been spoken by grandparents or parents.

Who is a Bilingual?

Now that we have explored the nature of bilingualism, and the typologies which have been proposed in describing the linguistic competence of bilinguals, it is necessary to give some thought to some additional criteria which may be used in describing a bilingual.

Bilingual behaviour has prevailed consistently in many aspects of social life across space and time, such that its communicative functions can now be said to transcend the scope of these formal typologies. Li Wei (2000:6) presents an interesting list of additional types of bilingualism in the form of dichotomies or lexical oppositions, which throw more light on the description of a bilingual's competence. Some of these are: minimal/ maximal bilingual,

early/late bilingual, overt/covert bilingual, additive/subtractive bilingual, horizontal/ vertical bilingual, subordinate/coordinate bilingual, primary/secondary bilingual, active/dormant bilingual, among other pairs. In this regard, bilingual competence in contemporary life may be described by several types and categories, some with overlapping features, but certainly representing trends in the social applications of bilingualism in social life.

Bilingualism:

The Nigerian Experience

Bilingualism and multilingualism are undeniable linguistic situations in Nigeria. Most Nigerians are either bilingual or multilingual. The linguistic situation in Nigeria is complex with over four hundred and fifty (450) languages (Ethnologue, 2000) and more than one thousand (1000) dialects spoken by a population of over 140 million people. Less than 30% of these languages have their orthography, primers, elaboration of functions, etc. as compared to English language. Nigeria is essentially a multilingual society which has a hierarchical system of language classification. For example, we have class one, two and three languages (Brann, 1986).

Class One Languages: These are known as “decamillonnaire language(s)” and also referred to as "demolects". This means languages spoken by more than ten million people. This class is made up of Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba languages.

Class Two Languages: These are sometimes referred to as "millionaire" and "choralects". They are languages spoken by more than one million people. Example include: Tiv, Efik, Edo, Ijaw, Nupe, among others.

Class Three Languages: They are languages spoken by more than one hundred thousand people e.g. Ishan, Isoko, Urhobo, Ika, and others.

Minority Languages: These are languages spoken by less than one hundred thousand people. Examples include: Marda in the North, Akoko in Edo State, and others.

Bilingualism, Multilingualism and Language Choice

Bilingualism/Multilingualism is widespread in Nigeria as each state has at least more than two languages used simultaneously. However, it is more pronounced in the southern states such as Rivers, Cross River, Delta and Edo. In these states, one language may be used for intra-group communication to the exclusion of others.

In everyday inter-personal contact situations, this 'elevated' language is not imposed as a second language on speakers of other languages,

but it usually acts as a third language chosen as the medium for inter-ethnic communication. As a rule, it is normally the dominant language of the district that is so elevated. This is the case in Cross River State where Efik, (which is in fact a dialect of Ibibio), is the language of communication among other ethnic groups.

Furthermore, we observe some instances where a language may have a geographically well-defined area of influence based partly either on numerical strength or the historical significance of the ethnic group using the language. The prolonged use of such languages as local "lingual francas" may lead to acculturation and language shift, for they may play defined complementary roles among the minority groups inhabiting the geographical area. Old Bendel State (now Edo and Delta) provides us with a good example. Here, Edo language plays the leading role in Benin while other languages like Urhobo, Itsekiri, Ishan, Isoko, Igbo, etc. rather than competing for supremacy, complement Edo through cooperation and acculturation. There is also a case where a language, instead is waxing stronger and unifying an

otherwise multilingual society, disintegrates when its dialects become full-fledged languages, such that mutual intelligibility no longer exists among its speakers. When this happens, the complexity of the multilingual society deepens because it will spread from the leading language to the emerging ones. Ijo (Ijaw), a leading language in River State, provides a good illustration of the point mentioned above.

In this regard, Williamson (1983: 16-28) argues that:

"Although Ijaw is often referred to as a single language with different dialects, the degree of difference between the groups is really beyond the realm of dialect. Speakers of Eastern Ijaw have difficulty understanding Nembe, although Nembe speakers can understand them considerably. Nembe speakers understand Southern Izon dialect but this is not Northern or western ones: speakers of Bisens and Okordia learn Kolokuma for wider communication. But there is no one form accepted as a standard language by all Ijaw speakers. It is therefore more appropriate to speak of a language cluster than a language."

This type of language situation is widespread in most multilingual states in Nigeria. With this diversity of languages, coupled with the presence of foreign languages such as English, French and Arabic, Nigeria as a political entity constitutionally recognizes the languages in the following order:

Constitutionally recognized official languages:

These are languages of government as stated in the 1979 and 1999 Constitutions. They are English, Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba.

Official languages as recognized by Public (governmental) policy but not the constitution:

French was declared an official language by the 1998 National Language Policy.

State government recognized official language:

An example is Kanuri, a language recognized by the Bantu state legislature as the state's official language (Awonusi, 2012 Web).

English however occupies a dominant position among all these languages, despite any constitutional provision elevating the native

languages. Thus, Nigerians are expected to be bilinguals in English and at least one Nigerian language. Right from the primary school level therefore, the Nigerian child is already being prepared, taught and instructed to be able to communicate in English and his/her native language or language of his/her immediate environment. This trend continues till the secondary level where he/she is expected to have acquired some competence in English and one or two Nigerian languages. Thus, in the senior secondary examination, he/she will sit for English and one major Nigerian language from Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba along with other subjects. How the teaching/speaking of the native language(s) affects his/her performance in English positively or negatively or both is a matter of individual and societal factors.

Sociolinguistics

The sociolinguistic orientation investigates the inter-connections between language and society. Scholars of the late 1950's had discovered that the study of language devoid of society was narrow. Therefore, they propagated the need to examine certain aspects of society which illuminate the study of language. Studies in the relations between language and society have thus gained tremendous ascendancy over the past six decades, thus evolving the field of language research known as sociolinguistics (William Bright, 1966; William Labov, 1972; Richard Hudson, 1980; Ralph Fasold, 1990; J.K. Chambers, 1995; Florian Coulmas, 1997; Miriam Meyerhoff, 2006; Ronald Wardhaugh, 2014, among others.

The word 'Sociolinguistics' comprises two key terms: Socio+ linguistics.'Socio' stands for 'social' or 'social context' while 'linguistics' is understood as the field that

investigates the scientific study of language. The fact that the prefix ‘socio’ appears before the key term ‘Linguistics’ shows that before ‘Sociolinguistics’, there was mainstream Linguistics. As we already know, Linguistics is the field that explores language at different levels: Phonology/Phonetics, Grammar, Syntax, Morphology, and Semantics. These are recognized as the major they aspects of the scientific study of language. In other words, each field presents a different perspective to the analysis of language as a science. Thus, the term ‘sociolinguistics means the study of language in relation to society.

Origins of the ‘a social’ view of language.

The study of language has been of interest to scholars from the Classical period and Roman period to modern day. Linguistic studies before the 1950s focused on what has come to be known as the ‘asocial’ view of language.

What does ‘asocial’ mean?

Linguists in the early 50’s recognized that language was not homogenous (having uniformity or being same or similar) or monolithic (single, unchanging), but they ignored the presence of variants in language. The founding fathers of modern linguistics like Ferdinand de Saussure espoused the idea that the study of language should be based only on the knowledge or intuitions of the native speaker, rather than the societal input. Linguists of that period thus followed the Saussurian tradition by focusing on the homogenous, monolithic aspects of language while ignoring the social aspect. This is what we have come to understand as the ‘asocial ‘view of language - the study of language without a consideration of the social context.

The asocial view was thus characterized by de Saussure's separation of la langue (knowledge of the language) from la parole (actual use of the language in society).To Saussure, what needs to be studied was la langue and not la parole

Edward Sapir (1921) also recognized the difference between an individual's language and communal variation. But the pressure of the Saussurian tradition forced him and others to focus only on the invariant aspects of language. Noam Chomsky (1957) made the distinction between language and corpus. Like others, he argued that only language should be studied because it is the idealization of raw data. Later, in 1965, he further made the distinction between competence and performance. Chomsky's argument is summarized in this famous quote:

"Linguistic theory is concerned with an ideal speaker-listener in a completely homogenous speech community, who knows the language perfectly, and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as "performance variations"

The paradox in the arguments of all these early scholars is that while on one hand, you accept to study language as a social phenomenon located in the society and used by all people; at the same time, you avoid the reality of variations (features of usage) by all people, in preference for individual usage.

Sociolinguistics – Definitions

Now that we understand the term 'sociolinguistics', we need to examine some of its definitions:

Hudson, 1980: "The study of language in relation to society"

David Crystal (1985): "Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics which studies all aspects of the relationship between language and society "

R. Le Page (1988): "all sociolinguistics is linguistics, and all linguistics is sociolinguistics"

Each of these definitions points us to a unique perspective to what sociolinguistics entails, from the perspectives of different scholars.

The Beginning of Sociolinguistics

As mentioned earlier, prior to the 1950s, many linguists had been doing research on language and society in their different countries. William Labov in the United States had been studying social stratification in New York. He found that speakers were stratified along social lines in the pronunciation of certain sound patterns. Peter Trudgill in England had been studying social differentiation among British speakers. He also found that speakers were differentiated in speech according to their social status/ educational standard. Edward Sapir (1921) had been studying American-Indian languages. Otto Jespersen (1925), was a European grammarian who was also interested in language and society. J.R. Firth (1937) was a Briton interested in dimensions of language and society. Leonard

Bloomfield (1933) wrote the book Language which focuses on language and society. A British anthropologist, Malinowski (1923), also did a lot of work on human language within the context of social groups. Uriel Weinreich (1953) did some extensive work on Language Contact and the effect of language in a bilingual context. Eina Haugen had also done some work on the effect of language variation on bilingualism in Paraguay around the same period. Others are: Basil Bernstein (1971) published the book: Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical Studies Toward Sociology of Language. Joshua Fishman (1972) had worked on the Sociology of Language. William Labov (1957, 1965) had also done definitive work on language variation. These were the scholars whose works formed the foundation for the development of Sociolinguistics as a field of study.

The major themes which dominated these early studies were those which were related to the perspectives of the scholars who were studying it. These different scholars introduced new dimensions to the field: Fishman – sociology of language; Gumperz- anthropological

linguistics; Labov – language variation; Weinreich – language contact; William Mackey – bilingualism. In view of this multi-disciplinary orientation, a broad definition of sociolinguistics is provided by David Crystal (1985): "Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics which studies all aspects of the interrelationship between language and society".

The major themes which dominated these early studies were those which were related to the perspectives of the scholars who were studying it. These different scholars introduced new dimensions to the field: Fishman – sociology of language; Gumperz- anthropological linguistics; Labov – language variation; Weinreich – language contact; William Mackey – bilingualism. In view of this multi-disciplinary orientation, a broad definition of sociolinguistics is provided by David Crystal (1985): "Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics which studies all aspects of the interrelationship between language and society".

Happenings in Europe and the United States of America.

There were different concerns about language in these two Western societies. Sociologists were concerned about the relationship between language and social disadvantage. In Britain for example, there were social problems emanating from the difference between language and social class, based on speakers' origin. For instance, those who spoke dialects like Welsh or Corkney were regarded as low class, compared to those that spoke 'Queen's English' otherwise known as 'Received Pronunciation' (RP). At that time, no one could be admitted into the Foreign Service, the Navy or get a job in the BBC if they did not speak RP. Consequently, people who belonged to the lower classes in the British society were socially disadvantaged.

In the United States of America, the social disadvantage had to do with the problem of language and race. Black children were considered deficient in language and poor performance in school was ascribed to the blacks. The same was said of the Hispanic (people of

Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican or South or Central American origin) people in America. Thus, the 'Language Deficit Theory' held sway for some time, until sociolinguists began investigating the trend as a social issue. People from minority groups such as Blacks and Hispanics simply had restricted access to good living conditions, unlike their white counterparts. So the poor performance of such people in schools was found to be a result of socially disadvantage and not language deficient.

In the case of West Germany and other European societies (France, Paris), people were confronted with the problem of language and immigration. People who spoke the main languages - French or German - were privileged, while those that spoke dialects of these main languages were considered inferior because they came from the regions. This is one of the reasons why linguists began to study sociolinguistics.

3.4.2. The growing interest in the discipline called Sociology of Language.

There was an upsurge of interest in different dimensions of sociology, such as Structuralism, and Functionalism; especially the works of Charles Weber and Karl Marx as a result of the development of conflict theories. The sociology of language as an academic discipline experienced tremendous growth in the 60's and early 70's. Following the introduction of the Theory Consensus Paradigm, terms like structuralism and functionalism became two key words in language. Scholars thought that if functionalism was so important to language study, it had to be seen in a social context. The growth of the sociology of language around this time strongly influenced the interest of linguists in socially - relevant topics like: bilingualism, multilingualism, language choice, language policy, language and sex, language and race, language and immigration, as well as a renewed interest in dialects and their importance.

3.4.3. Dissatisfaction with the Ascendancy of Chomskyan Linguistics

At this period, many linguists were getting tired of the dominance of Chomsky's theories and they began to question them. Dell Hymes

(1974) questioned Chomsky's linguistic competence and replaced it with communicative competence.

3.4.4. The Redefinition and Reformulation of Dialectology There had been some confusion as to the difference between language and dialect. Some even used the terms interchangeably. This opened up studies in dialectology and explanations on the nature of languages and the social impact on

dialects, types of dialects (urban/ rural); dialectal differences in vocabulary, pronunciation, spelling, etc. for example, the suffer was between British and American dialects of English. These studies began to throw more light on the social dimensions of language, hence the interest in sociolinguistics.

Sociolinguistics:

The simplest definition of Sociolinguistics is that it is the study of language in relation to society (Hudson, 1980). Since the 1960s, sociolinguistics has been studied as an inter- disciplinary field in linguistics which embraces aspects of the sociology of language, anthropology, ethnography, and more recently, discourse analysis. The early scholars in the field include sociologists like Basil Bernstein (1971), Joshua Fishman (1972), and John J. Gumperz (1964, 1982) who were interested in linguistics. They were later joined by linguists like William Bright (1966), William Labov (1972), John Pride and Janet Holmes (1972), Peter Trudgill (1974), Dell Hymes (1974).

The central focus of sociolinguistics is the study of the use of language by social groups. Sociolinguistics adopts two approaches in the explication of group dynamics in different social settings: these are micro-sociolinguistics and macro-sociolinguistics. Micro-

sociolinguistics takes the individual as its focal point and shares areas of common interest with psychology in general and social psychology in particular. At the micro level, sociolinguistics lays emphasis on individuality, that is, the sum total of the characteristics of an individual which distinguishes him from other individuals. Here, the emphasis is on individual speech features such as register rather than dialect. Macro-sociolinguistics on the other hand, is more sociological in its emphasis and shares common features with analytical procedures in anthropology. This approach seeks to account for the distribution of language differences through a society in terms of variables like age, sex, education, occupation and ethnicity. (Chambers, 1995). It deals with the correlation of linguistic variables with these demographic features. Thus, individual idiosyncrasies of the individual may be analyzed in terms of the indications of group affiliations. The two approaches may be summarized in terms of the relationship between individual and group features of language. Sociolinguistics takes either the individual or the group as its focal

point. The linguistic features of the interaction within (intra) and between (inter) groups may be examined in terms of their dynamics.

Language:

Many people generally know what Language is, but coming up with an adequate explanation of language will probably begin with the assertion that language is a means of interaction by members of a group or community. In other words, language is what members of a speech community speak. This assertion has implications for society itself. Based on the linguistic composition, a society may be described as mono-lingual (using one language), bilingual (using two languages) or multilingual or pluri-lingual (using many languages).

Linguists generally describe language as a rule-governed system which the members of a group habitually use in their daily interactions. This means that language users from different communities can be described by the language they speak. For instance, English is the language of the people of England and French

is the language of the people of France. But of course we know that these languages are also spoken by people in many different parts of the world. In this regard, language scholars, especially those in the fields of sociolinguistics and related fields (like anthropology and sociology of language) explain the view of language essentially as a social phenomenon (Hudson, 1980; Chambers, 1995) because language is domesticated in society. Therefore, it is of necessity, a code. In this regard, we may also recognize the possibility of a multi-code which involves moving from one code to another as the situation demands, for instance, code-switching.

Language as spoken by different people in different places thus has varied manifestations since the speakers themselves vary in their social characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, among others. Language is thus described as being socially relevant (Labov 1972; Halliday, 1985; Meyerhoff, 2006; Wardhaugh, 2014).This social dimension suggests that language is defined by the people who speak it.

Moreover, anthropologists have often stressed the view that differences in language may lead to differences in perception of the world. This view is clearly established in the controversial Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis which posits that man's view of his environment may be conditioned by the world view of his language. For instance, while a language like English has only one other word for 'snow' (sleet), a language like Eskimo has several terms for the same concept.

Society:

The main focus of sociolinguistics is the Society. The perception of language as a social phenomenon includes its existence within a social structure and value system (Trudgill, 1985) which are critical factors in the establishment and sustenance of human societies. These two factors determine to a large extent, the nature of interactions among members of a particular society. A language society is thus a community made up of a group of people who use language to

perform social functions such as greeting, working, buying, selling, teaching, courtship, marriage, marketing, advertising, politics, governance, among other activities common to humans in different communities.

Another distinguishing feature of language is that it is mostly verbal, although some aspects of its use may not be necessarily verbal, as in the case of sign language or non- verbal cues, such as the smell of perfume which communicates a message without a verbal component. The speakers of a given language are people who interact on a daily basis through a recognized set of verbal symbols which have meaning within a specific environment.

The environment of language use is otherwise known as ‘setting”, or ‘social environment’ which is usually a component of society and includes features like ‘home’, ‘school’, ‘neighbourhood’, ‘work-place’, ‘restaurant’, ‘church’, ‘banking-hall’, among others. These aspects of language setting also naturally have considerable effect on the vocabulary used by speakers.

Culture:

Most anthropologists simply define culture as what everybody has. In other words, culture is perceived as the property of members of the society. This means that culture may be both intra and inter-personal, and can thus be seen as an aggregate of beliefs, traditions and customs of a given society. On the basis of its relevance to both intra and inter-personal knowledge, we may argue that culture is indeed shared knowledge. Furthermore, Goodenough (1957) identifies culture as acquired knowledge. That is, what a person needs to know in order to function appropriately in society. If culture is indeed knowledge, it may also be studied with the same kind of methods identified with language – introspection, interviewing, experimentation, and observation. This means there must be some relationship between language and culture. Another question arises: If culture is indeed knowledge, is it factual knowledge? The answer is simple: not in all cases, for instance, the existence of superstition, myth, folk tales, etc.

Most of language is believe3d to be contained in a people's culture. Therefore, sociolinguistics focuses on what is known as linguistic culture. This is most exemplified in culture-specific concepts such as: conversation, greetings, kingship terminologies, euphemisms, and taboos.

Micro-sociolinguistics

As the name implies, deals with small-scale explorations of the use of language in specific societies. It involves examining language at different levels- grammar, syntax, phonology- in the context of a speech community. Micro-sociolinguistics addresses locally situated issues like studies in language and dialect, accents, varieties and registers, language choice, language attitudes, and variation studies in specific settings.

Macro- sociolinguistics

On the other hand, this sub-field deals with larger-scale issues of language use at the national or global level. Macro- level enquiries in sociolinguistics include issues in language policy, education, language planning, trends and developments in language use around the globe.

It addresses global -scale issues such as: language contact, language ecology, diglossia, acts of identity in different societies, language shift, language death, language conflict, multilingualism, language and cognitive orientation, second language acquisition, psycho linguistics, among others.

Generally, while micro-sociolinguistics focuses on the social dimensions of language, macro-sociolinguistics deals with the linguistic dimensions of society, otherwise called the sociology of language.

Dialectalization

On the societal level, we consider language differentiation in terms of two factors: spatial factor (or distance) and time.

. Distance or Separation by Space

This is the case where people are forced to leave their original location and settle elsewhere, far removed from their original location. Once there is a physical separation of language speakers, each half of the community is likely to develop differently and may eventually be seen to be speaking different forms of the original language. Factors such as natural disasters, war, political upheavals, among others can cause a group to leave their language domain.

If further split takes place, the emerging groups from the original will again evolve differently in relation to the linguistic characteristics of their new environments. The splinter group, therefore, moves to another location, develops a new set of linguistic norms and evolves a

new linguistic tradition, which will, of course, be influenced by their new environment The variety that emanates from such a split is known as a variety caused by space or distance, which is a variety of the original language. The immediate result of this is called Dialectalization.

This is the case with children of Nigerian-born parents who are born abroad and grew up with a different form of their mother-tongues in a new setting. They are likely to speak English as their first language.

. Time

Dialectalization as a result of time occurs when a community is separated for a long period of time, often resulting in the springing up a new generation. For example, when a part or section of a community moves to a different location for a decade or more, there will be a change in their linguistic norms and these norms will be transmitted to the younger

generation, depending on the individuals involved. In this regard, we will have any of these three options: language maintenance, language loss or language death.

These three options represent the different ways in which the various splinter groups can emerge as sub-communities and develop differently.

Language maintenance occurs when a community becomes split though time, and the original group retains the original language while the splinter group goes through series of changes in phonology, semantics, syntax etc. They could maintain the original language and pass it on to the next generation by encouraging the children to maintain the original phonology, syntax, etc. although this may be difficult because of the influence of the host community. This is essentially a function of Time. The language of the original community naturally undergoes generational transmission over the course of time. In this regard, we observe that the younger generation acquires the language from the older generation in different forms:

i) The language system of the original language may be inadequately or inaccurately transmitted due to wrong comprehension or poor proficiency on the part of the older generation who have been separated from their mother-tongue for some time. This is often observable in the transmission of culture-specific content like proverbs, idioms, euphemisms, songs, etc.

ii) Various innovations in grammar, phonetics and vocabulary may occur over time. These may differ from one splinter group to another. Nigerians in Ghana versus Nigerians in the United States of America. Some of these innovations may or may not be accepted by the older generation.

iii) Differential assimilation of innovative language features may lead to the establishment of gradual differentiation in the forms of the original language spoken by the ach splinter group.

iv) New ways of speaking may evolve entirely among splinter groups, especially the younger generation.

However, if language maintenance is not achieved, it may lead to language loss. This is because a language is alive only when people speak it. If language loss persists over a long period of time, it results in language death.

Dialectalization is, therefore, the process whereby an originally unilingual society becomes split into groups, which results in distinct forms of the original language as a result of distance/space and time.

The sociolinguist, Ronald Wardhaugh, in his 1986 publication, outlines seven criteria which may be useful in explaining how languages can differ from one another:

1. Standardisation: This refers to the process by which a language has been codified in some way. It usually involves the development of such language features as its grammar and dictionary.

2. Vitality: This refers to the existence of a living community of speakers. This can be used to distinguish between "dead" and "living" languages. Language this derives it's vitality from its speakers.

3. Historicity: This refers to the fact that a particular group of people finds a sense of identity through the use of a particular language. In other words, such people may be able to trace their history through the use of the language.

4. Autonomy: This is the feeling by speakers of a particular language that their language differs from other languages, in terms of form, structure and functions.

5. Reduction: In this case, it is possible that a particular variety may be regarded as a sub-variety of the standard language, rather than an independent entity, e.g. pidgin varieties.

6. Mixture: This refers to the feeling of speakers that the variety they speak may be regarded as one of the marginal varieties of some other standard language.

7. De Facto Norm: It is assumed that there are "good" speakers and "poor" speakers and that the food speakers represent the norms of proper usage.

Standardisation

Another process that occurs in the spatial and time process is language standardization.

Again, the transmission of language to the younger generation can take place in two ways. First, there may be inadequate or inaccurate comprehension of the language by the children. Here, the system of the language becomes muddled and may lead to innovations in grammar, phonetics and vocabulary, where the children develop their own system. Secondly, it may be in form of retention of the original language structure, which may be developed.

The process of standardization involves bringing some form of legitimacy or codification into the language and this can be achieved through legislation or formal recognition of the language, in both written and spoken forms. It often involves legal procedures and political influence. This kind of formalization always has elements of

power by people in authority who can legislate on the requirements for attaining a standard form of the language.

Standardization always involves a documentation of a language in a written form. Not all languages have written forms, so a language which has the written form of its phonology, grammar etc. and their rules is standardized. We could also say that splinter groups of a language community or speech community could decide to standardize their language as long as there is a cohesive decision.

Diglossia

This is the situation in which two functionally different varieties of a language co-exist in a single speech community. The two varieties have separate labels: while one is labelled the High Variety (H), the second is called the Low Variety (L).

3.3.1 Characteristics:

In diglossia, we have one of the varieties being the standard language while the Low variety consists of the local dialects of the same language. The High variety (H) is usually a super- imposed variety. It is not usually the widely spoken variety of the language. It is recognized as the superimposed variety because it is the variety that dominates.

The High variety is used for writing and generally functions as the language of formal communication. It is usually learned through the school system. It has very high prestige value and grammatically, it is different from the Low variety.

The Low variety is usually the commonly used language. It is intended mainly for oral communication and conversation. It is acquired as a mother-tongue, and it is not subjected to any normative control.

Functions:

The High and Low varieties are strictly divided according to their functions.

The High variety is used in broadcasting, public institutions, political institutions, church or mosque, etc. It is used in broadcasting, public institutions, political institutions, church or mosque, etc. The High variety is considered to be the prestige language and consequently superior to the Low variety.

The Low variety is used as a means of interpersonal communication, and is well adapted to informal and unstructured situations.

The High and Low varieties produce a comical effect when they are not used in their appropriate contexts.

The difference between **High and Low varieties** are established in the grammar, lexicon and phonology.

High and Low varieties share one single phonological system. While the Low phonology represents the basic system, the High variety forms a sub-system of the Low variety. Examples are: Classical Arabic (High); Colloquial Arabic (Low).

At the level of grammar, the Low variety has fewer grammatical (morphological) categories and has a reduced system of inflection. e.g. Adjectives of degree: Few, Fewer, Fewest Number inflection: Boy. Boys; House, Houses Derivation paradigms: Faith, Faith-ful

All these are known as morphological paradigms. It is a special characteristic of Diglossic situations that lexical pairs are used situation-specific and the two words in each pair have the same meaning in both High and Low varieties.

The Concept of a Language Variety

The work of Catford (1965) provides us the needed clarity on this topic. Catford sees language variety in a similar light as Hudson when he defines it as "a subset of formal and/or substantial features which correlates (regularly) with a particular type of socio- situational feature".

The salient terms in the above definition are: subset, formal and substantial features, correlates and socio situational features.

A subset is a part of a set or something subsumed under a set. Set, here, is a number of things of the same kind that belongs together because they are similar or complementary to one another. In this context, language is the set, and variety is a subset. It is important to note that members of a set have something in common and naturally, features of the subset will find common ground in the set just like varieties of a language have certain features in common.

The formal and substantial features deal with the fact that language is organized along three levels; the substantial, formal and semantic/contextual levels. The substantial level of language is made up of two elements: phonemic substance and graphic substance. The formal level refers to the internal meaningful structure of language, known as form and it is subdivided into grammar, syntax and morphology. The semantic/contextual level is the meaning realization level, at which the substantial and formal features become meaningful.

To correlate, on the other hand, means to put things in reciprocal relationship or to make things mutually related. In the case of language variety, two things must correlate: linguistic features and situational features. Linguistic features are inherent in language, while situational features are components of situation or context Therefore, a variety of language is a contextual category which correlates or matches a set of linguistic features with a set of situational features.

However, socio-situational features are only determined by the linguistic features, hence, the question mark in the diagram below:

Language Varieties

At the centre of the study of sociolinguistics is the concept of language variety. To further explain this concept, its typology according to different categories will be explicated in this discourse and they are: temporal/ historical varieties, geographical or regional varieties, social varieties (or sociolects), functional varieties, stylistic varieties, and standard/nonstandard varieties.

Generally, varieties of language are examined along the following criteria: 1. Time- leading to diachronic/historically/temporal varieties like Old English. 2. Space- leading to special varieties like Nigerian English.

.

Variety Category

3. Style-leading to Stylistic or diatypic varieties like formal English.

4. Social status or societal organization -leading to social varieties like upper class and lower class English.

These varieties are not compartmentalized but are interrelated in varying degrees as will be seen in the discussion below:

. Temporal or historical varieties

These varieties describe the development or the evolution of language from one period to another. This category of language varieties are a product of the process of variation (or language change) over time, otherwise known as diachronic variation. In the English language, for example, this variety segments the historical changes in English language into progressive stages: Old English period (450-1150), Middle English period (1100- 1500), and Modern English period

(1500-present). The Modern English period is subdivided into Early Modern and Late Modern English periods.

This progression is significant for the evolution of English in many aspects – vocabulary, syntax, phonology, spelling. For instance, the Old English period witnessed the constant relegation and repression of the English language under the yoke of invasions by several nations – the Germanic, Romanic conquests. Moreover, the Old English period is also noted for the dominance of Latin and the prevalence of archaisms at the lexical level. Middle English is noted for the Great Vowel Shift in English phonology, as well as the progression of written English from the age of Chaucer to the age of Shakespeare

The Middle English period covered the period of the French invasion of the British Isles, the Norman conquest of 1066 which heralded notable changes in English vocabulary

Geographical or Regional Varieties

Geographical varieties are the varieties of language according to the speaker's origin (otherwise called dialects), for example: British English, American English, Scottish English, Nigerian English, Kenyan English, etc.

They are of two types - regional and urban dialects. Regional dialects are spoken in the hinterlands, especially among the uneducated and they do not have elements of standardization or prestige. Urban dialects are spoken by people in the urban centres; they are sophisticated and educated speakers.

Geographical varieties can also be viewed from the perspective of language forms in different parts of the world. For example, the English spoken in Nigeria is quite different

from that spoken in Ghana and the one spoken in India. Dialectologists use maps to divide countries into various geographical varieties and in a particular country; they divide varieties of a language into regional varieties. The lines demarcated on the maps are

called isogloss. Each regional variety is identified by a specific Accent spoken by the people in that region.

Within Accents, we may also identify Idiolects. These are varieties which identify speakers by their individual characteristics or personal idiosyncrasies, as in the following examples: Speaker A: Shut the door Speaker B: Shut the freaking door! Speaker C: Kick the door shut Speaker D: Close the door, will you?

Social variety

The third category of language varieties is social variety, also known as sociolects. Social variety has two dimensions or levels; individual level and societal level. Under the individual level, we are concerned with variables such as generational differences of the individuals involved, socioeconomic status of the individuals in terms of upper, middle and lower classes, depending on the social strata in that society; level of education and the form of occupation. In places like

Britain, where social stratification was, and perhaps still is, the norm, uneducated speech tends to be associated with the peasant class, and educated speech with the middle and upper classes. Such social differences carry marked pronunciation differences. Also, words used in Britain could betray or portray one's class, as in the table below:

	Upper Class	Lower Class
1	Dinner/supper	Evening meal
2	Sofa	Couch
3	Convenience	Loo
4	My lady	Madam

Social varieties identify the speaker by many different criteria, and each produces a specific kind of social variety. Social varieties are called sociolects when they identify speakers according to their social status or position. Here, we may distinguish upper class and middle class speech. (as in Table 1 above).

Social varieties may also be occupational in which case they identify speakers by their occupation, profession or vocation. These are called Registers. Thus, we have the register of law, carpentry, tailoring, medicine, architecture.

Registers are the unique vocabulary of different professions or occupations. If the same or similar words are used in other professions, the meaning will be different. e.g. the word 'morphology' means word structure in English, but in Biology, it refers to cell structure of organisms

Functional varieties

These are similar to registers, but more specifically, they refer to language varieties which are used to execute specific functions in social communication. These are varieties according to use, which are classified based particular functions such as advertising, broadcasting, journalism, marketing, law, among others.

3.2.5. Stylistic variety

These are varieties of language according to style. They are similar to functional varieties but the specifically exhibit unique stylistic features which sets them apart from others. For example, the language of drama has unique pattern of dialogue and stage directions; the language of poetry has unique structure of stanzas and rhyming scheme.

Like functional variety, stylistic variety results from differences in subject matter, social context and mode of discourse. Some forms of language which may be classified as stylistic include the language of

poetry, the language of speeches, political campaigns, among others which have implications for the analysis of the writer/speaker's style in specific contexts.

Varieties of English which we can identify as a result of differences in subject matter are called registers. The relationship between the interlocutors, that is, the social context, results in polarization between formal and informal varieties. Also, varieties according to mode of discourse, or medium, are conditioned by speech and writing as we have in registers, where we identify the language of informal conversations, radio or TV commentary, religion, law, cookery, literature, science, and so on.

In this regard, we can say that there are certain usage situations in which we can say that there is considerable overlap between stylistic variety, functional variety, and registers (a sub-set of social variety).

Formal versus Informal variety

Formal English applies mostly to formal situations, while informal English is used for informal communication. Formal language is mainly written, but may also be spoken. In this sense, the vocabulary of formal language is distinct from that of informal expressions. For example:

Formal: Informal

proceed go

commence begin

eliminate remove

procrastinate postpone

The vocabulary of formal English derives mostly from Latin, Geek, and French and can be translated to informal English by replacing them with simpler words or phrases Formal language is the variety normally used in formal correspondence like official letters, business

reports, memoranda, and also for writing books, speeches and official documents.

Informal language on the other hand, is the variety used mainly in informal situations. These include writing personal letters and private conversations. There are also some grammatical differences between formal and informal expressions, for example:

Formal: I need a friend with whom I can discuss the matter. Informal: I need a friend (who) I can discuss the matter with.

Formal: In whose house did she stay?? Informal: Whose house did she stay in?

Spoken versus written variety

(variety according to medium): Some communicative media are more suited to spoken language, such as (radio and television) while others, like newspaper writing, are basically written. There are also some language forms which may be either written or spoken as the case may be. For example: advertising, religious sermon, and speeches.

Written language tends to be formal than spoken languages, such as contracted form, and generally will not allow certain forms which are common in spoken forms (wouldn't aren't, can't, isn't, etc.), non-standard forms ('you aint seen nothing', 'how's things?'). Written language is more serious, deliberate and contemplative than spoken language. The grammar of spoken language is much simpler and more constructed. Therefore, it is more prone to grammatical errors. Written language must be precise and accurate in its grammar and syntactic structure.

Polite versus Familiar variety

Polite language is generally reserved for communicating with people with whom we are not familiar, or people of senior status, or people who represent some official position, such as employer/employee, teacher/student conversation.

Conversely, familiar language is used to communicate with familiar people, such as siblings, friends, colleagues, neighbours, etc.

Polite forms in English are often expressed in the form of personal titles like: Mr., Mrs., Dr., Professor., Chief., etc. for example: Mr. Gideon Okeke or Mr. Okeke (not 'Mr. Gideon') ; Mrs. Sarah Roberts or Mrs. Roberts (not Mrs. Sarah). Familiar forms are often dropped in familiar language, sometimes replaced with nicknames or shorter forms of personal names, e.g. 'Giddy' for 'Gideon'; 'Lizzy' or Liz for 'Elizabeth.

Furthermore, polite variety may be more formal, using terms like: "Could you?"; "May I?"; "Kindly"; "Please"; "Thank you", not "Thanks" which is less formal/polite.

Standard Versus Non-Standard variety

The difference between standard and non-standard may be linked to formal versus informal language. Standard language is used in formal settings while non-standard is used in informal settings where we are more relaxed and with familiar people, for example standard English versus Pidgin English.

Tactful and Tentative variety

Tactful language is used when it is necessary to avoid hurting or embarrassing others. It is essentially polite in nature. Tentative language is the extreme form of politeness, whereby the speaker may use forms which indicate tactfulness, for example:

Her father died / Her father kicked the bucket Her father passed on/ passed away

She was booted out / She was relieved of her job.

Can you think of more examples of tactful language?

Literary, Elevated or Rhetorical variety

This kind of usage variety is mostly found in literary writings, especially poetry, and some kinds of advanced prose, such as book reviews, essays, and literary pieces. It is called rhetorical because it makes use of figures of speech, and generally uses vivid expressions. Some speakers or writers often use literary or elevated language to impress or show off.

Sometimes, literary language is used to express the seriousness of the discourse. This is common among orators and public speakers who often use vivid imagery in their speeches. Literary language often contains archaisms or old-fashioned words, e.g 'foe', 'swine', 'handsome' (for a female).

Attitude of speakers

The first feature of Attitude is language solidarity. This is the speakers' expression of their preference for their own language in relation to other means of communication.

The second feature of Attitude is the language pride. The native speakers have pride in their language and this is often exhibited in relation to the prestige function.

The third feature of the attitude is seen in the social communication network. The use of the standard language in enacting interaction is also an essential part of the speakers' attitude

Sociolinguistics

There are two qualitatively different ways of sociologically probing into language. They are not only thematically and historically (or to be more precise periodically) delineated. One of them is mimetic - it believes language and communication and their functioning mechanisms reflect or represent the social structures, layers and mechanisms. This trend of sociolinguistic theorizing and analysis could be termed traditional or linguistic sociolinguistics. The second sociological approach to language and communication is rhetorical and believes that communication shapes our identities. Consequently, the two mainstreams, despite their common sources and shared goals, concentrate their efforts on quite different problems.

Traditional (co-relationist) sociolinguistics is preoccupied with defining variation, linguistic change, dialect, bilinguialism, register, style, pidgin and Creole language formations, code-switching, the

different languages men and women use, language variation and change, language planning and linguistic policy.

This type of sociolonguistic approach to language issues is corelationist in essence and implies a conception of the independent, though connected autonomous categories. Sociolinguistics analyses the match between these closely related but complete in themselves systems. The rhetoric trend deals predominantly in issues of the following type: identification and language, linguistic approach to socialization, empirical studies of verbal habits of human groups, enculturation processes, engendering process, enactment of role relations, ethnographic problems, anthropological investigations and others. This latter might be better termed linguistic sociology in opposition to the first which quite deserves the name social stratification of language or sociolinguistics.

"Social categories must be interpreted in terms of situational constraints" is this approach's founding assumption. Status and role are not permanent qualities of speaker, rather they are abstract communicative symbols. The distinction between social and linguistic categories is obliterated. Communication is not governed by fixed social rules. It is a two-step process in which the speaker first takes in stimuli from the outside environment, evaluating and selecting among them in the light of his own cultural background, personal history and what s/he knows about his/her interlocutors. Then the speaker decides on the norms that apply to the situation at hand. These norms determine the speaker's selection from the communicative options available for encoding his intent.

For any communication to be possible we need a code. This the rule system for matching overt linguistic behaviour with meaning. Often language and code are equated. This a gross simplification and over generalisation because it precludes the vistas of functional, social,

register and various other types of codes that constitute everyday communicative exchange in all spheres of life.

Men and women are claimed not to share the same communicative competence. Their rule systems for the use and interpretation of utterances are different as a result of their different patterns of socialisation into two contrasting subcultures. Women are said to develop a co-operative repertoire of verbal behaviour with other women, where intimacy, connectedness and empathy are the powerful structuring parameters. Men are believed to acquire and employ a competitive repertoire of verbal behaviour. The ethos of power, the strife for institutionalised hierarchisation and paternal leadership are the factors shaping and motivating the communicative

competence of men. When the two subcultures interact, the character of the parameters of communicative competence and linguistic strategy change.

In men-women interaction men tend to be overprotective, to simplify their meaning and to sound overtly and purposefully endearing. Women on their part become less assertive and demonstrate eagerness for subordination. The communicative styles and rule systems of men and women are overlapping and not mutually exclusive.

Men and women do know equally well how to do the same things communicatively but are subject to different contextual constraints.

Men gossip. This is not e type of verbal behaviour characteristic of women only, but they do it in different circumstances and under a different name or label. The construction of gender identity through socialisation takes different paths for boys and girls. Cultural stereotyping is an integral part of socialisation.

“Boys will boys” is self-explanatory and there is not a parallel expression to capture symbolically the stereotype of girls. That is the male stereotype gets named and what is not specified there remains as an attribute for the other gender. The linguistic differentiation between men and women is that of style, not one of competence.

The distinction between the communicative behaviour of men and women is not coterminous with the notion of linguistic engendering. The latter refers to the ways attitudes are conveyed in and through language. Hailing and interpellation are the two phases of one and the same process of fixing identities. Public communication legitimises ways of being. By the way we address one

another we enact and mutually impose identities.

We should distinguish between sociolinguistics and sociology of language. According to Hudson 1980:

"sociolinguistics is the study of language in relation to society", whereas the sociology of language is "the study of society in relation to language".

The major field of interest for all approaches trying to uncover or at least bring to the fore the relations between language and society can be subdivided into the following allotments:

a) linguistic diversity and the speech community;

b) language and social interaction;

c) language and representation;

d) the role of language in processes of

socialisation and ideology construction;

e) language, culture andsociety.

The first allotment is further subdivided into:

language and regional variation - accent and dialect; language and ethnic identity - national varieties, pidgin, Creole and substandard variants.

The second one is portioned in the following areas: language and social class: restricted and elaborated speech variants; language and situation - register (functional variants), accompanied by the study of styles of making meanings which are overt markers (though multifaceted and complex ones) of social distancing (colloquial speech, informal, etc.);

the third bifurcates into ethnography of communication and anthropological investigations;

the fourth into language and subcultures: antilanguages; the last interests in language and gender, language and identity, instituionalisations and many others.

This last subdivision takes for granted that the existence of ideologies makes life and communication easier. We assume agreement by the commonplaces of ideologies and do not have to reinvent the wheel every time we want to use it. Or to put it Benjamin Lee Whorf's words: "Whenever agreement or assent is arrived at in human affairs . . . this agreement is reached by linguistic processes. Or else it is not reached." One obstacle for not reaching agreement is the phenomenon of aberrant decoding (a term coined by Umberto Eco to name the mismatch between intentionally encoded meaning and decoded sense). The major reason still remains the fact that we speak a particular kind of English (or any other national language) depending

on which region of the country we come from (accent and dialect), which class we are most strongly affiliated with (restricted and elaborated speech variants), which subculture we belong to, what type of situation we have to behave in accordance with (register), what is our relation to the other participants in the communicative event (style), etc.

Register

Register helps to clarify the interrelationship of language with context of communication by subsuming it under three main headings: field, tenor and mode. Field terms the ongoing activity wherein utterances are embedded so that they help sustain and shape the activity itself. Not all instances of language are closely embedded in sets of actions (like "scalpel, clips, etc. directly refer to surgical proceedings). In such cases the notion of field refers not so much to the ongoing activity, rather to the subject matter of the communicative act. The field is extrinsic in relation to activity-based talk and intrinsic to 'text' with degree at least remote from the immediate circumstances of activity. (The classic example of the latter being news) The particular aspect of language most affected by "field" is the vocabulary.

Technical, field-specific and specialized vocabularies are portions of lexis which are topic-oriented or activity based and can be looked upon as model generated semantic fields with no specific domain structure but with a topical definitional base.

Tenor refers to the kind of social relationship enacted in or by a text or communicative act. This notion highlights the way in which linguistic choices are affected not just by the topic of communication but also by the type of social relationship within which communication is taking place. The aspects of social relationship most crucial under the heading of tenor include politeness, degrees of formality and the relative statuses of participants. These dimensions of interpersonal relations affect a whole range of linguistic choices. In addition to considerations of topic and social relationship, language is also sensitive to the means adopted for communication. Herein surface notions of phatic communication of social fillers and props, backchannel behaviour (speech is shaped in such a way as to prompt immediate and ongoing responses from other participants) and

markers of sympathetic circularity (ways of inviting the listener to assume the speaker's point of view).

The most common way of describing the relation between language and social class is by distinguishing between two habitual modes of utterance organisation involving contrasting orientation to the production of meaning in and through language. The founder of this approach (Basil Bernstein) has termed the two differing principles of utterance-organisation as the *restricted* and the *elaborate(d)* code.

These two modes of generating meaning are closely related to two kinds of social formation which not only adopted the former but also are the ultimate cause for their emergence. The first type of social formation is characterised by strong bonds between its members, with clear and well defined social roles.

The social identity of the individual members is defined on the basis of relatively set and stable sets of parameters such as sex and age, etc. The social roles are ascribed on relatively fixed and public criteria.

The role system is *positional* and *closed*. This formation reduces role discretion to fixed positions and closes off potential role ambiguities. Within such a social formation the shared knowledge and assumptions between members of the subculture are high, so that communication goes on against a dense background of meanings held in common which rarely need to be stated explicitly. In the other type of social formation, persons achieve a social role and identity not so much on the basis of publicly obvious and self-evident criteria, but more on the basis of individual disposition and temperament. Within this type of social formation members negotiate and achieve their roles rather than have them there ready-made in advance to step into. In this way, who they are and where they stand is subject to constant definition and redifinition. The respective role system is *open* and *personal*. The individual intentions and viewpoints of the speaker need to be spelt out and made explicit. Within a positional or closed role system language is used to affirm solidarity and to invoke shared understandings.

Meanings of utterances are implied and taken for granted. Within the personal or open role system language is used to explore and construct individual identities. There is pressure on language to be more explicit.

Between these two extreme and well defined formations we recognise an amorphous social formation which uses antilanguage as a means of communication. Antilanguages may be understood as extreme versions of social dialects.

Antilanguages

Antilanguages are basically created by a process of *relexicalization* - the substitution of new words for old. The grammar of the parent language may be preserved, but a distinctive vocabulary develops, particularly - but not solely - in activities and areas that are central to the subculture and that help to set it off most sharply from the established society. Accounts of ‘pelting speech’, for example,

contains over twenty terms for the classes of vagabond including ‘rogue’, ‘wild rogue’, ‘prigger of prancers’ (horse thief), ‘counterfeit crank’, ‘bawdy basket’ and so on. Similarly, the language of the Calcutta underworld contains over forty words for the police and twenty words for bomb.

Taboo Words

Le and Le (via Fakuade, 2013: 120) argue that the level of prevention of taboo words in language are specific in culture since the parameter of “taboo” from one culture to another depends on the cultural views and beliefs of the linguistics communities towards a certain topic. Supporting that idea, Trudgill (1986: 29) states that taboo language is simply a matter of agreement where the normal employment of an item in language is possessed by specific social value and belief. In addition,

Akmajian et al., (2004: 303) also state that what is called as taboo is usually described by culture and not by anything which are usually

attached in the language. In the same sense, Farb (in Fakuade et al., 2013: 120) states that any kinds of words including taboo words are at first only contain a mere collection of sounds but they are changing after the community gives them other connotation so that they cannot be employed in a certain speech situation. In detail, Farb explain that the words become taboo because the community encloses them with symbolic value which belongs to specific culture.

Since taboo and the words which denote it are related to a specific culture, people should learn about what things they "should" or "should not" do in a particular society to understand the term. The process of differentiating what is taboo and what is not usually begins when a person becomes a part of a particular society which shares ideas through language. Moreover, the person should understand the norms which exist in her or his living place since there is no one in this world born with innate knowledge about taboo words. Therefore, the knowledge about language in one society is accomplished through socialization process (Jay in Doyle, 2009: 1).

The socialization process will allow the language users to know that every society has something that should not be said and certain words contain a strong connotation so that they cannot be used in a polite situation. Uttering or doing taboo words is strongly against the social value because it will bring embarrassment and offensiveness to the members of the society.

Embarrassment has a tendency to be connected with sexual activity and its outcomes. Offensiveness is identified with different substance like the body, and the distinctive forms of physical, mental, and social abnormality. Being more specific, in An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Wardhaugh (2006: 239) defines taboo in the following way:

Taboo is the prohibition or avoidance in any society of behavior believed to be harmful to its members in that it would cause them anxiety, embarrassment, or shame. It is extremely strong politeness constraints.

Consequently, so far as language is concerned, certain things are not to be said or certain objects can be referred to only in certain circumstances. In the statement above, Wardhaugh tried to emphasize that a certain object can only be referred to only in certain circumstances. It also means that the use of taboo words can create misunderstanding between two people who are involved in a conversation if they have different knowledge since they belong to different societies

and different circumstances. This idea is also brought by Freitas (2008: 26) who states that certain words and expressions may be considered as taboos for certain people, especially when these words and expressions are used by other social class members. An example of this case is the use of taboo words like *n*gg*r*. The word *n*gg*r* can be extremely offensive if white persons use it. However, it may be used freely by some groups of black people without feeling being offended. Therefore, it can be concluded that the parameter of certain words or expressions which are thought to be taboo usually depends

on the values in one society, the relationship between the speaker and listeners, and also the circumstances where the words are uttered.

Since taboo words are expressed in different ways by different societies, it is important to present specific taboo words in one culture in which this research tries to investigate. Thus, in the next section the explanation of taboo words in western society is provided.

Functions of Taboo Words

Taboo words are usually uttered because there is a reason behind them. According to Wardhaugh (2006: 239), taboo words are disregarded in particular occasion because they have several functions such as to draw attention to oneself, to show contempt, to be provocative, and to mock authority. To give a clear explanation of the functions of taboo words, below are brief descriptions of the functions completed with examples in conversations

To Draw Attention to Oneself

Sometimes people utter taboo words in order to get the attention from the listener. Mc Edward (in Mc Guire 1973: 5-6) explains that the speakers should gain the interest through the use of strong, powerful language whose connotation can stimulate an instant reaction from the audience. Therefore, people use taboo words which are believed to have power in gaining listener's attention because of its strong connotation. The explanation below is the example of taboo words which function to draw attention to oneself.

Example: The f**king car just died.

To Show Contempt

The use of taboo words in conversation between two people can also mean to show contempt. According to *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary* (1995: 249) *contempt* means the impression in which a person or may be some thing is totally useless and cannot be regarded.

In other words, when someone tries to show contempt by using taboo words, he or she will insult the addressee by uttering words that can offend their pride.

. To Be Provocative

When someone utters taboo words, he or she may have an intention to provoke a certain response such as violation or anger from others. This is in line with Rothwell (in Fitzgerald 2007: 17) who says that verbal obscenity can be the most efficient symbolic process offered to protester intended for inviting chaotic reaction. Taboo words are considered successful when the response is suitable with the speaker's expectation. Here is the example in the conversation.

Sometimes people use taboo words when they are not satisfied with public images such as government and institutions. Rothwell (in Mc Guire, 1973: 6) asserts that verbal obscenity communicates a significant hatred for society's rule, a rebellion against power as well as impertinence for things that are considered sacred. In other words,

people used taboo words because they want to express their disappointment about reality that are different from what they have expected.

Therefore, some people may prefer to use certain taboo words that are directed to mock authority in order to show their disbelief about governmental stuffs. (**F. N.Anggita, 2015)**

Reference

Reference is commonly construed as an act in which a speaker, or writer, uses linguistic forms to enable a listener, or reader, to identify something. In other words, reference is concerned with designating entities in the world by linguistic means. Matthews (1997:312) states that "reference is the relation between a part of an utterance and an individual or set of individuals that it identified."

It is important to note that reference is often contrasted with the notion *sense*. While reference deals with the relationship between the

linguistic elements (language) and the non-linguistics elements (the world), sense is exclusively concerned with the intra linguistic relations, particularly words (Palmer, 1981). Thus, the sense of *tulip*, for instance, relates to sense of other words such *flower* (known as hyponym), and the sense of *profound* relates to the sense of *deep* (known as synonym). The relation among words is also known as *sense relation*. The linguistic forms or the linguistic means used to identify or designate entities are called *referring expressions*, which can be proper nouns (*Edison, Bandung*), noun phrases that are definite (*the woman, the singer)*, or indefinite (*a man, an island*), and pronouns (*he, her, it, them*). Noun phrases, proper nouns are called primary referring expressions, while pronouns are termed secondary referring expressions (Kreidle,1998).

In addition, Kreidler (1998:130) states that referring expression is "a piece of language that is used in an utterance and is linked to

something outside language, some living or dead or imaginary entity or concept or group of entities or concepts."

When the sentence *Einstein is a famous scientist* is uttered to make a statement, we will say that the speaker refers to a certain individual (*Einstein*) by means of a referring expression. The thing or things (or the individual named Einstein in this case) in the world referred to by a particular expression is called its *referent(s).* Thus the notion *referent* is an expression for the thing picked out by uttering the expression in a particular context (Saeed, 1997:27). Sentences may also contain two or more referring expressions.

For example, if the sentence *Bill kissed Mary* is uttered, with its characteristic force of making a statement, both *Bill* and *Mary* would be referring expressions, their referents being the individuals identifiable by names as *Bill* and *Mary*.

Types of Referents

Kreidler (1998) provides a comprehensive account of different types of referents used by a language to identify entities in the world. According to him, there are essentially three kinds of differences in referents. Each of these will be discussed below.

Unique and Non-Unique Referents

A referent has a unique entity or unique sets of entities if its referring expression has fixed reference. Thus entities like *the Rocky Mountains, the Louvre, the Pacific Ocean, Germany* designate unique entities that can be found only in certain places, and knowledge of it is part of one's general knowledge. On the other hand, a referent may have a non-unique entity if its referring expression has variable reference. Entities such as *that woman, my brother, a mountain,* are not unique since they are different every time they are used, and knowledge of it is a matter of specific knowledge. It is the physical and linguistic contexts that help the speakers to identify those entities.

Concrete and Abstract Referents

Concrete referents are denoted by concrete or tangible objects such as *book, lamp, tree, brick,* whereas the abstract ones are designated by abstract or intangible entities such as *beauty, democracy, knowledge, philosophy*. It is interesting to note that lexemes with different kinds of denotation generally occur in different kinds of utterances and may have different effects on other lexemes. Thus the lexeme *key* has a concrete referent in the phrase *the key to the front door*, bearing literal meaning, and an abstract one in *the key to success*, bearing figurative meaning.

Countable and Non-Countable Referents

It is the property of noun phrase that merits the notion countable and noncountable, both of which can be concrete and abstract. Concrete countable expressions are those that are separate from one another, and those that can ordinarily be counted one by one. This includes

such entities as *pencil, bags, chairs, and watches*. Abstract countable nouns include such entities as *problem, experience, and suggestion*. Concrete non-countable phrases have three kinds of reference: those that refer to continuous substances (*ketchup, sauce, milk, ink*), those that name substances consisting particles not worth counting (*rice, sand, sugar*), and those that refer to collections (*furniture, jewelry, luggage*). The feature that distinguishes countable noun phrases from non-countable ones is that the former recognize the division between singular and plural forms while the latter do not. Thus we can say *an apple, a hat, an umbrella,* the overt specifier being present preceding the singular nouns, and *some apples, some hats, some umbrella, some apple sauce, some mud, some ink,* with a zero specifier preceding both plural countable and non-countable. In a language such as English the names of the animals that are countable by nature become uncountable when referring to food.

An instance of this is the lexemes *(a) lamb, (a) chicken, and (a) turkey*. Finally, some nouns phrases may have dual class membership in that it can be countable and noun-countable, depending upon the items it designates. Such entities as *(a) paper, (a) iron, (a) glass, (a) coffee*, etc. can be countable and non-countable.

Deixis

The notion *deixis* has become one of the important topics that merits our attention. Deixis is a semantics notion, which is originally derived from a Greek word meaning *pointing* or *indicating* via language. Any linguistic form used to accomplish this *pointing* is called a **deictic expression**. The adjective deictic (*deikticos*) has the sense of *demonstrative.*

When we notice a strange object and ask, "What's that?" we are using a deictic expression (*that*) to indicate something in the immediate context. Deictic expressions are also sometimes called **indexical**.

The notion of what deixis is relatively uncontroversial among the linguists. Lyons (1977:637) offers the following definition of deixis: "the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatiotemporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically of a single speaker and at least one addressee."

Similarly, Yule (1996:9) argues that deixis is a form of referring that is tied to the speaker's context, with the most basic distinction between deictic expressions being "near speaker" versus "away from the speaker."

If the referents being referred to are near the speaker, the **proximal terms** such as *this*, *here*, *now* are used. By contrast, the **distal terms**

such as *that*, *there*, *then* are employed provided that the referents are away from the speaker.

Matthews (1997:89) states that deixis is "they way in which the reference of certain elements in a sentence is determined in relation to a specific speaker and addressee and a specific time and place of utterance." From the three definitions given above, it can be inferred that the notion deixis involves the pointing of certain referents that belong primarily to the category of persons (objects), speaker-addressee relationship, space, and time, context of utterance. Respectively, this category is termed **person deixis, social deixis, spatial deixis, temporal deixis,** and **discourse deixis.** We shall examine each of these in detail.

Person Deixis

Person deixis basically operates on a three-part division, exemplified by the pronouns for first person or the speaker (*I*), second person or the addressee (*you*) and third persons or other participants (*he*, *she*, *it*).

What is important to note here is that the third person singular forms encode gender, which is not deictic by nature because it is not sensitive to aspects of the speech situation (Cruse, 2000). Another point worth making with regard to the person deixis is the use of plural pronouns, which can be in the **representative** or **true** use (Cruse, 2000:320). If the pronoun *we* is spoken or written by a single speaker or writer to represent the group he or she refers to, it is the case of representative use. On the other, if it used to refer to the speaker and the group, the pronoun *we* is employed in its true sense.

The representative and true use of pronoun *we* are also called **inclusive** and **exclusive** *we*, respectively. The inclusive-exclusive distinction is explicable in the utterance *Let's go* (to some friends) and *Let us go* (to someone who has captured the speaker and friends). The action of going is inclusive in the first, but exclusive in the second.

Social Deixis

In many languages the deictic categories of speaker, addressee, and other(s) are elaborated with markers or relative social status (addressee with higher status versus addressee with lower status). Expressions that indicate higher status are described as **honorifics**.

A widely quoted example to describe the social deixis is the so-called TV distinction, from the French *tu* (referring to familiar addressee), and *vous* (referring to non-familiar addressee).

Other languages that make a distinction between the social status are German with the distinguishing pronoun *du* and *Sie*, and Spanish with *tu* and *Usted*.

In the social context the higher, older, and more powerful speaker will tend to use the *tu*

version to a lower, younger, and less powerful addressee, and be addressed by the *vous* form in return.

Spatial Deixis

The concept of distance is relevant to spatial deixis, where the relative location of people and things is being indicated. As Cruse (2000:320) puts it "spatial deixis manifests itself principally in the form of locative adverbs (*here* and *there*) and demonstratives or determiners (*this* and *that*).” In English the spatial deictic system is indicated by two terms labeled **proximal** and **distal.**

Such terms as *here* and *this* indicate that the location is relatively close to the speaker, and hence proximal. Conversely, the terms *there* and *that* indicate the relative distant of the location from the speaker, and hence distal In considering spatial deixis, Yule (1996) warns that the location from the speaker's perspective can be fixed mentally and physically. Speakers temporarily away

from their home location will often continue to use *here* to mean the (physically distant) home location, as if they were still in that location. Speakers also seem to be able to project themselves into other locations prior to being in those locations, as when they say "I'll come

later" (movement to addressee's location). This is sometimes described as **deictic projection**.

Temporal Deixis

Cruse (2000) asserts that temporal deictics function to locate points or intervals on the time axis, using the moment of utterance as a reference point. The time axis can be divided into three major divisions: before the moment of utterance, at the time of utterance, and after the time of utterance.

The time adverbial that forms a basic concept in temporal deixis in English includes *now* and *then*. *Now* displays the same capacity for indefinite extension, which can refer to a precise instant, such as *Press the button-now*!; or it can accommodate a wide swathe of time like *The solar system is now in a relatively stable phase* (Cruse, 2000:320). However, very often *now* indicates the time coinciding with the speaker's utterance; for example, *I am reading a novel now* (the action done at the moment of the speaker's utterance). *Then*, on

the other hand, designate the time period which is distal from the speaker's utterance. *Then* is normally interpreted from the context, as the following sentences indicate:

(1) Watching movies at 8.30 tonight? Okay, I'll see you then.

(2) December 23 rd , 2002? I was in Solo then.

Apart from the time adverbial, there are essentially other types of temporal deixis worth mentioning here. One type is related to calendric notions that include both clock time as in [1] and calendar time as in [2]. Other temporal deictic related to calendric system includes such expressions as *today, yesterday, tomorrow, this week, last week ,next* week, *this month, last moth, next month, this year, last year, and next year*. The last type of temporal deixis in English is related to the verb tense, as illustrated in the following sentences.

(3) We live here now.

(4) We lived there then.

The verb tense in (3) is in simple present and is normally treated as close to (proximal) the speaker's current situation, whereas in (4) the verb tense is simple past, and is thought as distant (distal) by the speaker.

Discourse Deixis

Discourse deixis is actually a linguistic device used to designate an entity in the discourse. The linguistic devices can be the deictic expressions *this* and *that,* the expression *hereby* in the explicit performative sentence, and sentence adverbs such as *therefore* and *furthermore*. The following sentences exemplify each of these devices.

(5) Listen to this, it will kill you!

(6) That has at least two implications.

(7) Notice is hereby served that if payment is further delayed, appropriate legal action

will be taken.

(8) That rationale is controversial; furthermore……

The deictic expression *this* in (5) and *that* in (6) respectively refer to future discourse element and past discourse element. Similarly, the *hereby* in (7) points to current discourse. Finally, the sentence adverb marker in (8) refers to what follows in the future discourse. Discourse deixis is not, however, to be confused with anaphora, the difference being that the latter might extract a referent from an extralinguistic entity. Thus the anaphor *she* in sentence (9) below does not strictly refer to the word *Susan* itself.

(9) Susan is indeed sexually attractive. She has been admired by many men. *Reference, Anaphora, and Deixis (S. Sugiharto)*

The deictic center

A linguistic phenomenon that crucially relies on this ability is deixis. As Bühler (1934) and other theorists have pointed out, the use of deixis involves a particular viewpoint called the *deictic centre* or the *origo* (cf. Bühler 1934; Lyons 1977). The deictic centre is the centre of a coordinate system that underlies the conceptualization of the speech situation.

In the unmarked case, the deictic centre is defined by the speaker's location at the time of the utterance. Deictic expressions are used to indicate a location or point in time relative to the deictic centre. For instance, the spatial adverbs *here* and *there* can be used to express a contrast between two different locations based on their relationship to the origo:

here marks the area that is conceptualized as the deictic centre, and *there* indicates a location that is not included in this area. In the

literature, *here* and *there* are commonly characterized as proximal and distal deictics, but the attributes ‘proximal’ and ‘distal’ must not be taken in the absolute sense of these terms because the deictic centre and the speech situation are conceptual units that cannot be equated with the physical location in which the speech event occurs. Consider for instance the use of the spatial deictic *here* in examples (1a-e).

(1) a. *Here* where I am

b. *Here* in this room

c. *Here* in Jena

d. *Here* in Germany

e. *Here* on this planet

What these examples illustrate is that the area included in the deictic centre (denoted by *here*) varies with the construal of the speech situation. In (1a), *here* refers to a location that is further specified by the pronoun *I* , indicating that the deictic centre is basically identical

with the speaker's body; but in all other examples the deictic centre includes a much larger area organized around the speaker's location at the time of the utterance: In (1b) the deictic centre is the room in which the speech event is taking place, in (1c) it is the city of Jena, in (1d) it is a country, and in (1e) the deictic centre consists of the whole planet. In other words, the referent of *here* varies with the conceptualization of the speech situation. The distal term *there* is used in contrast to *here* ; it can refer to any location in the speech situation as long as it is not included in the area conceptualized as the deictic centre. In general, *here* and *there* , and other proximal and distal deictics, do not express absolute measures of distance, but differentiate between two different locations relative to the deictic centre within the current construal of the speech situation.

In conversations, the deictic centre is constantly changing between the communicative partners. Every time a new speaker adopts the turn, the speech event is conceptualized from a different point of view, which means that expressions such as *here* and *there* and *I* and *you*

refer to different entities when used by different speakers. Adult speakers are so used to this procedure that they do not realize the constantly changing perspective that is involved in the use of deictic expressions; but children have great difficulties with the alternating point of view. Although English-speaking children begin to use deictic expressions very early, they often misinterpret their meaning and use (cf. Clark 1978; Tanz 1980; Wales 1986). For instance, it is well-known that some children begin to use the personal pronouns *I* and *you* as fixed expressions for the child and an adult speaker.

Consider for instance the dialog in (2) between a two-year-old English-speaking boy and his mother (cf. Clark 1978: 101).

(2) Mother: What do you want? Child: Daddy toothbrush.

Mother: Oh you want Daddy's toothbrush, do you?

Child: Yes . . . *you* want to put the frog in the mug. [you = I]

Mother: I think the frog is too big for the mug.

Child: Yes *you* can put the duck in the mug [you = I]

make bubble . . . make bubble.

Mother: Tomorrow. Nearly all the water's run out.

Child: *You* want Mummy red toothbrush . . . yes [you = I]

you can have Mummy old red toothbrush.

In this example, both the boy and his mother use the pronoun *you* with reference to the child, suggesting that the boy misinterprets the term as some sort of proper name. The same absolute use of personal pronouns has been observed in many other studies.

Check yourself test

A. Discuss the following:

What is meant by pure and impure deictics?

Deixis is said to be related to distance. Explicate it.

What is the recycling of deictics? Give examples.

Tense is a deictic category. Could you comment on it?

Discuss deictics used in the following sentences; describe the situations in which the sentences may be used:

1. That/ this is a nice cottage.
2. This book was published last year.
3. The theatre is on the left.
4. We're going to New York next week.
5. We're coming to New York next week.
6. I don't like that man.
7. The student there is a friend of mine.
8. John looked up when she came in.
9. She is an actress.
10. What's that? What's that thing?
11. Who's that? Who's that person?
12. My friend here will show you the way.
13. Here's the money you lent me.

14. I was born in London and have lived here/there all my life.

15. Hey, you over there! Get out of here!

16. You have to be 21 to buy alcohol in Florida.

17. How are we feeling today, Mr. Robson?

18. Shall we stop for a coffee?

19. I like this movie today better than that concert last night.

20. It was quite a large fish – about that long.

21. There was an accident there.

22. John's uncle died last week.

23. John's grandmother had died the previous week.

24. That's true. I agree with you there.

25. He missed hitting the car in front by that much.

26. Do come in / Do go in.

References

REFERENCES/ FURTHER READING

1. Adegbija, Efurosibina (2004): Current Issues in Language Planning in Nigeria. 2. Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning 3. Chua C.S.K. Introduction: 'Issues in language planning and policy: from global to local' 4. Crystal, D. (2003): English as a global language (2nd ed). Cambridge University Press. 5. Kaplan, R. B. Baldauf, R. Jr. (2003): language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin. Kluwer Academic Publishers. 6. Kaplan, R. B. Baldauf, R. Jr. (1997): 'Language planning from practice to theory' Multilingual Matters. 7. Baldauf, R.B. Jr, (1990): 'Language planning and education'. In R.B. Jr. Richard &A. Luke (Eds.) 'Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific'. Multilingual Matters. 8. Baldauf, R.B. Jr. (1993/1994) "Unplanned" language policy and planning. Annual Review of Linguistics, 14, 82-

89. 9. Baldauf, R.B. Jr. (2006): 'Rearticulating the case for micro language planning to a language ecology context'. Current Issues in Language Planning.7 (2&3) 147- 170. 10. Kirkpatrick, A. (2010): English as a lingua franca in ASEAN: A multilingual model. Hong Kong University Press. 11. Ricento, T.K. (2006): An Introduction to language policy: Theory and Method. Blackwell. 12. Philipson, R. (1996): 'English only worldwide, or language ecology?' TESOL Quarterly 30, 429-452. 13. Phillipson, R. (2003): English-only Europe? Changing language policy. Routledge. 14. Pennycook, A. (2006): Postmodernism in language policy: Blackwell Publishing. 15. Liddicoat, A. (2003): Language-in-education policies: The discursive construction of intercultural relations. Multilingual Matters.

Agirre, Eneko and Philip Edmonds (2006). Word Sense Disambiguation. Algorithms and Applications. Berlin: Springer.

Aitchison, Jean (1987). Words in the Mind. An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon.

Oxford: Blackwell. Aitchison, Jean (2003). Words in the Mind. An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon.

3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell. Alinei, Mario (1996). 'Aspetti teoretici della motivazione'. Quaderni di Semantica 17: 7-17.

Allan, Kathryn (2009). Metaphor and Metonymy. A Diachronic Approach. London:Wiley-Blackwell.

Allan, Keith (2001). Natural Language Semantics. Oxford: Blackwell.

Allan, Keith and Kate Burridge (1991). Euphemism and Dysphemism. Language

Used as Shield and Weapon. New York: Oxford Uiversity Press.

Allwood, Jens (2003). 'Meaning potentials and context: Some consequences for the analysis of variation in meaning'. In Hubert Cuyckens, René Dirven and

John Taylor (eds.), Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Lexical Semantics29-66. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Apresjan, Juri (1966). 'Analyse distributionelle des significations et champs sémantiques structurés'. Langages 1: 44-74. Apresjan, Juri (1971). Ideen und Methoden der modernen strukturellen Linguistik. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. Apresjan, Juri (1973). 'Regular polysemy'. Linguistics 142: 5-32.

Apresjan, Juri (2000). Systematic Lexicography. Oxford University Press.

Apresjan, Juri, Igor A. Mel'čuk and Aleksander Zholkovsky (1969). 'Semantics and

lexicography: Towards a new type of unilingual dictionary'. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), Studies in Syntax and Semantics 1-33. Dordrecht: Reidel.Armstrong, Sharon L., Lila R. Gleitman and Henry Gleitman (1983). 'What some concepts might not be'. Cognition 13: 263-308.

Arppe, Antti (2008). Univariate, Bivariate, and Multivariate Methods in Corpus- Based Lexicography. A study of synonymy. PhD Thesis, University of Helsinki.

Asher, Nicholas and Alex Lascarides (1996). 'Lexical disambiguation in a discourse context'. In James Pustejovsky and Branimir Boguraev (eds.), Lexical Semantics. The Problem of Polysemy 69-108. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Asher, Nicholas and Alex Lascarides (2001). 'Metaphor in discourse'. In Pierrette

Bouillon and Federica Busa (eds.), The Language of Word Meaning 262- 289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Athanasiadou, Angeliki, Costas Canakis and Bert Cornillie (eds.) (2006). Subjectification. Various Paths to Subjectivity. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Athanasiadou, Angeliki and Elzbieta Tabakowska (eds.) (1998). Speaking of

Emotions. Conceptualization and Expression. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Atkins, B.T. Sue and Michael Rundell (2008). The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Atkins, B.T. Sue, Michael Rundell and Hiroaki Sato (2003). 'The contribution of FrameNet to practical lexicography'. International Journal of Lexicography 16: 333-357. 253/317

Atkins, B.T. Sue and Antonio Zampolli (eds.) (1994). Computational Approaches to the Lexicon. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Atran, Scott (1990). Cognitive Foundations of Natural History. Towards an Anthropology of Science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Austin, John L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Baicchi, Annalisa, Cristiano Broccias and Andrea Sansò (eds.) (2005). ModellingThought and Constructing Meaning. Cognitive Models in Interactions.Milan: FrancoAngeli.

Baldinger, Kurt (1957). Die Semasiologie. Versuch eines Ueberblicks. Berlin:

Akademie-Verlag.

Baldinger, Kurt (1960). 'Alphabetisches oder begrifflich gegliedertes Wörterbuch?'

Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 76: 521-536.

Baldinger, Kurt (1964). 'Sémasiologie et onomasiologie'. Revue de linguistique romane 28: 249-272.

Baldinger, Kurt (1980). Semantic Theory. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bally, Charles (1940). 'L'arbitraire du signe: valeur et signification'. Le Français moderne 8: 193-206.

Bar Hillel, Yehoshua (1967). 'Dictionaries and meaning rules'. Foundations of Language 3: 409-414.

Barcelona, Antonio (2002). 'Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics: An update'. In René Dirven and Ralf Pörings (eds.), Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast 207-277. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barcelona, Antonio (2005). 'The multilevel operation of metonymy in grammar and discourse, with particular attention to metonymic chains'. In Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez and Sandra Peña Cervel (eds.), Cognitive Linguistics. Internal Dynamics and Interdisciplinary Interaction 313-352. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barcelona, Antonio (ed.) (2000). Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads. A Cognitive Perspective. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bartlett, Frederick C. (1932). Remembering. An Experimental and Social Study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bartsch, Renate (1987). Norms of Language. Theoretical and Practical Aspects. London: Longman.

Bechtoldt, Heinrich (1935). 'Der französische Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes: die geistliche und lehrhafte Literatur von ihren Anfängen biszum Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts'. Romanische Forschungen 49: 21-180.

Beckwith, Richard, Christiane Fellbaum, Derek Gross and George A. Miller (1991).'WordNet: A lexical database organized on

psycholinguistic principles'. InUri Zernick (ed.), Lexical Acquisition. Exploiting On-line Resources To Build A Lexicon 211-232. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bendix, Edward H. (1966). Componential analysis of general vocabulary. The semantic structure of a set of verbs in English, Hindi, and Japanese. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Berlin, Brent (1976). 'The concept of rank in ethnobiological classification: Some evidence from Aguarana folk botany'. American Ethnologist 3: 381-400.

Berlin, Brent (1978). 'Ethnobiological classification'. In Eleanor Rosch and Barbara B. Lloyd (eds.), Cognition and Categorization 9-26. Hillsdale, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berlin, Brent (1992). Ethnobiological Classification. Principles of Categorization of Plants and Animals in Traditional Societies. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Berlin, Brent, Dennis E. Breedlove and Peter H. Raven (1973). 'General principlesof classification and nomenclature in folk biology'. American 254/317 Anthropologist 75: 214-242.

Berlin, Brent, Dennis E. Breedlove and Peter H. Raven (1974). Principles of Tzeltal Plant Classification. An Introduction to the Botanical Ethnography of a Mayan-speaking People of Highland Chiapas. New York: Academic Press.

Berlin, Brent and Paul Kay (1969). Basic Color Terms. Their Universality and Evolution. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bertels, Ann (2006). La polysémie du vocabulaire technique. Une etude quantitative. PhD Thesis, University of Leuven.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1969). 'On certain problems of semantic representations'. Foundations of Language 5: 153-184.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1970). 'Semantics'. In John Lyons (ed.), New Horizons in Linguistics 166-184. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1971). 'On classifying semantic features'. In Danny D.

Steinberg and Leon A. Jakobovits (eds.), Semantics. An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology 410-435. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1983). 'Formal and lexical semantics'. Linguistische Studien

114: 56-79.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1983). 'Major aspects of the psychology of language'. Linguistische Studien 114: 1-38.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1987). 'Linguistik als kognitive Wissenschaft: erläuterungen zu einem Forschungsprogramm'. Zeitschrift für Germanistik 6: 645-667.

Bierwisch, Manfred (1988). 'On the grammar of local prepositions'. In Manfred Bierwisch, Wolfgang Motsch and Ilse Zimmermann (eds.), Syntax, Semantik und Lexikon 1-66. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Bierwisch, Manfred and Ewald Lang (eds.) (1989). Dimensional Adjectives. Grammatical Structure and Conceptual Interpretation. Berlin: Springer.

Blank, Andreas (1997). Prinzipien des lexikalischen Bedeutungswandels am

Beispiel der romanischen Sprachen. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Blank, Andreas (2001). Einführung in die lexikalische Semantik. Tübingen: Max

Niemeyer Verlag.

Blank, Andreas (2003). 'Words and concepts in time: Towards diachronic cognitive

onomasiology'. In Regine Eckardt, Klaus von Heusinger and Christoph Schwarze (eds.), Words in Time. Diachronic Semantics from Different Points of View 37-65. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Blank, Andreas and Peter Koch (1999). 'Onomasiologie et étymologie cognitive: l'exemple de la tête'. In Mario Vilela and Fatima Silva (eds.), Actas do 1º Encontro Internacional de Linguística Cognitiva 49-72. Oporto: Faculdade

de Letras. Blank, Andreas and Peter Koch (eds.) (2003). Kognitive romanische Onomasiologie

und Semasiologie. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Bloomfield, Leonard (1933). Language. New York: Henry Holt.

Boden, Margaret (2006). Mind as Machine. A History of Cognitive Science. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Boers, Frank (1996). Spatial Prepositions and Metaphor. A Cognitive-semantic

Journey along the UP-DOWN and the FRONT-BACK Dimensions.Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Boers, Frank (2003). 'Applied linguistics perspectives on cross-cultural variation in conceptual metaphor'. Metaphor and Symbol 18: 231-238.

Bohnemeyer, Jürgen (2003). 'NSM without the Strong Lexicalization Hypothesis'.

Theoretical Linguistics 29: 211-222.

Bolinger, Dwight (1965). 'The atomization of meaning'. Language 41: 555-573.

Boroditsky, Lera and Michael Ramscar (2002). 'The roles of body and mind in abstract thought'. Psychological Science 13: 185-188.255/317

Bouillon, Pierrette and Federica Busa (2001). 'Qualia and the structuring of verbmeaning'. In Pierrette Bouillon and Federica Busa (eds.), The Language of Word Meaning 149-167. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bouillon, Pierrette and Federica Busa (eds.) (2001). The Language of Word Meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowdle, Brian F. and Dedre Gentner (2005). 'The career of metaphor'. Psychological Review 112: 193-216.

Braisby, Nick, Bradley Franks and James Hampton (1996). 'Essentialism, word use, and concepts'. Cognition 59: 247-274.

Brandt, Per Aage (ed.) (2004). Spaces, Domains, and Meaning. Essays in Cognitive Semiotics. Bern: Peter Lang.

Bréal, Michel (1897). Essai de sémantique. Science des significations. Paris: Hachette.

Brown, Cecil H. (1984). Language and Living Things. Uniformities in Folk Classification and Naming. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Brugman, Claudia (1988). The Story of 'Over'. Polysemy, Semantics and the Structure of the Lexicon. New York: Garland.

Buitelaar, Paul (1998). CoreLex. Systematic Polysemy and Underspecification. PhD Thesis, Brandeis University.

Burling, Robbins (1964). 'Cognition and componential analysis: God's truth or hocus-pocus?' American Anthropologist 66: 20-28.

Cameron, Lynne J. (2003). Metaphor in Educational Discourse. London: Continuum.

Cameron, Lynne J. and Juurd H. Stelma (2005). 'Metaphor clusters in discourse'.

Journal of Applied Linguistics 1: 107-136. Carnap, Rudolf (1956). Meaning and Necessity. Chicago: University of Chicago

Press.

Carnoy, Albert (1927). La science des mots. Traité de sémantique. Leuven:

Editions Universitas. Carter, Ronald (1998). Vocabulary. Applied Linguistic Perspectives. London:

Routledge.

Casad, Eugene H. (1992). 'Cognition, history and Cora 'yee". Cognitive Linguistics 3: 151-186.

Catlin, Jane-Carol and Jack Catlin (1972). 'Intentionality: A source of ambiguity in English?' Linguistic Inquiry 3: 504-508.

Charniak, Eugene (1996). Statistical Language Learning. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2004). Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2005). Politicians and Rhetoric. Persuasive Power of Metaphor. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Chierchia, Gennaro and Sally MacConnell-Ginet (2000). Meaning and Grammar. An Introduction to Semantics. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chilton, Paul (2004). Analysing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice. London: Routledge.

Chomsky, Noam (1957). Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, Noam (1965). Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Church, Kenneth and Patrick Hanks (1990). 'Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography'. Computational Linguistics 16: 22-29.

Cienki, Alan (1989). Spatial Cognition and the Semantics of Prepositions in English, Polish, and Russian. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Cienki, Alan J. and Cornelia Müller (eds.) (2008). Metaphor and Gesture.

Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 256/317

Coleman, Linda and Paul Kay (1981). 'Prototype semantics: the English verb 'lie''. Language 57: 26-44.

Collins, Allan M. and Elizabeth Loftus, F. (1975). 'A spreading-activation theory of semantic processing'. Psychological Review 82: 407-428.

Conklin, Harold (1955). 'Hanunóo color categories'. Soutwestern Journal of Anthropology 11: 339-344.

Conklin, Harold (1962). 'Lexicographical treatment of folk taxonomies'. In Fed W.

Householder and Sol Saporta (eds.), Problems in Lexicography 119-141. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Conklin, Harold (1964). 'Ethnogenealogical method'. In Ward H. Goodenough (ed.), Explorations in Cultural Anthropology 25-55. New York: McGraw Hill.

Copestake, Ann and Ted Briscoe (1996). 'Semi-productive polysemy and sense extension'. In James Pustejovsky and Branimir Boguraev

(eds.), Lexical Semantics. The Problem of Polysemy 15-67. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1962). Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios.Madrid: Gredos.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1964). 'Pour une sémantique diachronique structurale'. Travaux de linguistique et de littérature 2: 139-186.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1966). 'Structure lexicale et enseignement du vocabulaire'. Actes du premier Colloque international de linguistique appliquée 175-217. Nancy: Faculté des lettres et des sciences humaines de l'Université

de Nancy.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1967). 'Lexikalische Solidaritäten'. Poetica 1: 293-303.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1975). 'Vers une typologie des champs lexicaux'. Cahiers de Lexicologie 27: 30-51.

Coseriu, Eugenio (1980). Textlinguistik. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Coseriu, Eugenio and Horst Geckeler (1981). Trends in Structural Semantics. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Coulson, Seana (2001). Semantic Leaps. Frame-shifting and Conceptual Blendingin Meaning Construction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coulson, Seana (2008). 'Metaphor comprehension and the brain'. In Raymond W.

Gibbs (ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought 177-194. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coulson, Seana and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.) (2005). The Literal and Nonliteral in Language and Thought. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Craig, Colette (ed.) (1986). Noun Classes and Categorization. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Croft, William (1993). 'The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies'. Cognitive Linguistics 4: 335-370.

Croft, William and D. Alan Cruse (2004). Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, D. Alan (1982). 'On lexical ambiguity'. Nottingham Linguistic Circular 11:65-80.

Cruse, D. Alan (1986). Lexical Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, D. Alan (1995). 'Between polysemy and monosemy'. In Henryk Kardela and Gunnar Persson (eds.), New Trends in Semantics and Lexicography 25-34. Umeå: Swedish Science Press.

Cruse, D. Alan (1995). 'Polysemy and related phenomena from a cognitivelinguistic viewpoint'. In Patrick Saint-Dizier and Evelyne Viegas (eds.), Computational Lexical Semantics 33-49. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Cruse, D. Alan (2004). Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and 257/317 Pragmatics. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cruse, D. Alan (2006). A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cruse, D. Alan, Franz Hundsnurscher, Michael Job and Peter Rolf Lutzeier (eds.) (2002). Lexikologie. Lexicology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Natur und Struktur von Wörtern und Wortschätzen. An International handbook on the Nature and Structure of Words and Vocabularies. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Culler, Jonathan (1975). Structuralist Poetics. Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cuyckens, Hubert (1991). The Semantics of Spatial Prepositions in Dutch. A Cognitive Linguistics Exercise. PhD Thesis, University of Antwerp.

Cuyckens, Hubert, René Dirven and John Taylor (eds.) (2003). Cognitive Approaches to Lexical Semantics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cuyckens, Hubert and Günter Radden (eds.) (2002). Perspectives on Prepositions. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Cuyckens, Hubert, Dominiek Sandra and Sally Rice (1997). 'Towards an empirical lexical semantics'. In Birgit Smieja and Meike Tasch (eds.), Human Contact through Language and Linguistics 35-54. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. Cuyckens, Hubert and Britta Zawada (eds.) (2001). Polysemy in Cognitive Linguistics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

d'Andrade, Roy G. (1995). The Development of Cognitive Anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darmesteter, Arsène (1886). The Life of Words as Symbols of Ideas. London: Kegan Paul.

Darmesteter, Arsène (1887). La vie des mots étudiée dans leur significations. Paris: Delagrave.

Darmesteter, Arsène and Adolphe Hatzfeld (1890). Dictionnaire générale de la langue française du commencement du XVIIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours. Paris: Delagrave.

Dauzat, Albert (1922). La géographie linguistique. Paris: Flammarion.

Davidson, Donald (1967). 'Truth and meaning'. Synthese 1967: 304-323. de la Cruz Cabanillas, Isabel (1999). 'The conflict of homonyms : does it exist?'Cuadernos de investigación filológica 25: 107-116.

De Mulder, Walter and Anne Vanderheyden (2001). 'L'histoire de centre et lasémantique prototypique'. Langue Française 130: 108-125.

De Saussure, Ferdinand (1916). Cours de linguistique générale. Paris: Payot.

Deane, Paul D. (1996). 'On Jackendoff's conceptual semantics'. Cognitive Linguistics 7: 35-92.

Deane, Paul D. (2005). 'Multiple spatial representation: On the semantic unity of'over''. In Beate Hampe (ed.), From Perception to Meaning. Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics 235-282. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Deignan, Alice (2005). 'A corpus perspective on the relationship betweenmetaphor and metonymy'. Style 39: 72-91.

Deignan, Alice (2005). Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dekeyser, Xavier (1990). 'The prepositions 'with', 'mid' and 'again(st)' in Old and Middle English: A case study of historical lexical semantics'. BelgianJournal of Linguistics 5: 35-48.

Del Bello, Davide (2007). Forgotten Paths. Etymology and the Allegorical Mindset. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Desmet, Piet (1996). La linguistique naturaliste en France (1867-1922). Nature, origine et évolution du langage. Leuven: Peeters.

Dewell, Robert B. (1994). "Over' again: On the role of image-schemas in semantic 258/317

analysis'. Cognitive Linguistics 5: 351-380.

Di Meola, Claudio (1994). Kommen und gehen. Eine kognitiv-linguistische Untersuchung der Polysemie deiktischer Bewegungsverben. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Dilthey, Wilhelm (1910). Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften. Berlin: Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Dirven, René (1985). 'Metaphor as a basic means for extending the lexicon'. In Wolf Paprotté and René Dirven (eds.), The Ubiquity of Metaphor. Metaphor in Language and Thought 85-120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dirven, René (1993). 'Metonymy and metaphor: Different mental strategies of conceptualisation'. Leuvense Bijdragen. Leuven Contributions in Linguistics and Philology 82: 1-28.

Dirven, René (2002). 'Metonymy and metaphor: Different mental strategies of conceptualisation'. In René Dirven and Ralf Pörings (eds.), Metaphor andMetonymy in Comparison and Contrast 75-111. Berlin: Mouton deGruyter.Dirven, René, Roslyn Frank and Cornelia Ilie (eds.) (2001). Language and Ideology: Descriptive Cognitive Approaches. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.