## POST & (E)MAIL

# **Eminent misuse**

From: Benjamin Lease Professor Emeritus of English, Northeastern Illinois University, USA

A brief comment on Emily Dickinson might usefully supplement Donald Hook's fine article in *ET59* (Jul 99) on the use and misuse of the apostrophe. One of America's greatest poets was a hopelessly confirmed misuser who invariably (in hundreds of poems) added an apostrophe to *its*. 'Hypercorrection of possessive pronouns' is how Hook explains this phenomenon; Dickinson *never* did otherwise. Here is the opening stanza of one of her most famous poems:

Further in Summer than the Birds Pathetic from the Grass

A minor Nation celebrates It's unobtrusive Mass (J1068) breaking edition (1955) and with Dickinson's ever-growing fame, these obtrusive apostrophes are being increasingly scattered far and worldwide.

Since Thomas Johnson's ground-

# The Pokemon phenomenon

From: Robert Craig Weston-Super-Mare, England

I wonder if *ET* might consider the Japanese and now worldwide 'Pokemon' phenomenon, where *Pokémon*, the name of a Japanese game, is short for 'pocket monster'.

The phenomenon itself is coinages formed out of English elements, but minted outside the English-speaking world.

An early example is *unwell* (Ireland), and others are *walkabout* (New Guinea), *dreamtime* (Australia), *warpath* (U.S.A.), *cuppa* 

(tea) (Australia). Now *walkman* and *gameboy* (Japan), and a possible new addition *handie* (German: mobile or cell phone).

# Thinking about sex

From: Jyh Wee Sew Linguistics Section School of Language, Literature, and Performing Arts, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

In an episode of the Oprah Winfrey Show in August 1999 on TV3 in New Zealand, Oprah advocates that one should heed her motherly instinct on potential danger in a vicinity. One of the cases discussed concerns a child who had been repeated abused sexually by a close family friend who was a respected paramedic at a fire station. Oprah notes that parents often have a misconception of sex abuse, associat-

# A response to Modiano and Lilles

ANDREW DALBY writes in his column 'Notes in the Margin' in *The Linguist* (journal of the Society of Linguists, London) on two recent issues in *ET*, separately raised by Marko Modiano and Jaan Lilles (reproduced with the kind permission of the editor and the author)

### English(es) 1

In the nicest possible way, Marko Modiano indulges in a little British-baiting in *English Today*, October 1999. I will not tell you the title of his paper, because it is too long. It is about pinning down the Standard English that textbooks are meant to be teaching people. When the textbooks are British, their English is sometimes – from the US point of view pretty bad. He gives examples, straight from these textbooks, that most US speakers would consider ungrammatical: 'I havent got any'; 'I haven't got a bloody clue'. Here are three more examples: 'Helen's reading history at Oxford'; 'It would be a good idea if you sat it again' and 'Tuesdays and Wednesdays are given over to football and basketball respectively'. The special British uses of 'read', 'sit' and 'give over to' would make these sentences confusing or incomprehensible to US speakers, says Modiano.

He observes that there is a 'common core' of standard English, acceptable worldwide. He draws a Venn diagram, with an arrow pointing straight to the common core, and says we should teach it, rather than the British-slanted version of 'standard English' that many teach now. Well, yes. But, to take one of his examples, 'I haven't got any' is OK in Britain, and 'I don't have any' is OK in the United States. The only thing available in the common core is the stilted 'I have none'. We cannot just teach that.

It may be true that too many British textbooks and British examiners assume without thinking that British English equals standard English: but students do not learn from just one textbook or one teacher. There is really no single standard English, and no reason to pretend, to students, teachers or examiners, that there is. But we are very lucky that the common core exists, because students who want a real command of English need it and as much as they can learn of the uncommon bits as well. From teachers like Modiano (author

English Today 64, Vol. 16, No. 4 (October 2000). Printed in the United Kingdom

ing it with horrible scenario of bruised body. The fact is that sex abuse could be a 'nice' experience to the child who does not know that s/he is being exploited. In other words, sex abuse need not be brutal nor violent.

What has it got to do with English in particular? I sense a Whorfian understanding in the perception of sex abuse. Due to the semantics of the word abuse which is associated with violence towards a person regarded as victim, which in turn entails physical and/or mental injuries, one's definition of sex abuse is evident from the victim rather than the victimisation. The term abuse results in a particular semantic idiosyncrasy (cf. Bauer 1983: 79) that influences one's conception of the reality. This is most unfortunate to the victim of child sex abuse, as a child might be victimised but fail to show signs of a victim. The child might remain as a transparent victim as s/he does not understand that what has happened is unacceptable.

If we value children's rights and

of *A mid-Atlantic handbook*, 1996, and of studies of euro-English) I am quite sure they will learn all of that.

#### English(es) 2

*English Today*, always worth reading, is (in April 2000) in a mood to question current assumptions on the nature of Englishes.

Jaan Lilles writes on "The myth of Canadian English', arguing that there is no such entity. Admittedly any largescale regional variety, socalled, of a language such as English is 'an abstraction, a fiction': John Algeo had already said exactly this in 1991. Some of them, however, are useful fictions. There is something real to describe, and to contrast with all other varieties, in (say) South African or Australian advocate the need to speak for children, our language should have a more transparent definition of sex abuse so much so that a higher degree of sensitivity on the subject matter is codified in the language. We might like to consider sex offence in place of sex abuse because the former means 'inappropriate sexual contacts' irrespective of any bodily harm. The word offence is not determined semantically by violence but can encompass violence in its sense. In contrast to abuse, offence has a wider semantic field. This will alleviate the level of awareness on issues of well being related to children and other persons.

While *sex offence* might not be a new term in English, it could be a practical usage reflecting the conviction of the speakers towards a safer future for children. This lexical choice can offer a glimpse of social psychology in English today.

Reference: Bauer, Laurie. 1993. English Word-Formation. Cambridge: University Press.

English. Lilles proposes that 'Canadian English' is only supposed to exist because Canada exists, and perhaps because Canadian French exists. Actually, isoglosses do not follow but cross the US-Canadian border. Canadian English amounts to a fairly small number of special words and usages, plus a rather random choice between spelling and pronunciation variants that are standard either in the US or in Britain: in fact the three recent Canadian dictionaries tend to make different choices among these variants. It would not be the first time that dictionaries and grammars have set out to describe a non-existent linguistic unit: have the makers of the Canadian Oxford dictionary and its rivals done it again?

Meanwhile the debate begun by Marko Modiano, already mentioned in 'Notes in

## A half-mixed compound?

From: David Dean, medical science student, Leeds, England

Some lessons learnt during high school chemistry remain with me, none more so than the distinction between a mixture and a compound:

*Mixture*: a substance consisting of two or more substances mixed together without any chemical bonding between them.

*Compound*: a substance that contains atoms of two or more chemical elements held together by chemical bonds.

As a teenager I did not object to being termed *half caste*. For the past few years I have preferred, and asked others to use, *mixed race*. Lately, I have been aware of the inadequacies of this phrase, and now consider 'compound ethnicity' to be more appropriate.

My father is of Asian and my mother is of European ethnic origin. We do not, nor do the cultures

the Margin', continues in *English Today*. His basic point is that teachers and examiners of English as a foreign language have tended to regard only Standard British English as correct, and they should long since have ceased to do this. Modiano's EIL, 'English as an International Language', will have its own norms, and since it is a lingua franca its L2 speakers will have just as much right to determine them as native speakers will.

This is all very well, but it's futuristic and slightly impractical. Paul Rastall brings the debate back to earth. The existing variation between current usage and the textbook rules already causes quite enough difficulties for teachers and examiners. 'Diversity, yes: but what is the English teacher to do?' □

#### POST & E-MAIL

of which we are a part, adhere to a caste system, hence I cannot be half caste which is also a derogatory term suggesting that I do not belong to either of my parent's groupings; that I am neither here nor there. To continue this thought, any children my wife, Sally, and I produce would therefore be quarter caste in regard to Asian and three quarter caste with respect to European ethnic origin. As may be seen by observing any family over several generations, the extent to which individuals display, and to which they choose to follow, characteristics of their family varies greatly, and in an unpredictable manner.

Mixed race seemed a better classification; it seemed to have no disparaging connotations, nor any reference to caste. However, for some this gives a negative impression, as in mixed up. In addition, if I am mixed race who can determine which parts of me are from my father and which from my mother? Is my left arm from one and my right from the other? Is my knee from Punjab and my elbow from Norfolk? In terms of character and of appearance for example, skin colour am not a mixture, but a compound.

I believe the best description is to say that someone is of compound ethnicity. It has the additional benefit of necessitating the use of a noun to give the adjectival phrase meaning: for example, she is a woman of compound ethnicity; this boy has compound ethnicity. There may be future improvements to this term, but for the time being let us avoid the use of halving and mixing with reference to ethnicity and consider the basic distinction between a mixture and a compound.

[This letter has already appeared in the *BMJ*:  $\bigcirc$  British Medical Journal 1999. The writer sent it on to *ET* because of its linguistic implications: Ed.]

# Stuck in a time warp?

From: Leila Ward Combe Down, Bath, England

Pam Peters' *Langscape* review in *ET63* (Jul 00) includes some interesting theories about people's preferred usages, but she may not have all the answers.

As an Age 6 (65+) respondent, I should point out that my spelling and punctuation are probably stuck in a time-warp, and largely reflect what I was taught in the 1930s and 1940s (but not entirely: I have dropped the old apostrophe from 1930's, you will notice). Never mind these uppity modern digraphs: words like *encyclopædia*, *anæmia* etc rejoiced in proper diphthongs during my formative years. Anything else just 'looks wrong' to me.

Everyone is subjected to different influences: some of my practices may be attributed to secretarial training. When learning office skills, and later when teaching them, I had to follow the examiners' requirements. Whether or not to insert a stop after Ave or Rd did not arise. A competent typist could key in the whole word in no time, and the abbreviations were considered the height of sloppiness.

This is not to say that people of my age never move on. We acquire new vocabulary and usages just as younger folk do, and discard others – I no longer pronounce *ski* as *she*, for instance. But I am really not aware of 'putting an iconic value on every letter of the stem or root of a word'. Generally, I just spell the way I always have done: don't most people?

#### CROSSWORLD

#### ET63 CrossworLd solution



#### ET62 CrossworLd winners

The winners of *Words on Words*, David and Hilary Crystal, 2000, the prize for our April 2000 crossword, are:

Joselyn Darling, Waiheke Island, New Zealand Michael R. Ferguson, Berlin, Germany Valerie High, Ware, Hertfordshire, England Dr B. C. Lamb, East Sheen, London, England Gibb E. Webber, Anderson, Indiana, USA



ENGLISH TODAY 64

October 2000

64