The variability of literary dialect in Jamaican creole*

Thelwell's *The Harder They Come*

Edgar W. Schneider and Christian Wagner
University of Regensburg

This papers investigates the representation of the variability characteristics of the post-creole continuum of Jamaica in literature, and it discusses theoretical ramifications concerning the nature of an author's 'pan-lectal' competence. Based upon Thelwell's novel *The Harder They Come* and set against the background of theoretical statements on literary dialect, the origin of the novel, and the Jamaican culture which it represents, the variability of literary dialect is investigated by two complementary types of approaches: a quantitative sociolinguistic analysis of three phonological and 13 morphological variables of Jamaican Creole as represented in the speech of 14 fictive characters, and a qualitative documentation of the style-shifting employed by some of these characters. The results show that Thelwell's literary representation of the Jamaican speech continuum is remarkably accurate and in line with the findings of fieldwork-based sociolinguistic studies. A wide range of variation between basilect and acrolect is convincingly represented in the novel, with the characters' idiolects correlating with their socioeconomic status and with situational parameters.

Keywords: literary dialect, creole writing, Jamaican Creole, novel, creole continuum, style shifting, variability, sociolinguistics, competence, verb grammar

---

1.   Introduction: Literary dialect in creole and cross-varietal competence

In any nation, and perhaps more so in post-colonial countries struggling to develop distinct national identities of their own, literary creativity is an important means of expressing cultural identity, characterictic of a phase of endonormative stabilization in the evolution of newly-emerging language varieties (Schneider 2003: 252–253). Language choice and linguistic encoding are an essential element in this process of identity construction and projection, and by necessity this includes the use of local vernacular language forms, which therefore deserve special attention. This general description applies to both the highly successful "New Literatures" in English, which have resulted in the emergence of a new field of literary scholarship and representatives of which have been awarded many prizes, including Nobel Prizes, over the last decades, and to so-called "creole literatures" which employ creole languages. Typically, linguistic usage in these texts is divided between a narrative in Standard English and conversational discourse, direct speech, frequently rendered in local vernaculars. The language used in these texts, naturally an object of scholarly discussion and investigation (cf. Adamson & van Rossem 1995; Lang 2000; Talib 2002; Mühleisen 2005), represents a novel instantiation of what has been known for decades in metropolitan contexts as literary dialect.

A seminal article on literary dialect was published by Ives (1971), which is on American English but offers valuable general information on its topic, such as a preliminary definition of this literary device:

> A literary dialect is an author's attempt to represent in writing a speech that is restricted regionally, socially, or both. His representation may consist merely in the use of an occasional spelling change, like FATHUH rather than *father*, or the use of a word like *servigrous*; or he may attempt to approach scientific accuracy by representing all the grammatical, lexical and phonetic peculiarities that he has observed. (Ives 1971: 146)

Literary dialect has frequently been the object of scholarly investigation, although linguists, interested, quite naturally, in authentic rather than artistic expression, have tended to regard it as a marginal and only secondary object of investigation. The use of non-standard language in fictional dialogue has a long tradition in British and American literature, especially the novel (Blake 1981). From a linguistic perspective, however, literary dialect has typically been regarded as problematic, as it does not record authentic data produced by real-life speakers but represents language constructed by an author of a literary work as

quasi-authentic speech uttered by fictional characters. As Ives (1971) observed: "Nearly all examples of literary dialect are deliberately incomplete; the author is an artist, not a linguist or a sociologist, and his purpose is literary rather than scientific" (ibid. 147), and "Any literary dialect, therefore, will necessarily be a partial and somewhat artificial picture of the actual speech" (ibid. 159). A similar statement is made by Holton (1984: 57): "Any literary writing of dialect must be regarded as suggestion rather than as authentic representation of the speech of a particular group of speakers". This has to do with the process of the author creating literary dialect, which is described by Holton (1984: 56) as follows:

> he must depend upon the accumulation of dialect pronunciations of particular words, or unusual syntactic combinations he has previously heard; he must draw features from this mnemonic accumulation and imagine these features in new combinations. Thus by a combination of memory and imagination he will 'represent' imagined speech appropriate for his characters.

The purpose of literary dialect is not linguistic authenticity but typically some artistic effect, that of lending credibility to the construction of a cultural context or simply entertaining its readership: literary dialect is frequently meant either to emphasize the linguistic idiosyncrasies of a character's speech for humorous effect or to contribute an atmosphere of authenticity and "local color" (Holton 1984: 55–6). However, because the intended readership is not only a local one, an acceptable balance has to be achieved between authenticity (LePage & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 73) and readability for a wider audience (cf. Blake 1981: 191–2; D'Costa 1983: 260–1). Some authors are more reliable and linguistically accurate in their written literary representation of spoken non-standard language than others (cf. Ives 1971: 177). In general, however, the relationship between literary dialect and "natural usage" has been found to be relatively unreliable, marked by the overuse of select stereotypical features and, conversely, the underrepresentation of variability in a speech community, let alone of frequency relationships between variants of a variable:

> literary dialect often treats quantitative features qualitatively. Many dialect features are, of course, quantitative. Thus, while literary dialect can be useful for documenting the presence or absence of features, it is only useful for establishing the constraints on their occurrence in rare instances.
>
> (Bailey & Smith 1994: 19)

These concerns and limitations have to be considered but should not cause linguists to ignore literary dialect altogether: it is a stylistic device and a con-

ventional form of linguistic expression that deserves to be taken seriously as a text type of its own. Bernstein (1994) promotes "literary linguistics" and argues "that the literary text is a legitimate source of linguistic data" (239). In addition, there are contexts in which despite all limitations literary dialect representation becomes interesting as a primary window in language variation and change of earlier periods, when no other, more authentic evidence is available: dialect samples represented in literature have been used to cater for the well-known problem of lack of historical evidence, as a stopgap if nothing else has been preserved, as it were (Schneider 2002). The careful investigation of early southern English in the US by Ellis (1994) is a case in point.

Obviously, these general considerations apply in much the same way to the literary representations of creole languages – even more so, perhaps, given that in recent decades creolists have worked hard to document the early histories of creole languages and hence, to unearth early textual records, which not infrequently were literary representations. Rickford (1991:312) emphasizes the fact that in order to arrive at a better assessment of the reliability and validity of written records there is a need

> to develop a better theoretical understanding of the relation between everyday speech varieties and the ways in which these are reported and represented by travelers, dramatists, novelists, cartoonists, newspaper writers, and other nonlinguists, using the insights gained to interpret written records of the past.

Literary representations, amongst others, have therefore figured prominently in documentations of (earlier) Jamaican (D'Costa & Lalla 1989), Guyanese (Rickford 1987) and Trinidadian (Winer 1993) Creoles, for instance. The increasing status of creoles in many countries has also found its reflections in literary representations of creoles, as Rickford & Traugott (1985:255–256) observed:

> Like non-standard dialects, pidgins and creoles have traditionally been used to inject comedy into a story, to present a pathetic character, or at best to suggest the folkways of the people who speak them. ... Recently, however, more and more writers have been using pidgins and creoles in a different way – as a vehicle for the presentation of the cultures and rich communities in which these languages flourish, often as the voice of reality, truth, and genuineness in a world otherwise largely destructive (the colonial world) or corrupt (the go-getting, often fraudulent world of post-colonial governments).

Not surprisingly, such uses have also sparked linguistic investigations (for a general framework, see Lang 2000), so the present analysis continues a small

but growing tradition of investigations of literary representations of creoles (and related varieties) including work by Bernhardt (1983) on the Trinidadian author Samuel Selvon;[1] Holton (1984) on African American Vernacular English; D'Costa (1984b) on the dialect poetry of the Jamaican writer Louise Bennett; and Mille (1997) on Ambrose Gonzales' Gullah. More specifically than these studies, however, the present analysis operates in an explicit variationist framework and asks questions developed from this perspective.

The aims of this paper can be pinned down on three distinct levels: literary dialect description, analysis of variation, and probing into the nature of the author's pan-lectal competence. Primarily, our analysis is intended as a contribution to the study of literary dialect in creole languages, notably the Jamaican Creole represented in a well-known novel, Thelwell's *The Harder They Come*. More specifically, our aim is that of studying the representation of the variability that is so characteristic of Jamaica's linguistic make-up: Jamaican Creole is known to vary along a continuum (for a sophisticated documentation of its variability, see most recently Patrick 1999). Thus, this study stands at the crossroads of three disciplines: creole linguistics, the study of literary dialect, and variationist post-Labovian sociolinguistics (cf. Chambers, Trudgill, & Shilling-Estes, eds. 2001). We are interested in examining the amount of similarity between the fictitious representation of variability and authentic language realities in Jamaica. Hence, the focus of this study is on the description of (fictitious) performance data, its organization in (fictitious) speaker profiles, and its comparison with documentary descriptions of authentic performance data.

On a third level, however, our study aims to go beyond the description and assessment of literary variability. The theoretical question of interest here concerns the nature of an individual's cross-varietal productive competence: To what extent is an individual (the author of a literary work, in the present case) capable of modeling and producing the variable performance of **different** speakers? Do an individual's intuitions on variable linguistic usage include a familiarity with adequate token frequencies by various speakers and styles? What precisely do speakers "know" about variable usage in given environments?

That an individual is able to style-shift across a range of sociostylistic options as required by situational demands is generally accepted. What this implies for a theory of language variability has been under discussion for decades

---

1. Bernhardt's analysis looks at the codeshifting of some fictive characters and is thus even more closely comparable to the present study.

(more so in the early phase of sociolinguistics in the 1970s than recently, though, but the question is still open and highly relevant), with the main options being either of the following two: Either a speaker manipulates and switches between several interrelated "lects", each of which is perceived as a categorical system in its own right (the position associated with C. J. Bailey and Bickerton), or his/her competence comprises some sort of a probabilistic device, with variability to be quantitatively modeled (the view held by Cedergren & Sankoff 1974, as well as Labov and many of his followers).[2]

The precise nature of an individual's competence with respect to frequency differences in performance was the subject of a brief debate in the early phase of discussions of variable rules and variability. How do speakers in a speech community achieve relatively consistent frequency relationships between variables of a variant? It was suggested that somehow frequency relationships between variables and constraints must be part of their competence, but would that entail just a general familiarity with which constraints play a role, or some knowledge of a hierarchy of constraint effects, or even a subconscious ability to manipulate probabilities or frequencies? This question led Bickerton to pronounce his well-known and funny but absurd imputation that speakers have to keep track of their performance frequencies of the variants of any variable continuously and to maintain a certain average value even in the physical absence of other members of the speech community (1971:461).

Bailey (1973) explicitly stated that language variability needs to be analyzed as reflections "of mental capacity" (24). In his view, "[t]he quantitative paradigm … takes a more radical approach to mental capacity … it assumes that the human mind has the power to handle variability on a very large scale, and in particular is able to maintain proportional relationships between competing phenomena" (25). To this he juxtaposed his "dynamic paradigm", which assumed the co-existence of many distinct "lects", defined as "a completely non-committal term for any bundling together of linguistic phenomena" (11) and accounted for variability by assuming that subsequent waves of spreading rules have "reached" or "passed" some speakers but not others (24). He agreed that "the time has come to abandon the previously orthodox view that language-users have competence only in their own 'dialect'" (11) but believed that not some sort of statistical knowledge or knowledge about relative quantities are

---

2.   A good introductory discussion of the issue of categoricity versus variability can also be found in Chambers (2003).

internalized (22) but rather "a psychologically credible implicational pattern generated by the wave model", a polylectal grammar (cf. 27, 32, 35 and *passim*).

Cedergren and Sankoff (1974) argued that frequencies relate to the performance level but that probabilities are part of a speaker's competence, with variability in performance being "a statistical reflection of competence"; in the post-generative terminology of the 1970s this was phrased as follows:

> The variable rules developed by Labov should, like other rules of generative grammar, be interpreted as part of individual competence. The numeral quantities associated with the features in the environment of a rule are indications of the relative weight which they contribute to the applicability of the rule, rather than the existence of discrete probabilities in the head of the speaker. ... how finely speakers can control or vary their rates of rule application – these are all empirical problems which may have different answers in different contexts.   (Cedergren & Sankoff 1974: 335)

Although the number of publications in which speech data relating to individuals are published and interpreted has increased in recent years, the individual as such has not been the typical goal of sociolinguistic investigation. For instance, even if Labov (2001) pays considerable attention to the linguistic behavior of individuals, what is portrayed as being of interest is their socially representative function: "This investigation", he says, "is not a search for individuals, but rather for social locations and social types." (33)

We do not wish to re-embark on the debates of the theoretical modeling of a variable competence, or on the role of individuals in sociolinguistic investigations and the relationship between individual and community grammars (cf. Patrick 2002). The issue we wish to raise, however, has to do with the nature of an individual's competence. The default assumption, largely unquestioned and usually not pointed out explicitly, is that a speaker manipulates linguistic choices as required by his/her own social requirements, and based on his/her own personal background. Literary dialect is different, however, in that an author creates linguistic representations of several idiolectal competences, each of which, in turn, encompasses variation by style and context. Hence, the writer's creative linguistic competence is multiple-layered, pan-lectal, as it were: like the workgroup manager of a computing network, s/he commands each individual's (variable linguistic) access code, delimitating their varying ranges of competence by his/her representation of their performances in the text. This adds a complicating dimension to our understanding of the nature of a human linguistic competence, a level of complexity which to our knowledge has not yet been addressed or investigated as such but which nevertheless reflects

a piece of linguistic reality: Is it true (and if so, to what extent?) that individual speakers not only command the range of variability as determined by their own social needs and experiences but also some speech varieties other than their own? This may not be the most natural thing to do, and possibly creative writers represent a prototypical instance of displaying a pan-lectal competence, but there are situations which suggest that some competence in other varieties is not that extraordinary – including linguistic mimicry and the fun of imitating another dialect (Preston 1996: 344–355), linguistic impersonators, or the existence of "performance" registers (Schilling-Estes 1998).

2.   Background and methodology

2.1   The linguistic situation of Jamaica

The novel we will be analyzing represents the linguistic situation of Jamaica (especially in the middle of the twentieth century), so obviously a description of this situation is a necessary background to our investigation.[3] This topic has been treated elsewhere, however, so it will be assumed to be largely familiar (cf. Cassidy 1961); aspects of the country's sociolinguistic setting will be referred to in the text where appropriate. Jamaica counts as a prototypical case of a creole-speaking Caribbean society, with a linguistic continuum extending between the "deep creole" basilect (described in a somewhat idealized way by Bailey 1966), a range of mesolects (cf. Patrick 1999; Rickford 1974) and a Caribbean-accented English acrolect. This lectal range used to be accounted for by the notion of decreolization and as a post-creole continuum, but this model has been questioned in recent years, partly because the diachronic sequence of an erstwhile ideal creole, only later "spoiled" by accommodations toward English,[4] has been

---

3.   This situation, in turn, has to be understood in the light of the linguistic situation of the Caribbean in general (Roberts 1988) and of the social composition of Jamaica's society, marked by great status differences and a strongly unequal distribution of wealth and poverty (Smith 1965).

4.   The question of whether "intermediate" creoles originated through decreolization or by concurrent variability from the moment of creole genesis has been frequently debated in creole studies (Alleyne 1980: 182–5; Mufwene 1988; Schneider 1990; Neumann–Holzschuh & Schneider 2000), as has been the possibility of defining creoles on social or on strictly linguistic grounds (cf. Mufwene 2000; McWhorter 2000), but neither these issues nor the

challenged, and because it has been suggested that the variability is multidimensional rather than monodimensional (cf. Bickerton 1980; DeCamp 1971; LePage & Tabouret-Keller 1985; Mufwene 2001; Rickford 1987). The mesolect has been described as a mixture between two systems (Lawton 1980, 1985) or as a distinct, variable system in its own right (Patrick 1996, 1999). Expanding its range of acceptability into domains which formerly required the acrolect only, Jamaican Creole (JamC) is undergoing a status change toward greater acceptability, to some extent as an expression of the island's national identity (Roberts 1988: 13–14; Shields-Brodber 1997) – a process which is also reflected in its use in literary works like Thelwell's.

In this paper only one dimension of variation is analyzed, namely the sociolinguistic one, which, in turn, encompasses possible further determinants reflecting Jamaican language realities: the distinction between urban and rural orientations; gender differences; education and income or possession as determinants of social status; and influences from Rasta Talk and other forms of religious language. It is characteristic for speakers to command a certain range of the sociostylistic continuum, depending on their social background, status, and range of contacts.

2.2 The corpus of analysis: Dialogue in Thelwell's *The Harder They Come*

The text corpus of this analysis, Michael Thelwell's *The Harder They Come*, must be seen in the tradition of its genre, the West Indian, and especially the Jamaican, novel. Some investigation, documentation and literary criticism on this genre is available (D'Costa 1983, 1984a, 1984b; Lalla 1996, 2005; LePage 1969; Ramchand 1983), and there are some predecessors upon whose model Thelwell might have drawn.

Lawton (1985: 75) remarks that in the examination of literary texts as linguistic data it is very important for the researcher to have enough background data on the author, the language varieties used in the respective text, and the nature of the audience. The importance of the author's background, especially his command of the respective non-standard dialects, has been pointed out repeatedly in linguistic studies on literary texts (cf. Ellis 1994: 129). Michael Thelwell, the author of *The Harder They Come*, was born in 1939 and grew up

---

historical dimension and documentation, excellent as it is in the case of Jamaica (Lalla & D'Costa 1990; D'Costa & Lalla 1989), are central in the present context.

in a middle-class Kingston family (Dance 1986; Gunton & Stine 1982; Locher 1981). His family had rural roots, and he himself says that in Kingston he had extensive contact with urban lower-class youths from the poor areas and enjoyed hanging out with them. According to his own self-assessment, he fully commands the whole range of Jamaican varieties except the "deep rural creole" (p.c. to CW, 6 June 1998). Since 1959 he has lived in the USA; he is the former chairman of and now a professor at the W.E.B. Du Bois Department of Afro-American Studies at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Although Thelwell has not yet achieved as much fame as other Caribbean writers, he has received several awards, mostly for his short stories (Dance 1986: 461; Locher 1981: 506). However, his masterpiece is the novel *The Harder They Come*, published by Grove in 1980.

The publication of the novel *The Harder They Come* has an interesting and quite unusual history: it is based on the Perry Henzell and Trevor Rhone film with the same title, the first feature-length film produced in Jamaica (Dance 1986: 458) in 1972. This film, with its creole dialogue and English subtitles, was a box-office hit. The film interpreted the life and exploits of a historic figure, a ghetto gunman called "Rhygin'" killed by the Jamaican police in 1948, who passed into legend and whose fate and actions made him something like a hero, especially of the poor working-class people. In his preface to the novel, Thelwell states that "Henzell and Rhone used events from 'Rhygin's' career as the center of a film about working class life and culture which probed the psychological, economic, and political roots, as well as the media inspiration, of 'Rhygin's' rebellion." (Thelwell 1980: 7) His own novel expands that interpretation in a masterly way, adding considerable detail and biographical authenticity (the entire section about Rhygin's youth, about one third of the book, is completely new). Thelwell elaborated on motifs of the movie and its psychological dimension, not only writing a "standard novelization" (Locher 1981: 506) of the film but "giving a meaningful introduction to Jamaican life and culture" (Dance 1986: 458–9) by depicting Rhygin as "the main figure in a larger portrait of Jamaica's peasant life" (Gunton & Stine 1982: 415), especially in the first part of the book. Also, his novel is full of culture (rituals, music, dance, proverbs, traditions, etc.) in which authentic language plays an important role. Gunton and Stine (1982: 415) characterize it as follows:

> In his fiction, Thelwell examines the cultural milieu of his native country. *The Harder They Come* portrays the moral turpitude of a Kingston ghetto by focussing on the dreams and frustrations of a would-be Jamaican pop singer turned outlaw, an infamous figure in Jamaican history.

Thelwell's novel was highly successful and was received enthusiastically (at least for the most part) by both literary criticism (cf. Dance 1986: 460–1; Gunton & Stine 1982: 415–6; Locher 1981: 506) and, to the extent that they read books, "ordinary" creole speakers, which pleased Thelwell even more (Thelwell 1991: 155–9). The representation of the sociocultural background in which the novel plays has received enthusiastic acclaim, because it gives a very authentic picture of Jamaican life away from the tourist hotels. To quote Dance (1986: 459),

> *The Harder They Come* is as Jamaican as saltfish and ackee. Every aspect of the Jamaican landscape, people, and culture is forcefully and dramatically represented in this novel. There are moving pictures of the magnificent Jamaican countryside (the lush mountainsides, the clear cool waters with their coral reefs, etc.); the squalid, brutal Kingston slums (the bustling marketplaces, the poverty-stricken and violent dungle, the scheming street urchins, the Sufferers, the prisons, the corrupt policemen, etc.); as well as the retreats of the wealthy (the rich Jamaicans hiding in their castle-like enclaves protected by guard dogs and high fences, and the American tourists frolicking on beaches and boogying at clubs which exclude the natives). There are captivating accounts of folk practices and rituals, many of them, like the meticulously reproduced Nine Night celebration, derived from Africa. The sounds and rhythms of Jamaica are apparent throughout the novel.

To characterize the sociolinguistic background and the situational contexts of the speakers and dialogues which form the basis of our analysis, it is necessary to briefly summarize the plot of the novel, emphasizing sociolinguistically relevant details concerning individual characters:

> The first part of the novel vividly describes the childhood of its hero, Ivan, in the Jamaican countryside, where he grows up in a small farming community where traditions and local culture are still upheld. His mother having left for Kingston, Ivan lives with his grandmother, Miss 'Mando, who teaches him the daily work of a peasant, Maas' Nattie, an old friend of Miss 'Mando's and a fatherly figure for Ivan, and community members like Joe Beck, who have a deep sense of traditions and rural values. As an adolescent Ivan meets the country girl Mirriam, his first love.
>
>   However, the idyllic country scenes are increasingly disrupted by symbols of the city, to which Ivan feels magically attracted; his love for radio broadcasts from Kingston results in frequent arguments with Miss 'Mando. At his first opportunity, after the death of his grandmother, Ivan, who now calls himself Rhygin, succumbs to the promise of teeming city life and the attractions of the music business and moves to Kingston, which, however, he soon recognizes

as a place full of crime, violence, and poverty. He finds his poverty-stricken mother, who warns him about the city and urges him to return to the country; finding him determined to stay, she gives him the address of Preacher's mission, in case of emergency. Ivan is robbed of his belongings by petty criminals, and although he is lured by the attractions of the city and impressed by urban hustlers like Jose, he is unable to make a living. That he basically has a good character is shown in an episode when he helps the poor Ras' Sufferah push his cart full of empty bottles to a far-away bottle factory. After some time of living on the streets Ivan finds his way to Preacher's mission. Working by day in a little lumber workshop at Preacher's mission under the charge of Longah, Preacher's malicious and hypocritical helper, and falling in love with Elsa, an orphan girl at the mission, by night Ivan associates with the members of street gangs, such as Jose and Bogart. Having fallen out of Preacher's favor and after a violent confrontation with Longah, Ivan has to leave the mission and is cruelly punished by the authorities.

Elsa proves her love to Ivan and leaves the mission to live with him in poverty. Ivan's situation seems to turn for the better when he manages to contact the record producer Hilton and records a hit song that makes it into the dancehalls of Kingston and into the charts. However, Hilton tricks him out of financial success by a foul contract, and Ivan, although his song is played in the streets, finds himself as poor and desperate as ever. Having lost faith in all of society's institutions, Ivan is driven to a life of crime. Together with his old acquaintance Jose and with Pedro, a Rastafarian, he gets successfully involved in the ganja trade. This activity gets him into violent conflicts with the police, led by the fraudulent police officer Ray Jones, and after an extended period of being chased by the authorities but supported by the people a final shootout results in his death.

It was Thelwell's task to create an authentic picture of Jamaican life patterns in his novel, i.e. to combine settings, characters and language in a realistic and consistent manner within a specific sociocultural environment, and language clearly plays a primary role in this. The richness and authenticity of Thelwell's language have been praised repeatedly. Jervis Anderson talks about "the rich and sustaining vernaculars" of the Jamaican poor's culture (in Gunton & Stine 1982:415). Darryl Pinckney praises "the richness of his characters' language – the rolling, resonant, hypnotic patois" (ibid.). Mel Watkins, also in Gunton and Stine (1982:416), remarks: "The dialogue of his characters is authentically rendered and perfectly reflects the singsong cadences of much West Indian dialect", and "In fact, the dialogue is so realistic that some readers may initially have problems deciphering it". Similarly, Locher states that "the dialect is endlessly fascinating" (1981:506), and Dance emphasizes "the author's su-

perb rendering of Jamaican dialect and his brilliant reproduction of the folk speech" (1986: 459). More than merely imposing an atmosphere of "realism" and adding local color to the novel, Thelwell's dialect extracts in the novel contribute to the authenticity of the creation of his characters.[5]

Thelwell's narrative technique blends several levels of speech, four of which can be distinguished:

1. the narrative as such, in Standard English;
2. direct speech in dialogue passages, which is consistently in the creole or dialect;
3. sections of "free indirect speech", providing inside views from a character's personal perspective in the manner of an inner monologue; these are predominantly but not exclusively in nonstandard dialect, with smooth transition from standard to dialect sometimes within a sentence; and
4. sections in first-person narration, in the later parts of the novel only (cf. Thelwell 1991: 152), in which individual characters relate their "versions" (called *vershann*) of events to the reader from their subjective points of view and in their language, which is, as opposed to the neutral narrator's language, also non-standard dialect; these portions are not formally marked by quotation marks as a character's explicit "speech", but they are clearly recognizable as speech-based by contextual clues.

2.3 Methodology of analysis

For the purpose of data extraction, it is necessary to delimit our corpus; obviously, the intention is to circumscribe those textual portions which represent the characters' individual dialects. On the basis of the above categorization, the delimitation is relatively simple and clear-cut: For the following investigations, we have included categories 2 and 4, i.e. quotations of direct speech in dialect and the first person narrations ("vershanns") which are clearly and fully dialectal. Excluded are the third-person narrations in Standard English and also the inside view narrations in dialect, as these are not infrequently code-mixed with standard language, with gradual and blurred transitions.

Furthermore, we have also excluded formulaic and conventionalized linguistic data, such as bible quotes and recitations, song lyrics, proverbs,

---

5. In a later essay (1991), Thelwell reflected on his use of the patois, comparing the techniques of the movie and of the novel.

ritual formulas and exclamations, as these do not represent natural conversational behavior.

The following analysis focuses upon 14 main characters, whose selection was based upon the simple criterion that more than 500 words of direct speech in the corpus must be provided by each of them. The sizes of the individual corpora range between 1000 and 3350 words for 11 out of the 14 characters; only Ivan has more (7900 words), and only Mirriam and Ras Sufferah have less. Appendix 1 identifies the sources of speech passages and the corpus sizes for each of the subjects.

In the following sections we pursue two distinct analytical perspectives, complementary to each other, to achieve a comprehensive and versatile picture of Thelwell's dialect representation. First, and most importantly, we provide an idiolect-based, conventional quantitative analysis of variation and sociolinguistic correlations, looking into the frequencies of all variants of select variables used by each individual. Secondly, we use a qualitative and exemplary methodology to check for some speakers' idiolectal competences and variability ranges by documenting their ability to style-shift and manipulate linguistic choices depending upon situations and conversation partners.

2.4 The sociolinguistic dimension: Measuring the status of fictive characters

For a sociolinguistic investigation it is necessary to situate speakers on scales of relevant parameters. In the case of fictive characters, this is actually more problematic than with real-life informants: an investigator can neither ask nor choose. Still, it is relatively easy to situate the main characters. Essentially, five major sociolinguistic dimensions of these speakers can be observed and analyzed (although the distinctions are not always clear-cut): sex, age, urbanity, status, and religious affiliation. Categorizing them by their gender presents no problems. Their precise ages are not given, but it is possible to assign them to the main phases of life, adolescence/youth, adulthood, and old age (Chambers 2003). The rural vs. urban dimension obviously plays a most important role in the Jamaican context, and can be extracted reliably (with the slight complications that characterize real-life investigations as well: Ivan moves from the country to the city; and Maas' Natie, while being clearly a rural character, has traveled widely and has thus had exposure to urban patterns). To some extent, it is intertwined with social status. In the country, people pay respect to each other, without substantial status differences becoming discernible. In the

city, status is important, and it is most prototypically associated with Kingston districts and residential conditions, and thus, indirectly, with wealth: Trench Town, and street life there, represent the lower class, as against, for instance, Hilton's luxurious habitat in the hills. Residential district and status in general largely correlate with an individual's occupation. Other conventional indicators of social class operate less successfully in this context: Education, for instance, fails to correlate with status differences, because with few exceptions the educational achievements of all characters are slight (and frequently resulting from association with the church), and any differences are hard to determine. Poverty and wealth serve as class indicators, though income does so only partially (as in the case of the ganja traders, who are relatively well off at times while not rising in status by that occupation). Finally, a person's religious orientation may influence their linguistic behavior – most obviously in the form of Rasta Talk (Pollard 1983; Roberts 1988: 36–44) but also in the form of some biblical language and through the security and status conferred by Preacher's community.

Table 1 outlines the most important social characteristics of the fourteen main characters to the extent that they can be relatively clearly categorized.

Putting aside gender and age for separate investigation, we hypothesize that the following social status groups can be established on account of their internal cohesiveness and similarities, with speakers assigned to them as indicated:

- Urban, high: Preacher (PR), Ray Jones (RJ), Hilton (H)
- Urban, middle: Elsa (E), Longah (L)
- Urban, low: Bogart (B), Jose (J), Ivan (I)
- Urban, low, Rasta: Pedro (PE), Ras' Sufferah (RS)
- Rural: Miss 'Mando (MM), Maas' Nattie (MN), Joe Beck (JB), Mirriam (M)

In Ivan's case, placing him with the urban rather than the rural speakers is justified by the fact that the majority of the novel is devoted to his urban years, and even during most of his boyhood days his orientation is strongly targeted toward the city, giving him a determined urban identity overall. The Rastafarians can be regarded as a sub-group of the low-status urban males. Preacher, Ray Jones and Hilton, despite all differences in their lifestyles, enjoy high-status positions in the city and economic security or prosperity. Elsa and Longah are both poor but economically safe through their association with Preacher's church (in Elsa's case at least as long as it lasts), and they are both also linguistically exposed to the more formal language that comes with Preacher and

Table 1. Social characteristics of the main characters

Character	sex	age	occupation	orientation/ background	possession/ status	religious orientation
Ivan (I)	M	boy – adoles cent – young man	country boy; unemployed; ganja trader	boy: rural; urban	poor	
Miss' Mando (MM)	F	old	farmer	rural	small landowner, respected	Christian
Maas' Nattie (MN)	M	old	tailor, farmer	rural; traveled	some wealth, respected	Christian
Joe Beck (JB)	M	adult	butcher	rural	poor, respected	Christian
Mirriam (M)	F	adolescent girl		rural		
Ras' Sufferah (RS)	M	adult	none	urban	very poor	Rastafarian
Pedro (PE)	M	ca. 30?	ganja cutter & trader	urban	poor	Rastafarian
Jose (J)	M	young man	ganja trader	urban	well off	
Bogart (B)	M	young	mechanic's apprentice	urban	poor	
Longah (L)	M	adult	house helper	urban	poor	
Elsa (E)	F	young		urban	poor	strong Christian
Hilton (H)	M	adult	music producer	urban	rich, high	
Ray Jones (RJ)	M	adult	police officer	urban	secure, high	
Preacher (PR)	M	adult	pastor	urban	controls foreign money	strong Christian

life in the church community. The rural group comprises different age ranges and displays but insignificant status differences: people vary in the amount of their properties, but they all lead economically secure lives, and neither the extreme poverty nor the exceptional wealth found among the urbans are realities of country life.

Our hypothesis implies that there should be some degree of correlation between these status groups and the amount of basilectal vs. acrolectal forms in their speech samples. The characters in the novel can be regarded as portraits of speakers, with – if only fictional – sociolinguistic identities, which should cor

respond to their – fictional – language use. If Thelwell's picture of the Jamaican speech continuum resembles reality, then the speakers' social and educational status should match their position on the continuum relative to each other. Therefore, we examine differences between the characters' speech patterns in terms of occurrences and frequencies of basilectal and acrolectal, sometimes also mesolectal, forms.

2.5 The space of variation: Features investigated

The selection criteria for linguistic features were simple and obvious. The features to be investigated had to be salient elements of the Jamaican basilect, the creole, but also rewarding with respect to the continuum situation, i.e. showing variants between the basilect (JC) and the acrolect (StE). They had to be frequent enough in the dialogue passages of the novel to allow a quantitative analysis, and they had to show variation in the novel. Last but not least, they had to be recognizable and distinguishable in the written medium of the novel: Obviously, phonological features can only be investigated insofar as they are represented by spelling, a criterion which excludes, for instance, suprasegmental phenomena such as tone and pitch.[6]

It is clear that morphosyntactic features are much more rewarding for our analysis (cf. Holton 1984:58; Ives 1971:171), since grammar is the language level where distinctively creole structures show most strikingly. The focus on grammar is justified by Cassidy (1961:49):

> The most striking differences between the folk speech of Jamaica and the educated speech are not in the sounds, still less in the vocabulary – they are in the grammar, the functional patterns into which the words fall.

Given Thelwell's emphasis on local culture, it is not surprising that there is also much local vocabulary of interest in the novel. However, we have not studied the lexicon because this level lends itself less to the application of a variationist methodology: It is difficult to establish semantic synonymy, a prerequisite for regarding forms as variants of a variable, and in relatively small text samples it

---

6. The three phonological features selected all represent consonantal variation, and all are easily and uncontroversially rendered orthographically. It is true that, as one reviewer pointed out, this would be harder for creole vowels, as their representation is not as straightforward and conventionalized. As the reviewer observed, a novelist, concerned about alienating readers through use of unfamiliar orthography, may choose to ignore Jamaican vowels as being (for the most part) harder to represent to a general readership (cf. Section 3.1).

is practically impossible to get sufficiently large frequencies of individual units for a correlational approach (cf. Ives 1971: 173).

On the basis of the above criteria, the following features were selected for analysis:

- three phonological features: final consonant deletion/cluster reduction, fricative replacement, and deletion of initial *h*-;
- three features of verb morphology: marking of the past/anterior, marking of the progressive aspect, and forms of the 3rd person singular present;
- two features of verb syntax: the forms of the copula (corresponding to StE *to be*); and negation (especially the forms of the negator);
- two features of noun morphology: pluralization and possessive marking;
- the forms of six (personal) pronouns, namely those of the 1st person singular, 1st person plural, 2nd person singular, 2nd person plural, 3rd person singular masculine, and 3rd person plural.

The following tables are designed to allow a summary evaluation of the data distributions by speaker, focusing upon the basilectal variants (with their lectal categorization and variants discussed in the accompanying text) and displaying the percentage of these forms out of the sum total of all potential tokens of the respective variable. In other words, a figure of 100 would indicate that the respective speaker uses the creole variant consistently and without exception, 50 means the s/he uses it half of the time, and so on.

3.   Sociolinguistic correlations: Quantitative analysis

3.1 Phonological variables

Dialectal pronunciation features are usually "suggested by systematic variations from the conventional orthography, or 'phonetic' re-spelling" (Ives 1971: 147). The representation of real dialect pronunciations must not be confused with the literary device of "eye dialect" (Bowdre 1971: 181), quasi-phonetic spellings which suggest standard pronunciations rather than any social or regional dialect features (cf. Holton 1984: 58). Also, the interpretation of the intended phonetic value of certain orthographic symbols may pose a problem (cf. Schneider 2002: 88–89). In addition, creole societies mostly lack accepted transliteration conventions. For JamC, Cassidy and LePage (1961: 22–23) devised a phonemic spelling system, which they used in their *Dictionary*

of Jamaican English (DJE) (Cassidy & LePage 1980:xlv–lxiv; Patrick 1995:232) and which many have adopted since, though it has tended to remain restricted to linguistic circles. As repeated discussions have shown (Cassidy 1993:136; Meade 1996) especially the representation of vowel phonemes of JamC in writing has presented difficulties and resulted in different conventions. Unavoidably, spelling problems of this kind also trouble the West Indian writer (Holton 1984:56; LePage 1969:5–6) as well as his readers (ibid. 57), and the resulting lack of homogeneity of transcription conventions renders the analysis of phonological features difficult.

In the text under discussion, Thelwell does not adhere to any particular, established system of creole orthography but spelt his non-standard dialect passages in a way that is fairly idiosyncratic in certain respects, and primarily serves the purpose of depicting linguistic features characteristic of the respective speakers. Ultimately, it is based upon established English sound-to-grapheme correlations with some fairly consistent and well-established modifications that have become conventional in dialect writing. Table 2 analyses those phenomena which can be observed straightforwardly in Thelwell's writing (for absolute frequencies, see tables A2-1 to A2-6 in Appendix 2).

–   final consonant deletion (XVC > XV'):

The deletion of a single final consonant, as in *gi*' 'give', *le*' 'let', *wha*' 'what', *ha*' 'have', is a well-documented basilectal feature of JamC (Akers 1981:30–31). In our corpus, we find the highest deletion rates with Ivan and the Rastafarians, followed by members of the urban lower class and male rural speakers. The feature occurs not at all in Preacher's performance and at very low rates in the performance of the urban high status speakers, Hilton and Ray Jones. Its frequency is also low in the urban mid-status ranks and only slightly higher among the rural females.

Table 2. Phonology: Percentage of basilectal variants by speakers

Variant	JB	MN	MM	M	RS	PE	J	B	I	L	E	H	RJ	PR
XVC>XV'	30	24	19	18	33	28	23	31	38	17	11	9	4	0
XCC>XC'	69	81	57	73	71	88	82	87	77	43	53	64	26	14
ð > d	28	69	55	37	100	92	96	60	80	71	47	39	29	2
θ > t	31	78	19	38	88	86	68	20	79	17	27	9	23	0
h->Ø	48	17	34	26	5	41	38	30	21	31	14	9	14	0
phon total	45	56	42	48	63	70	71	49	58	44	32	33	21	4

–   consonant cluster reduction (XCC > XC')

A phonotactic rule widespread in many nonstandard varieties results in the simplification of a final consonant cluster, as in *mus'* 'must', *los'* 'lost', *lef'* 'left', *worl'* 'world', or *ol* 'old'. Overall, this occurs considerably more frequently than single consonant deletion. High frequencies can be observed among the urban lower class males and, almost to the same extent, the rural speakers. There is a fairly clear stratification between these speakers (with percentages mostly in the 60s through 80s), the middle-stratum of urban characters (L and E, in the 40s and low 50s), and the high-status urban speakers (RJ and PR, in the teens and 20s). Notably, Hilton, who interacts a lot with the urban males, reduces final consonant clusters at a rate approximating theirs – clearly, this is a linguistic form employed to signal solidarity and accommodate to them linguistically.

–   fricative replacement

In the JamC basilect, the fricatives /v/, /ð/ and /θ/ are commonly replaced by the homorganic stops /b/, /d/ and /t/, respectively (cf. Akers 1981:33; D'Costa 1984b:138), a feature which can also be readily rendered in writing. Thelwell employs this process with the two dental variants (which are listed separately in the table), e.g. *tink*, *tief*, *somet'ing*; *dis*, *dem*, *breddah*, but not at all with the labiodental consonants. It can be observed more frequently with voiced than with voiceless consonants. The most basilectal forms occur among the Rastas and some of the urban low-status young males. The rural speakers are divided with respect to this feature (JB ranks relatively high but MN rather low). In general, a fine stratification roughly along status lines can be observed.

–   initial *h-*

The dropping of word-initial *h-* is another basilectal feature, one which is considered largely characteristic of Jamaica within the Caribbean (Roberts 1988:90; cf. Akers 1981:32; Cassidy 1961:36). In our sample, this is another basilectal feature which Preacher does not use at all and the high-status speakers show only rarely. High values to be observed with Jose, Bogart and Pedro appear to confirm a status correlation, but in this case also much idiosyncratic variation can be observed, with Joe Beck and Miss 'Mando using *h*-dropping quite frequently and Ras' Sufferah very rarely. Incidentally, the opposite process is also documented in JamC, though less frequently: initial *h-* can be attached to vowel-initial words in English (LePage 1957:383). Thelwell uses hypercorrect *h-* only once, viz. in an utterance by Longah (p. 232: *Hi* 'I').

The last line of Table 2 summarizes the characters' overall propensity to use basilectal phonological features, based upon the above variants. Overall, the distribution concurs fairly neatly with our hypothesis and with comparable sociolinguistic class stratifications: A strongly basilectal phonology characterizes the Rastafarians and, in general, the poor urban males, and also, to a slightly lesser extent, the rural speakers. In contrast, the urban high-status speakers are positioned close to the acrolectal end: Hilton less so than Ray Jones, and Preacher, in particular, is a largely acrolectal speaker. In line with his status and background, Longah's values are intermediate between those of the high and low status groups. The same applies to Elsa, whose values, like Hilton's, reflect the intermediate stance resulting from contact with speakers at both ends of the social cline. Both in the urban and in the rural context the phonology of the females is portrayed as relatively less basilectal than that of their male counterparts. The overall quantitative stratification is rather finely graded. Altogether, this appears a highly realistic picture in many respects.

3.2 Verb morphology and syntax

Morphological and syntactic features are usually rendered more easily and more reliably in writing than phonetic details (Schneider 2002), and sociolinguistic research has shown them to display sharp rather than fine stratification patterns. On both counts, therefore, literary dialect can be expected to reflect variable usage even more reliably here than on the phonological level. Let us see whether this prediction is borne out by the data. Table 3 documents the proportions of select forms from the domains of tense and aspect marking, copula use, and negation, all core elements of creole grammar (cf. Tables A2-7 to A2-13 in the appendix).

– Third person singular verb inflection

Creole verbs are said to have no inflectional endings (Holm 1988, 1: 148) – so it is not surprising that there are very few traces of any verbal inflection in the corpus, and those that do occur fully concur with the expectations based upon the speakers' fictive biographies. All of the rural speakers and all but one (PE) members of the lower-class urban group are fully creole, with invariant present tense verbs, in that respect. Conversely, the urban speakers with a mid- or upper orientation display some interference from the English verb morphology – very rarely, but still, with the middle group, slightly higher with those of the up-

Table 3. Verb morphology and syntax: Percentage of basilectal and mesolectal variants, respectively, by speakers

Variant	JB	MN	MM	M	RS	PE	J	B	I	L	E	H	RJ	PR
-Ø 3rd sg	100	100	100	100	100	91	100	100	100	94	93	75	64	0
Ø past	92	75	95	88	100	96	98	98	86	96	80	69	64	0
did V	5	14	5	13	0	4	2	2	9	4	2	0	0	0
a/da/de V	64	23	5	50	33	48	53	91	22	19	8	0	0	0
Ø V*in'*	27	58	85	50	33	52	47	9	60	63	75	100	68	39
cop. *a*/Ø _N	30	22	38	0	n.d.	38	33	21	46	10	13	11	10	7
cop. Ø _Adj	68	55	65	71	83	77	86	88	76	88	75	80	48	8
cop. *de*/Ø _loc	100	33	100	71	67	67	79	80	71	43	33	57	14	0
no/nah V	23	45	14	33	83	50	57	40	34	4	25	0	12	0
duon V	31	0	18	33	0	33	35	13	33	25	21	41	39	6
neba V	8	24	32	0	17	8	3	0	12	21	15	3	0	0

per echelons of society. Only Preacher seems fully acrolectal in this particular respect, but his token number is too low to justify a stronger interpretation.

– Past / anterior marking

JamC has the form *(b)en* as a basilectal preverbal marker of anterior time, i.e. time reference to a point in time before the time in focus (Alleyne 1980: 12; Holm 1994: 373–4; Mufwene 1983: 157; Taylor 1977: 180, 189), but Thelwell's characters do not use this form.[7] Its counterpart *did*, identified by Craig (1978: 606) as distinctly mesolectal and resulting from the "calquing of a creole item by an item used differently in Standard English",[8] is used: relatively more frequently by the rural speakers and occasionally by the lower class urban dwellers, but not at all by the high-status urban speakers – a sharp stratification. The distribution suggests that it is not Thelwell's intention to render the deep rural basilect, perhaps in the interest of retaining readability for a wider audience (Thelwell 1991).

On the other hand, mesolectal JamC is reflected commonly by the lack of morphological past marking, a form which is customary in this function especially with non-stative verbs (Holm 1994: 373). As mentioned above, only full verbs are included here. Unmarked verb forms have been assigned to either

7. One of the anonymous reviewers of the paper pointed out that this lack of the form *(b)en* may reflect the fact that it is not only basilectal but even archaic.

8. This interpretation has been challenged, however: Winford suggests that *did* is not a calque on *ben* but was part of creole usage from early on (p.c.).

present or past by means of context. Acrolectal variants in the tables include both inflected and irregular past forms (such as *went*). Zero past verb forms are near-categorical with the lower-class urban speakers, including the Rastafarians, and almost so with the rural and middle-status urban speakers (with Ivan and Maas' Nattie as well as the young females having values slightly below their respective group averages). The wealthy urban speakers Hilton and Ray Jones use an uninflected verb about two thirds of the time and an inflected verb form in about a third of all instances. Preacher is fully acrolectal in all of his 8 tokens.

– Progressive / continuative aspect marking

In addition to the StE marking of the progressive by a form of *to be* and an *-ing* form of the full verb, the JamC continuum provides two nonstandard ways of expressing this category: a basilectal preverbal aspect marker *de*, *da* or *a* (cf. Alleyne 1980:11; Cassidy 1961:58–9; DeCamp 1971b:357; Holm 1994:374–5; LePage 1957:387; Schneider 1990:90; Taylor 1977:181, 185) and a mesolectal construction with a zero copula and *Vin'* (Craig 1978:606–7; Holm 1994:375). A mixed type "*a* + V-*ing*", also considered mesolectal, occurs less commonly and is not attested in our corpus.

Thelwell uses three formal types which can be clearly assigned to the ranges of the creole continuum to mark the continuative: mostly *a* or *da* and occasionally *de* (3 instances) in the basilect; a verbal *-ing* form (without an overt copula and with an alveolar coda suggested by *-in'*) in the mesolect; and, rarely, also an acrolectal construction with a form of *to be* and *Ving/Vin'*. Toward the upper end of the cline, the three upper-class speakers do not use the creole preverbal marker at all (again, this confirms the tendency for grammatical patterns to show sharp stratification), and vary in their respective proportions of mesolectal *Vin'* (which occurs all the time with Hilton, more than two thirds of the time with Ray Jones, and in about one third of all instances with Preacher), the remainder being reserved to English constructions with a copula. Longah and Elsa, the two intermediate-status characters, use the mesolectal forms predominantly, with some basilectal and acrolectal variants occurring with both of them. The same pattern applies to Ivan, his rural grandmother Miss 'Mando, and, less strongly, her old friend Maas' Nattie. With the other speakers considerable variation can be observed. Only Bogart is an almost exclusive user of the basilectal variant of this variable, and in Joe Beck's speech it also predominates. The Rastas, Jose and Mirriam use the basilectal and the mesolectal options about equally frequently. Overall, the distribution of basilectal, mesolectal

and acrolectal structures correlates quite neatly, with some idiolectal variability, with the social cline.

– copula forms

It is characteristic of Caribbean creoles, including JamC, that copula forms vary according to four distinct functions (Bailey 1966: 32–3; Cassidy 1961: 59; Holm 1994: 377–8; LePage 1957: 388; Taylor 1977: 185): before adjectives (where the lack of an overt copula supports the analysis of adjectives as equivalent to stative verbs); before predicate nouns (in JamC typically the form *a*, which, however, may also be deleted); before locatives (typically with a copula *de*, which, following Bailey 1966: 82, may also be deleted unless the locative constituent is a simple adverb); and as a topicalizer, highlighting the following constituent as the focus of discourse. The latter function, which does occur in Thelwell's novel in the form *is*, will not be analyzed here, as it fails to lend itself to quantification: no potential envelope of variation can be precisely delimited. The breakdown of the other copular forms in Thelwell's characters confirms that several facts known about JamC grammar are represented accurately: Whereas there is a strong tendency for adjectives to be used like verbs, without a copula, prenominal constructions tend to have some copula form, and the same, though less restricted in scope, applies to a copula before locatives. For prenominal and pre-locative forms Table 3 lists only the cumulative figures of the basilectal variants (*a*/Ø and *de*/Ø, respectively); an accurate breakdown is available in the appendix.

For the preadjectival copula forms, the distribution shows the poor urban males in the lead, but also a few surprising distributions. While Preacher is confirmed as an almost fully acrolectal speaker and Ray Jones also has fewer basilectal forms than all the others, Hilton uses a zero copula in this function very frequently, and so do Longah and both girls, Elsa and Mirriam; on the other hand, the frequency of preadjectival zero is relatively but consistently lower with the older rural persons (JB, MN and MM).

Prenominal *a* is relatively rare: half of all characters use it, but only three (I, PE, JB) do so repeatedly. Basilectal prenominal copula forms are used by urban lower class males as well as rural speakers (except M) about two or three times more frequently than by the middle or upper group of urban representatives.

On the other hand, before locatives both *de* and zero occur with about equal frequency, with no principle of distribution discernible. Again, Preacher is fully acrolectal, and Ray Jones comes close, while Hilton uses zero relatively more frequently. Among the rural speakers, in this area of grammar two (JB

and MM) are fully basilectal, and Mirriam is considerably more so than Elsa, her urban age and gender cohort, so locative *de* appears to be used predominantly as a rural form. The urban males and Rastas show a grammar in which basilectal choices predominate but acrolectal ones can also be observed. Maas' Nattie is relatively high up this scale; whether this may be taken to reflect his earlier travel experiences is difficult to say.

– negation

Basilectal full verb negation in JamC operates by a negative particle which immediately precedes the predicate (Holm 1994:380; Mittelsdorf 1981:137; Taylor 1977:183), with a choice between three forms in that function between which there is a slight functional differentiation but no sociostylistic difference. The negator *no* (with a formal variant *na/nah*) is usually described as "universal" (Bailey 1966:54). The use of *duon* seems restricted to certain predicates (psychic state verbs or habitual actions according to Bailey 1966:54; adjectives, *Ving* forms, stative and habitual verbs following Roberts 1991:298). Finally, *neba* usually occurs with non-state verbs in the past (Bailey 1966:54; Roberts 1991:299).

All three forms are used by Thelwell's characters, to varying extents. Much variability prevails amongst the rural speakers – all three basilectal variants plus their acrolectal counterpart can be observed, with some idiosyncratic differences. At the other end of the cline, Preacher is again almost fully acrolectal (except for one token of *duon*). Hilton also does not use preverbal *no*, but otherwise the urban high and mid-status groups show some creole impact (most frequently the form *duon*, and also *neba*; Elsa, on the other hand, as the only speaker in this group displays relatively more instances of *no*) in addition to their quantitatively dominant acrolectal choices. The urban lower-class males (and even more strongly the Rastafarians) show a relatively stronger creole component, esp. with respect to the frequency of the preverbal *no/nah* pattern.

3.3 Noun morphology

Table 4 summarizes the non-acrolectal plural and possessive forms of nouns.

– plural formation

The basilectal postnominal plural marker *-dem* is quite clearly class-stratified: Lower-class speakers, both rural and urban, use it quite freely, while it is used less commonly by the mid-status speakers and only occasionally by the high-status characters, except Preacher, who does not use it at all (his entire noun

Table 4. Noun morphology: Percentage of basilectal and mesolectal variants by speakers

Variant	JB	MN	MM	M	RS	PE	J	B	I	L	E	H	RJ	PR
Pl: *dem*	42	28	28	42	43	39	28	40	24	22	26	5	3	0
Pl: -Ø	50	28	52	50	43	26	37	27	32	0	22	18	6	0
Pl: -*s* + *dem*	12	2	0	0	7	0	5	0	6	0	0	0	3	0
Ø poss	50	83	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	75	0	100	0

morphology is acrolectal without exception). The zero plural is similarly distributed, being most common in the rural context. A mixed form of redundant, hypercorrect pluralization, consisting of both -*s* and -*dem* and considered mesolectal (Cassidy 1961:52; Hellinger 1985:179–80), can be found in the speech of six out of fourteen characters, on different positions of the continuum.

– possessive marking

In JamC possession is normally expressed by juxtaposition of possessor and possessed rather than inflection (Alleyne 1980:13; Bailey 1966:98; Cassidy 1961:52; Holm 1994:379). This is also reflected in the corpus, with an almost categorical distribution: All urban poor males and Rastas, and also Ray Jones, are fully creole in this respect, while Preacher and Hilton are fully acrolectal; Elsa and the two male rural speakers are the only ones to show some variation. The less frequent basilectal variant of postnominal *fi* + possessor (Bailey 1966:98; Mittelsdorf 1981:112; Schneider 1990:92, Table 4) is not used by Thelwell.

3.4 Pronoun morphology

An "ideal" basilectal pronoun system of JamC is reported to do away with case and gender distinctions, thus consisting of only the six forms *mi*, *yu*, *im*, *wi*, *unu*, and *dem* (Bailey 1966:22–3; Cassidy 1961:55; Holm 1994:379). On the other hand, a mixed pronoun inventory prevails along the creole continuum. Table 5 breaks down those contexts in which Thelwell's corpus yields sufficient data for a frequency analysis; further grammatical persons are discussed in the text below.

In the first person singular subject function, the acrolectal form *Ah/I* predominates quite clearly, being categorical with the high-status and near-categorical with the mid-status speakers; conversely, only two characters have

Table 5. Pronoun morphology: Percentage of basilectal variants by speakers

Variant	JB	MN	MM	M	RS	PE	J	B	I	L	E	H	RJ	PR
me 1sg Subj	19	18	0	43	56	21	21	20	20	7	3	0	0	0
Ah 1sg Obj	0	0	0	0	29	27	18	0	4	0	0	4	7	0
me 1sg poss	100	91	100	100	45	74	50	50	79	80	81	67	13	0
you 2sg poss	100	97	100	100	n.d.	80	63	100	83	50	92	33	21	5
unu 2pl S	20	0	33	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	50	n.d.	60	33	33	57	62	n.d.
(h)im 3sg S	100	100	100	100	100	97	100	100	100	98	86	50	100	0
dem/them 3 pl S	100	94	100	100	100	95	97	100	97	100	100	91	100	0

subject *me* to some extent, with about half of their tokens. The grammatically opposite process, using *Ah* in object function, represents distinctively Rastafarian usage, picked up occasionally by Jose and Ivan but not used at all in the country and, with isolated exceptions which may be cases of hypercorrection, by mid- and high-status urban speakers. In the possessive function, the form *me* is near-categorical with rural speakers and highly frequent with all others except for the acrolectal end of the continuum, where Ray Jones uses it rarely and Preacher not at all.

In the first person plural, the data sample is too small to permit any serious quantifications, but a few qualitative observations are possible. As the object form, basilectal *we* predominates over *us*, and it shows some class stratification: it is the only form found with Pedro (9 instances), Bogart (3), Jose (2), and Longah (2), and the predominant one with Ivan (7 instances, as against 3 of *us*) and Maas' Nattie (6 to 1). Conversely, *us* is used as the only variant by Hilton (twice) and Mirriam (once), and Elsa has one occurrence of each of these options. As a possessive determiner, only Pedro uses the basilectal and invariant form *we* (2); all other speakers (for whom there is any evidence) have standard *our* (MN, I, J, B, E, H, RJ; only 11 examples altogether).

Figures for the second person singular exclude set phrases such as *thank you* or *you raas*, *you* in the indefinite sense of 'one', and tags such as *y'know*. The subject and object forms are consistently *you*, with one remarkable exception: There are two singular uses of *unu* (listed as a basilectal option by Alsopp 1996 but otherwise not pointed out in the literature) by Jose: when a boy pokes fun at him because he is said to be afraid of Ivan, Jose answers:

> Laugh, ... Unu laugh man. Go on. Hey, I may not fin' Rhygin, but I mark *your* face, y'know, breddah. Rhygin soon gone, but Jose is here fe evah ... wait, why unu stop laugh? (p. 361)

The variants of the possessive determiner, shown in the table, are clearly class-stratified. Basilectal *you* is wholly or nearly categorical in the country and also very frequently used by the urban lower class and Elsa but neatly stratified in the mesolectal range toward the acrolectal end (L 50%, H 33%, RJ 21%, PR 5%).

In the second person plural, the African-derived, basilectal form *unu* is reasonably well documented, but any attempt at a systematic stratificational analysis suffers from limited documentation. A quantification is possible for subject occurrences, and it yields surprisingly high values of this form with upper mesolectal speakers (H, RJ) and surprisingly low values of the rural speakers. As an object, *unu* is used by Pedro (twice), Maas' Nattie (3), Joe Beck (1), Hilton (1), Ray Jones (3) and Jose (4), and the latter two also show a few occurrences in possessive function. Hence, *unu* seems typical primarily of lower mesolectal speakers, but higher mesolectal speakers use it too, apparently to accommodate linguistically to lower-class speakers when it suits their purposes.

The acrolectal third person singular masculine pronoun *he* is extremely rare in the data: Preacher is the only one to use it consistently, thus, again, proving himself an acrolectal speaker, and Hilton and Elsa (but not RJ) show some intrusion of this form into the upper mesolectal speech ranges; but generally *im* / *him* (taken to be phonetic variants of the same pronoun type) predominates almost exclusively, not only in the basilectal but high up into mesolectal styles. The object form, not surprisingly, is always *im* or *him*. The basilectal form *im* / *him* also predominates as the possessive; acrolectal *his* comes up just a few times as a minority option (and, again, as Preacher's only form).

In the third person plural, the distributional pattern is about the same as in the previous case: The basilectal form predominates all the way up the sociostylistic continuum. Again, Preacher's speech is fully acrolectal, showing *they* / *dey* and *their*. In the possessive, his three attestations are the only acrolectal forms in the corpus (possessive *dem* / *them* is documented with MN, RS, PE, J, B, E and H, 12 times overall). In subject function, five more speakers show a single example of *dey* / *they* each, but *dem* / *them* is the norm.

3.5 Grammar summary

Table 6 provides a summary evaluation of the amount and proportion of basilectal tokens chosen by each of the speakers across all grammatical variables. Overall, the grammar of the lower-class and rural speakers displays basilectal options in about two thirds or slightly more of all possible instances.

Table 6. Grammar, total: proportion of basilectal tokens by speaker

Variant	JB	MN	MM	M	RS	PE	J	B	I	L	E	H	RJ	PR
n (tokens)	254	393	223	123	100	406	639	236	1020	373	571	343	446	193
% basilect	73	57	64	71	75	70	69	77	57	61	52	38	33	3

The Rastafarians and the urban young lower class males have the most basilectal grammar (except for Ivan). The rural speakers come close, although the two older ones amongst them, interestingly enough, have slightly lower basilectal proportions. The mid-status speakers are in an intermediate position indeed, with both of them, however, leaning toward different directions – Longah down the scale, Elsa up, with about half of all choices being basilectal forms. On the other hand, the difference to the few high-status speakers is impressively confirmed. Hilton and Ray Jones, the two powerful urban speakers, command and use basilectal forms, but considerably less frequently than the others, roughly about a third of the time. Preacher is different from all the others, being largely an acrolectal speaker with very few basilectal insertions.

When we compare this table with the last line of Table 2, the summary evaluation of phonology, far-reaching parallels are obvious. The mutual rank positions of the individuals are largely the same, and in general the class stratification of the various groups along the lines of our initial hypothesis has been confirmed convincingly on both levels of language organization. Preacher's acrolectal performance and the upper-mesolectal speech of the high-status males is fully confirmed. Some speakers have highly similar percentages of basilectal choices. Others, however, align themselves relatively more upwardly in terms of their pronunciation but display a relatively more basilectal grammar; this applies to Joe Beck, the rural females Miss 'Mando and Mirriam, Bogart, and the urban mixed-status pair, Longah and Elsa.

Also, it is noteworthy that different stratification types can be observed when looking at the phonology and grammar tables, something which also conforms largely to the findings of many sociolinguistic investigations. Phonological phenomena tend to display "fine stratification": frequency values increase gradually across contexts, with no sharp break anywhere (as in the cases of final consonant deletion, consonant cluster simplification, fricative replacement). With grammatical phenomena, on the other hand, "sharp stratification" can be found, as most clearly in the cases of the preverbal past and progressive markers and with very few exceptions in several other instances as well: Two distinct groups tend to use distinct forms, with little overlap and little

transition in terms of frequencies – a fairly sharp linguistic break separates one social group from another.

4.   Idiolectal competence and style-shifting: Qualitative analysis

4.1   Background and hypothesis

Speakers in a creole continuum not only differ from each other in their performances, but they also vary to a greater or lesser extent within their individual usage, depending on the breadth of their command of different styles, the social context of the respective speech act, and the identity of their dialogue partners. Each Jamaican speaker commands a certain span of the continuum (DeCamp 1971a:26), and Winford states that "higher status speakers tend to display much bigger differences between styles than lower status ones" (1991:576). The purpose of this section is to see whether this fact is also represented in Thelwell's linguistic portraits, and we will find that it is indeed. He is not the only Caribbean author to do so. Bernhardt (1983) has conducted research along similar lines on the fiction of the Trinidadian writer Samuel Selvon. One of his results is that

> in his novels and short stories, Selvon adroitly presents characters who style shift across a range of the dialect continuum, depending on the social constraints of the varying situations in which they find themselves. Not all of his characters, of course, are shown to be competent style shifters.
>
> (Bernhardt 1983:266)

This confirms that the phenomenon of an author commanding a pan-lectal competence is not an idiosyncrasy of the case studied here. Bernhardt goes on to "describe the speech patterns of several of Selvon's characters in order to indicate the range of linguistic variation which can be found in his fiction" (ibid. 267). Thelwell's characters show a similarly differentiated linguistic behavior, depending on the personal background Thelwell has given them. In line with Winford's observation, the lower the characters' socio-economic status, the more basilectal is their linguistic usage, and the less control they have over acrolectal (StE) variants – and, consequently, the more restricted is their ability to adjust their speech behavior according to context.

Our documentation in this section is based upon the notion of linguistic accommodation of a speaker to the addressee, i.e. we expect different styles to be used by the same speaker when talking to different people with different sta-

tus ranks. We focus upon select characters, and choose a qualitative, exemplary mode of documenting the stylistic range commanded by these speakers, citing samples of their linguistic adjustments made towards different interlocutors.

If Thelwell's representation of intra-speaker variation is accurate, then, in the light of the above statements, we should expect the higher-status, more acrolectal, speakers to show a higher degree of ability to style-shift. Except for Preacher, whose position at the acrolectal end of the continuum is somewhat isolated and who does not interact with the others on seemingly equal terms, this is indeed what we find. Hilton and Ray Jones are wealthy and influential, but because of their professions they regularly interact with hustlers, ganja traders, and members of the local underclass. In fact, their professional success depends to some extent upon their ability to communicate successfully with these people, and hence to accommodate to them. Style-shifting among the middle and lower-class representatives is less prevalent but always, as we will show, accords with their (fictional) biographical backgrounds.

4.2 Hilton

Hilton associates with members of all other social groups, and uses their language. Consequently, his command of styles ranges from the language of the very poor to nearly StE, and he consistently code-switches according to speech situation, dialogue partner and also his emotional state. For example, when talking to the American tourist he spent the night with (pp. 238–44), he approaches her level of standardness several times, as in (1):

(1)   I'm a businessman. The country needs me. I provide jobs an' investment. I gotta protect my property and life, eh? (241)

or, when referring to his house maid in (2):

(2)   The girl is good. I trained her myself. When she came to me fresh from her mountain she barely knew a knife from a fork. (242)

Obviously, he wants to appear cultivated and well-educated, given that his new acquaintance is a teacher (p. 243). But in between this conversation, when talking aside, as it were, to his house maid, his language becomes mesolectal (with a preadjectival zero copula, the subject pronoun *dem* with fricative replacement, and pronominal apposition, although he retains a genitive marker):

(3)   The lady's clothes, dem ready? ... Bring dem nuh. (239)

When he talks to Ray Jones about catching Ivan (pp. 369–71), he first keeps his language in a fairly intermediate mesolectal range (with a zero copula, a topicalizer *is* and a plural marker *dem* but also acrolectal elements like a copula *'s* and a verbal *-s* in the third singular):

(4)   Come on Jones ... Is jus' another little dutty criminal you going to ketch anyway. What's de big deal? So de record gets de sufferah dem a little excited – so what? (370)

However, when he gets very emotional towards the end of the conversation, his speech adopts a higher density of basilectal variants (including the pronoun *unu*):

(5)   First' unu mek de bwai turn unu fool. Den you so 'fraid for 'im you ban de record. Now, you out to shut down ganja trade. ... What you t'ink dem going' to do, eh? When white rum full up dem head an' wind full up dem belly, an' reggae lock down an' dem see de police fartin' in de wind, eh? (371)

4.3 Ray Jones

Ray Jones code-shifts along a fairly wide range of the creole continuum. For example, on pp. 366–72 he talks to the Commissioner, the little "dutty criminal" Sidney, Hilton, and Jose in turn, and adjusts to each of these. Extracts from these passages can be compared for contrast:

To the Commissioner (formal and fully standard):

(6)   Mr. Commissioner, with all due respect, sir. It sounds as if I'm being put in a position of having to deny that again sir. ... Of course, there are rings of informers drawn, of necessity, from the criminal element, but this Rhygin was never among them. ... Then sir, I propose you say to the Minister that it'd be disastrous for the morale of the men and ultimately for law enforcement. (366)

To Sidney (rather basilectal, including the pronouns *unu* and *'im*, zero copula, the topicalizer *is* and the clausal marker *fe*, as well as several pronunciation features):

(7)   Den why de raas unu hiding him for? Eh? Unu t'ink 'im smarter dan me because 'im have a hundred place fe hide an' I doan catch 'im? Is not because 'im smart I can' fin' 'im you know? Is because *unu* fool. *Unu* traders stupid. (368)

To Hilton (a mesolectal mixture, including both a standard negation with *didn'*, the pronoun *I*, and the pronunciation *boy* rather than *bwai*, but also zero past, the complementizer *say*, zero genitive, and other creole elements):

(8) I know you didn' come her to mek school boy joke, eh? ... De great Boysie Hilton, in police station? I figure say Sheraton burn down, or is could be police protection him looking? Wha' happen, you 'fraid Rhygin come colleck fe 'im record? (370)

To Jose (a distancing upper mesolectal style, with plural *-s* and both *was* and zero as copula):

(9) Stop you whining. When you was out you was too damn busy running from Rhygin to control nutten. ... But you lucky, damn lucky I suffer fools gladly. I have a job for you – nothin' dangerous, even you couden fuck it up. ... I want you to tek a message to the traders tomorrow. A simple message, nutten too complicated. Listen, I want you to tell dem ... (372)

Overall, Ray Jones' usage is fairly acrolectal when he is talking to a superior in a very official fashion; but when he is engaged in semi-official, semi-illegal operations with criminals, his language approaches their level, thus getting considerably more basilectal.

4.4 Longah

Although Longah basically can be categorized as a lower or intermediate mesolectal speaker, he has been exposed to and commands a range of styles: he is from the streets, but has been living in Preacher's mission, a largely acrolectal environment, for a considerable period of time. Accordingly, his speech, as frequently documented in the above tables, varies between lower-class and higher-status patterns. He aligns himself upwardly when talking to Preacher, his employer and, in a sense, his savior. For example, in the following extract he uses some forms one would not expect from a non-acrolectal speaker, including the copula *'s*, the pronoun *he*, a standard reflexive pronoun, and the negator *don't*, and, most tellingly, a hypercorrect word-initial *h-* in the first person pronoun. When Preacher asks him about Ivan's whereabouts, he answers:

(10) Hi don't know Preacha. Maybe he's gone for a cruise on his bike, sah. Gone ride out and sport himself. (232)

When he talks to other people, his language is more basilectal, as in the following extract (which shows uninflected verb usage, zero copula, the prenominal copula *a*, or an uninverted interrogative, though it still retains a plural *-s*), where he is about to fight with Ivan:

(11)   Dis a no joke. Dis bicycle belong to Preacher. Where you buy this bicycle dat you claiming? ... Preacha say if you come on yah, you trespassin' an' I mus' put you off de place. Him say to use any means necessary. Ah goin' beat your blood-claat. (256)

4.5 Elsa

Elsa's thorough education in Preacher's mission explains her higher mesolectal position relative to the other characters and her ability to style-shift. On p. 278, for example, she talks to Hilton, using a mixture of acrolectal and basilectal forms (fricative /ð/, plural *-s*, a past-marked verb, the standard subject pronouns *I* and *he*, and a fairly elaborate syntax, but also uninflected verb forms, the possessive pronoun *'im* and zero copula):

(12)   No, Mr. Hilton, ... is only a message I have for you, sir – from Ivan. ... Ivan *say* to tell you, sah, that 'im mother dead in the country and he had to go. But he said he will have two good tunes for you when he return.

However, she not only commands fairly formal language when it suits her purposes, but she also can use relatively basilectal variants; for example when she retorts to other girls who gossip about her relationship with Ivan (pronouns *unu* and possessive *you*, lack of article):

(13)   You can all stop you giggling and signifying. Unu too have bad mind for you own good. (221)

or to one of the policemen who search and destroy her room and threaten her (e.g. clausal marker *fe*, negator *no*, possessive *him*):

(14)   Yes, ... you ha' strength fe box up woman. Why you no go box Rhygin? Go put you han' inna *him* face, nuh? (383)

Similarly to Ivan, her language seems to change slightly over time as the story unfolds, alongside her change of socioeconomic status, from a sheltered life in Preacher's mission to the decline that goes with her life with Ivan. For instance, when she talks to Ivan in the beginning she uses *th-* but switches to *d-* later on,

and generally creole variants are more frequent in her speech later in the novel. The change can be documented by comparing her speech, predominantly her pronunciation, in different conversations with Preacher: Of the following extracts, (15) represents her early days when she is still fully part of Preacher's world, and (16) stems from an encounter with Preacher late in the novel, long after having left him. In (15), she uses the fricative *th-* consistently, in addition to acrolectal past tense forms and only one instance of consonant cluster reduction; in (16), she uses basilectal *d-*, several tokens of reduced consonant clusters and also an omission of a word-final single consonant, as well as *doan* and *fe*.

(15)   Anything else, sah? ... ah jus' thought maybe you wanted to see him, sah. ... Is that you think of me Preacher? *That*? (219–220)

(16)   Cho forget dat, ... Read dis – an' copy it in ink and den sign it. ... You doan ha' fe understan'. Jus' copy it – in ink. (387–8)

4.6 Maas' Nattie

Maas' Nattie is a character whose lower mesolectal usage is quite sufficient for his daily needs. However, he commands a wider stylistic range than other rural speakers (Joe Beck, for example), presumably due to his external linguistic exposure during the years he was traveling off the island. Example (17) illustrates his relaxed speech, with a wide range of creole elements (*bwai*, copula *a*, possessive *you*, pluralizer *dem*, invariant relativizer *whe'*, progressive marker *a*, negator *nah*, future marker *go*, fricative replacement in *dis* or *t'ink*), when engaged in a fatherly conversation with young Ivan:

(17)   Bwai – you a somebody. You come from some whe'. All you generation dem is right yah. ... You Granmaddah, you Granfaddah, you uncle Zekiel whe' de bull kill down a Duncans – him dey yah too. All a dem right yah. ... Now, dis place you a go – Kingston? What you know 'bout it? You t'ink say it stop yah? You a go see t'ings whe' you nah go believe. (110)

On the other hand, in (18), when holding a speech at Miss 'Mando's funeral, in addition to several creole features (like invariant verb forms, non-subject *we*, *unu*) he uses some features of relatively more formal language (including second plural *you*, complementizer *dat*, fricatives in *the* and *these*, inflected superlatives, plural *-s*):

(18)   You all know dat our dear departed sister was very dear to mi soul – to all a we. ... Before she go, she leave me wid two las' wish. She say dat she want a big funeral, an' praise be to Gawd an' the love and respeck of all of unu she have dat. ... Many of unu will be too young to know dis, ... but the woman you burying was one of the *staunches'* and mos' *steadfast* and *earlies'* members of the Universal Negro Improvement Association in these parts. (87)

Especially when he greets Miss Ida, the woman who runs the café in the nearby little town and is supposed to have a city background, his language approaches the acrolect:

(19)   You are welcome, Missis, to join us in our last farewells to our beloved sister. (86)

The formality of this mode of addressing Ida may be a tribute to the formality of the funeral situation, or an attempt at accommodating his speech to hers, but most likely it has to be interpreted as a distancing device (as Miss Ida is not really welcome at the funeral).

4.7 Ivan

As Ivan is the protagonist, the reader accompanies him over a number of years. It is interesting to observe that his language changes over a longer period of time in some respects. On the level of pronunciation, for example, his use of fricative replacement when talking to Elsa changes from mostly /ð/ at the beginning of their acquaintance to /d/ when he is more intimate with her. This suggests that Thelwell models his characters' speech not only in accordance with their dialogue partners but also relative to variables like mood and intimacy.

When talking to Hilton, who he tries to impress and talk into a recording contract with him, Ivan displays a conscious effort at upwardly-mobile speech by using (in addition to *th-*) a hypercorrect verb form, appending a verbal *-s* suffix to a second person singular predicate:

(20)   No matter, sah, jus' the chance, once you hears ... business *mus'* tune. (249).

4.8 Jose

Jose's usage can be classified as lower mesolect, with relatively little style-shifting. Not even talking to Ray Jones, the police officer, seems an incentive to "speak up" (except, perhaps, for one token of plural *-s*); he keeps using his normal style, with several creole features (topicalizer *is*, *t'* and *d* for *th*, preposition *ina*, pluralizer *dem*, relativizer *whe'*, pronoun *dem*):

> (21)   Maas' Ray? Look nuh, sah, a little trouble. Is a funny time, sah, an' t'ings thin ina de trade ... Is one a de trader dem, sah – yes sah, de one whe' work wid Ras Pedro ... Dem call 'im Rhygin. (339)

Extract (22) illustrates his most successful attempt at style-shifting. When he announces Ivan's first record in a dancing hall, i.e. "performs" speech in a public place, he does his best to approach an acrolectal level, which results in an assortment of some acrolectal elements (nonfinite clause syntax, plural *-s* in a name, copula *is*, inflected superlatives) together with some rather basilectal elements (object *I*, fricative replacement in *d-*, prenominal copula *a*)

> (22)   Hear I now – dis a Jose speaking. Jose who is known to you. ... Tonight de management of Paradise Tile Gardens, bettah known as *De Gardens*, is happy to present to you de latest and de hottest reggae disk to come out of de world famous Hilton Empire, Ahuh. (295)

4.9 Ras' Sufferah

The adult Rastafarian represents the bottom end of the social scale, extreme poverty with no prospect of improvement. His speech shows no stylistic variation; it is basilectal (the brief sample below shows a high density of creole features, like fricative replacement, cluster simplification, the complementizer *say*, the topicalizer *is*, the relativizer *whe'*, *inna*, an unmarked conditional, uninflected verb forms, zero copula, and the pluralizer *dem*) and shows the Rasta speech marker *I man*:

> (23)   Breddah, you understan' say is every penny whe' I man own inna dah cart? Anyhow it gallop down dah hill an' crashup, I man finish – *done* y'know. Den how my pickney dem to eat? (162)

4.10 Summary of style-shifting

On the whole, it can be observed that the ability to use situational variation and to style-shift correlates fairly closely with the characters' position on the social continuum as hypothesized at the beginning of this section. Lower-class, largely creole-speaking characters show a relatively restricted ability to style shift. Another group of characters style-shift towards StE variants to a limited extent, with incomplete mastery of the acrolect at times resulting in hypercorrection (e.g. Longah, Ivan). Of course, a speaker's ability and motivation to adjust stylistically need not coincide: Maas' Nattie seems an example of a speaker who would be able to adjust linguistically fairly successfully, but for him there is usually no need to do so because in his daily life he almost exclusively communicates with basilectal speakers. Other characters, however, show considerable ability to style-shift along the JamC continuum with considerable ease when it suits their purposes (e.g. Ray Jones, Hilton). In their performance, reverting to basilectal speech serves as a means of social accommodation and expressing group identification, or it comes naturally in intimate or highly emotional situations. Preacher holds an exceptional position in that he almost entirely uses acrolectal speech, even when downshifting would be appropriate. He only lapses into basilectal variants when he is very upset.

    According to Bailey (1966:2) the hard core of creole speakers in Jamaica is to be found among the unschooled and rural population, ranging from pre-school children to the elderly, living in isolated villages removed from the centers of culture; on the other hand, everyone born and raised in Jamaica understands, and most likely speaks, some form of creole. Our analysis of Thelwell's fiction largely corresponds to this: The rural-urban dimension as well as age seem to be less important parameters for style-shifting than the social stratification, especially education and occupation. Bailey (ibid.) also points out that there is a fairly large group of speakers for whom a Jamaican version of StE and not the creole is the dominant language, including professionals, civil servants, teachers, preachers, and so on. This group is depicted very accurately by Thelwell in the character of Preacher, who almost exclusively uses StE variants and only very occasionally lapses into non-standard speech.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The purpose of this study was to assess how realistically Michael Thelwell has succeeded in sketching the picture of the Jamaican speech continuum in his novel *The Harder They Come*, and, extrapolating from this inductive observation, to inquire into the nature of an author's pan-lectal productive language competence. The fundamental but rather general question was operationalized by transforming it into specific inquiries for analysis: How much variability, and on which linguistic levels, do the fictional characters of the novel display? Can these characters be placed on a continuum of various degrees of creoleness according to their speech? Do their respective positions on the linguistic continuum correspond to their socio-economic status ranks? Is their speech behavior portrayed as homogeneous or as shifting between styles (and if so, how does the style-shifting correlate with idiolects, status differences, or contexts of situation)? Above all, to what extent do these findings correlate with what we know about linguistic realities in Jamaica?

The overall result of this investigation is quite straightforward: Thelwell has succeeded remarkably well in creating a fictive world which reflects the linguistic variation within the Jamaican speech continuum highly accurately. In particular, the following observations are fully in line with real-life facts:

–   A wide variety of linguistic features in the characters' direct speech represent linguistic forms of basilectal and mesolectal JamC and acrolectal Jamaican English.
–   For most of these features, viewed as variables, there is a choice of at least two (basilectal and acrolectal, respectively), sometimes more, variants.
–   There is intra-individual variation: For most of the features this variability can be observed not only in the community in general but also in almost each of the idiolects.
–   There is inter-individual variation: The individual characters are distinguished by the relative proportions of basilectal vs. acrolectal choices that they display.
–   For any given individual, except for some idiosyncratic preferences, his/her position on the continuum between basilect and acrolect tends to remain fairly constant across features.
–   Speakers' positions along the linguistic continuum largely correspond to their positions on a social status continuum, such that higher-status speak-

ers tend to prefer acrolectal variants, and lower-status speakers use more basilectal forms.

–   For the individual speakers, these speech-status correlations tend to remain fairly constant across the individual linguistic features.
–   However, despite clear overall tendencies the pattern is anything but uni-linear and simple: many social and linguistic dimensions overlap, and there is a lot of idiosyncratic and random variability.
–   Speakers' performances span the entire range of the creole continuum, including, in particular, a complex array of mesolectal mixtures. At the basilectal end, an ideal "deep" creole, with (almost) only basilectal choices, is not represented. At the acrolectal end, one character remains largely acrolectal, with relatively few (but some) creole forms sprinkled in into his utterances.
–   Phonological and grammatical distributions, concerning the speech-status matching of individuals, also correspond to each other quite closely.
–   There is a clear tendency for phonological variables to display fine stratifi-cation, whereas some grammatical variables display sharp stratification.
–   Most individuals command a certain range of corresponding variants across the linguistic continuum, i.e. they show an ability to style-shift.
–   Style-shifting is determined by aspects of the speech situation, most no-tably by the status of the interlocutor, but also by factors such as the emo-tionality of a situation or the amount of accommodation towards or social distancing from a dialogue partner.
–   The range of style-shifting tends to be broad with high-status speakers but considerably more restricted with low-status characters.

In general, the findings of this study are strongly reminiscent of the results of Patrick's (1999) analysis of mesolectal speakers in a Kingston suburb, which is similarly idiolect-based but investigates real, not fictional characters. Thelwell has succeeded in creating a fictive world which is fully convincing not only culturally but also in its linguistic representation: *The Harder They Come* offers a high degree of authenticity and realism in a variety of linguistic dimensions.

Which broader conclusions can be drawn from this?

The relationship between the grammar of an individual and the grammar of a speech community is complex and still insufficiently understood. We have no way of knowing whether, or to what extent, the internalized grammar of any individual matches that of any other individual. In fact, given the idiosyn-cracy of human backgrounds and experiences, it seems unlikely that any two

person's intuitions, items and rules are fully identical. On the other hand, there is no doubt that in a given speech community such differences can be only minor, that a vast majority of forms and rules are shared – otherwise language wouldn't work as a social institution. Any individual's I-language can be assumed to stand in a very close "family resemblance" (in Wittgenstein's sense) relationship to any other individual's grammar in the same community, with a very high proportion of shared features and overlaps but also the possibility of some (undetected, subconscious) differences. If, on this basis, an individual's competence is a sub-set of the entire "feature pool" available to a community (cf. Mufwene 2001), then the set of phenomena observable in such an individual's performance (by necessity a limited corpus, not revealing all of that speaker's potential) represents a sub-set of this sub-set – and this quasi-sampling relationship is why no two speakers' data in an investigation are ever identical, even if, in the variationist paradigm, this is perceived as ordered, not random, heterogeneity. As Labov stated: "each individual shows a personal profile of the comparative use of resources made available by the speech community." (2001: 34)

The fictive, limited world in a novel like Thelwell's consists of several individual profiles, and it is the author who creates it, and each of them. By definition the fictive world is not real, but it is realistic – it is not a part of reality but it is created in such a way that it could be, it resembles reality very closely. The same applies to the artificial idiolects: they are not real but, in a successful case, realistic; and our analysis has shown that this applies in Thelwell's case.

The consequence of this should be of interest to variationist theory. Thelwell represents variable grammars, including complex arrays of frequency relationships between linguistic variants as voiced by several different individuals. It would be absurd to assume that he had sat down to count the precise number of times certain variants occurred in his representations in all of his characters and in a variety of contexts. Nevertheless, the results, analyzed in quantitative terms, appear to be faithful to reality also with respect to the frequencies involved. This means that Thelwell's language competence and intuition enable him to re-create accurate and consistent representations of what would be the possible sets of performance output phenomena of more than a dozen other individuals of different social ranks and backgrounds – he displays an intuitive pan-lectal "super-competence", as it were. In other words, an individual, the creative author, is able to convincingly manipulate (i.e. model through artistic creation) the competences and performances of several other individuals (the fictive but realistic characters), each of whom commands a different portion

of a sociostylistic continuum. At this point it is not quite clear which theoretical ramifications this thought entails, but it certainly provides for an interesting and novel perspective on variation, and therefore it should be worthy of further development and investigation.

Furthermore, Thelwell's example also shows that literary dialect does not necessarily have to be inaccurate or even invalid as linguistic data, which supports the view that literary representations of earlier stages of languages need not be ignored as sources of real-time data of language change. If the native-speaker status of the person who records the dialect and the breadth and quality of his/her intuitions can be proved, literary dialect should not be discarded too quickly, despite unavoidable limitations (cf. Schneider 2002). This study has not been intended to argue that literary dialect in general is linguistically reliable and valid, but it does show that literary dialect is a category in its own right which deserves analysis and observation and which may stimulate some fruitful thinking.

References

Adamson, Lilian, & van Rossem, Cefas (1995). *Creole literature.* In J. Arends, P. Muysken, & N. Smith (Eds.), 75–84.

Akers, Glenn A. (1981). *Phonological variation in the Jamaican continuum.* Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Alleyne, Mervyn C. (1980). *Comparative Afro-American: An historical-comparative study of English-based Afro-American dialects in the New World.* Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Alleyne, Mervyn C. (1988). *Roots of Jamaican culture.* London: Pluto Press.

Alsopp, Richard (Ed.) (1996). *Dictionary of Caribbean usage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arends, Jacques, Muysken, Pieter, & Norval Smith (Eds.) (1995). *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Bailey, Beryl L. (1966). *Jamaican Creole syntax: A transformational approach.* Cambridge: University Press.

Bailey, Charles-James N. (1973). *Variation and linguistic theory*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Bernhardt, Stephen A. (1983). Dialect and style shifting in the fiction of Samuel Selvon. In L. D. Carrington (Ed.), 266–76.

Bernstein, Cynthia G. (Ed.) (1994). *The text and beyond: Essays in literary linguistics.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Bickerton, Derek (1971). Inherent variability and variable rules. *Foundations of language, 7,* 457–492.

Bickerton, Derek (1973a). The nature of a creole continuum. *Language, 49,* 640–69.

Bickerton, Derek (1973b). Quantitative versus dynamic paradigms: The case of Montreal que. In Ch.-J. N. Bailey & R. W. Shuy (Eds.), *New ways of analyzing variation in English* (pp. 23–43). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bickerton, Derek (1975). *Dynamics of a creole system.* Cambridge: University Press.

Bickerton, Derek (1980). Decreolisation and the creole continuum. In A Valdman & A. Highfield (Eds.), 109–27.

Blake, Norman F. (1981). *Non-standard language in English literature.* London: Deutsch.

Bowdre, Paul Hull, Jr. (1971). Eye dialect as a literary device. In J. V. Williamson & V. M. Burke (Eds.), 178–86.

Carrington, Lawrence (Ed.) (1983). *Studies in Caribbean language.* St. Augustine, Trinidad: Society for Caribbean Linguistics.

Cassidy, Frederic G. (1961). *Jamaica talk: Three hundred years of Jamaican Creole.* London: Macmillan.

Cassidy, Frederic G., & LePage, Robert B. (1961). Lexicographical problems of *The dictionary of Jamaican English.* In R. B. LePage (Ed.), 17–36.

Cassidy, Frederic G., & LePage, Robert B. (1980). *Dictionary of Jamaican English* (2nd. ed.). Cambridge: University Press.

Cedergren, Henrietta, & Sankoff, David (1974). Variable rules: Performance as a statistical reflection of competence. *Language, 50,* 333–355.

Chambers, J. K. (2003). *Sociolinguistic theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford, Malden: Blackwell.

Chambers, J. K., Trudgill, Peter, & Schilling-Estes, Natalie (2002). *The handbook of language variation and change.* Malden, MA, Oxford: Blackwell.

Dance, Daryl C. (Ed.) (1986). *Fifty Caribbean writers: A bibliographical critical sourcebook.* New York: Greenwood.

D'Costa, Jean (1983). The West Indian novelist and language: A search for a literary medium. In L. D. Carrington (Ed.), 252–65.

D'Costa, Jean (1984a). Expression and communication: Literary Challenges to the Caribbean polydialectal writers. *The journal of Commonwealth literature, 19* (1), 123–41.

D'Costa, Jean (1984b). Louise Bennett's dialect poetry: Problems of variation along a creole continuum in a literary text. In W. Enninger & L. M. Haynes (Eds.), *Studies in language ecology* (pp. 135–58). Wiesbaden: Steiner.

D'Costa, Jean, & Lalla, Barbara (Eds.) (1989). *Voices in exile. Jamaican texts of the 18th and 19th centuries.* Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

DeCamp, David (1971b). Toward a generative analysis of a post-creole speech continuum. In D. Hymes (Ed.), 349–70.

DeCamp & Hancock, Ian F. (Eds.) (1974). *Pidgins and creoles: Current trends and prospects.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Ellis, Michael (1994). Literary dialect as linguistic evidence: Subject-verb concord in nineteenth-century southern literature. *American speech, 69,* 128–44.

Gunton, Sharon R., & Stine, Jean C. (Eds.) (1982). *Contemporary literary criticism: Excerpts from criticism of the works of today's novelists, poets, playwrights, short story writers, filmmakers, screenwriters, and other creative writers.* Volume 22. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company.

Holm, John (1988). *Pidgins and creoles.* 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press.

Holm, John (1994). English in the Caribbean. In R. Burchfield (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of the English language.* Vol. 5: *English in Britain and overseas: Origins and development* (pp. 328–81). Cambridge: University Press.

Holton, Sylvia W. (1984). *Down home and uptown: The representation of black speech in American fiction.* Rutherford, NY: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Ives, Sumner (1971). A theory of literary dialect. In J. V. Williamson & V. M. Burke (Eds.), 145–77.

Labov, William (2001). *Principles of linguistic change.* Vol. 2: *Social factors.* Malden, MA, Oxford: Blackwell.

Lalla, Barbara (1996). *Defining Jamaican fiction: Marronage and the discourse of survival.* Tuscaloosa/London: University of Alabama Press.

Lalla, Barbara. (2005). Creole and respec' in the development of Caribbean literary discourse. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages, 20,* 53–84.

Lalla, Barbara, & D'Costa, Jean (1990). *Language in exile: Three hundred years of Jamaican Creole.* Tuscaloosa and London: University of Alabama Press.

Lang, George (2000). *Entwisted tongues. Comparative creole literatures.* Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

Lawton, David (1980). Language attitude, discreteness, and code-shifting in Jamaican Creole. *English world-wide, 1,* 211–26.

Lawton, David (1985). Code-shifting in Jamaican Creole. In I. F. Hancock (Ed.), *Diversity and development in English-related creoles* (pp. 68–88). Ann Arbor: Karoma.

LePage, Robert (1969). Dialect in West Indian literature. *The journal of Commonwealth literature, 7,* 1–7.

LePage, Robert, & Tabouret-Keller, Andrée (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity.* Cambridge: University Press.

Locher, Frances C. (Ed.) (1981). *Contemporary authors: A bio-bibliographical guide to current writers in fiction, general nonfiction, poetry, journalism, drama, motion pictures, television, and other fields.* Vol. 101. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Company.

McWhorter, John (2000). Defining 'creole' as a synchronic term. In I. Neumann-Holzschuh & E. W. Schneider (Eds.), 85–123.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. (1988). Starting on the wrong foot. *Journal of pidgin and creole languages, 3,* 109–17.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. (2000). Creolization is a social, not a structural, process. In I. Neumann-Holzschuh & E. W. Schneider (Eds.), 65–84.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. (2001). *The ecology of language evolution.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mille, Katherine Wyly (1997). Ambrose Gonzales's Gullah: What it may tell us about variation. In C. Bernstein, Th. Nunnally, & R. Sabino (Eds.), *Language variety in the South revisited* (pp. 98–112). Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Mühleisen, Susanne (Ed.). (2005). *Creole Language in Creole Literatures.* Special Issue of *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages, 20* (1).

Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid, & Schneider, Edgar W. (Eds.) (2000). *Degrees of restructuring in creole languages.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Patrick, Peter L. (1996). Variation and the mesolect in Jamaican Creole. In J. E. Alatis, C. A. Straehle, M. Ronkin, & B. Gallenberger (Eds.), *Linguistics, language acquisition, and language variation: Current trends and future prospects* (pp. 196–220). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Patrick, Peter L. (1999). *Urban Jamaican Creole: Variation in the mesolect.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins. (VEAW G17)

Patrick, Peter L. (2002). The speech community. In J. K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, & N. Schilling-Estes (Eds.), 573–597.

Pollard, Velma (1983). The social history of Dread Talk. In L. D. Carrington (Ed.), 46–62.

Preston, Dennis R. (1996). Where the worst English is spoken. In E. W. Schneider (Ed.), 297–360.

Ramchand, Kenneth (1983). *The West Indian novel and its background* (2nd. ed.). London: Heinemann.

Rickford, John R. (1974). The insights of the mesolect. In D. DeCamp & I. F. Hancock (Eds.), 92–117.

Rickford, John R. (1987). *Dimensions of a creole continuum: History, texts, and linguistic analysis of Guyanese Creole.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rickford John (1991). Contemporary source comparison as a critical window on the Afro-American linguistic past. In W. F. Edwards & D. Winford (Eds.), 302–22.

Rickford, John, & Closs Traugott, Elizabeth (1985). Symbol of powerlessness and degeneracy, or symbol of solidarity and truth? Paradoxical attitudes toward pidgins and creoles. In S. Greenbaum (Ed.), *The English language today* (pp. 252–61). Oxford et al.: Pergamon Press.

Roberts, Peter A. (1988). *West Indians and their language.* Cambridge: University Press.

Schilling-Estes, Natalie (1998). Investigating 'self-conscious' speech: The performance register in Ocracoke English. *Language in society, 27,* 53–83.

Schneider, Edgar W. (1990). The cline of creoleness in English-oriented creoles and semi-creoles of the Caribbean. *English world-wide, 11,* 79–113.

Schneider, Edgar W. (1997). Earlier Black English revisited. In C. G. Bernstein, Th. Nunnally, & R. Sabino (Eds.), *Language variety in the South revisited* (pp. 35–50). Tuscaloosa, London: University of Alabama Press.

Schneider, Edgar W. (2002). Investigating variation and change in written documents. In J. K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, & N. Schilling-Estes (Eds.), 67–96.

Schneider, Edgar W. (2003). The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language, 79,* 233–281.

Schneider, Edgar W. (Ed.) (1996). *Focus on the USA.* (Varieties of English Around the World G16). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Schneider, Edgar W. (Ed.) (1997). *Englishes around the world: Studies in honour of Manfred Görlach.* Vol. 2: *Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Australasia.* (VEAW G19.) Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Shields-Brodber, Kathryn (1997). Requiem for English in an 'English-speaking' community: The case of Jamaica. In E. W. Schneider (Ed.), 57–67.

Smith, Michael G. (1965). *The plural society in the British West Indies.* Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Talib, Ismail S. (2002). *The language of postcolonial literatures. An introduction*. London, New York: Routledge.

Thelwell, Michael (1980). *The harder they come*. New York: Grove. [New Evergreen Edition 1988]

Thelwell, Michael (1991). *The harder they come*: From film to novel. *Grand-street, 10* (1), 135–65.

Valdman, Albert, & Highfield, Arnold (Eds.) (1980). *Theoretical orientations in creole studies*. New York: Academic Press.

Wells, John C. (1982). *Accents of English.* Vol. 3: *Beyond the British isles.* Cambridge: University Press.

Williamson, Juanita V., & Burke, Virginia M. (Eds.) (1971). *A various language: Perspectives on American dialects.* New York et al.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Winer, Lise (1993). *Trinidad and Tobago*. (Varieties of English Around the World T6) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Appendix 1: The structure of the corpus

Corpus size by speaker:

Ivan (7900)	Hilton (2200)	Bogart (1100)
Elsa (3350)	Maas' Nattie (2100)	Joe Beck (1000)
Jose (3250)	Miss 'Mando (1500)	Mirriam (700)
Ray Jones (2700)	Longah (1500)	Ras' Sufferah (500)
Pedro (2300)	Preacher (1150)	

Sources of texts by speaker and interlocutor:

Ivan: Ivan – Miss 'Mando	pp. 16, 18, 31–2, 34–5, 37–8, 40–1, 42, 43, 69, 70, 79
Ivan – other country people	pp. 24, 24–7, 28, 53, 55, 63–4, 86, 112–3, 117, 118, 119, 124, 316–7
Ivan – Maas' Nattie	pp. 45, 72–3, 78
Ivan – Mirriam	pp. 56–7, 57–8, 64–7, 83–4
Ivan – youths in Kingston	pp. 128–30, 133, 169, 196, 209, 212–3
Ivan – other city people	pp. 130, 133, 157, 159, 160, 166–8, 171–2, 173, 174, 176, 267, 269–71, 294, 309, 313, 315, 331, 341, 344–8, 350, 390
Ivan – Miss Daisy	pp. 135–9
Ivan – Jose	pp. 140–2, 147, 149–54, 155, 294–7, 299, 332–3, 337–8, 361–2
Ivan – Ras' Sufferah	pp. 161–3, 166
Ivan – Preacher	pp. 183–5, 189–90, 193, 220, 233, 250–1, 254–5
Ivan – Elsa	pp. 189, 223–5, 234, 251–3, 275, 277, 279–80, 291–2, 301, 324, 329, 330, 352–3
Ivan – Longah	pp. 190, 225, 231, 255–7

Ivan – Bogart	pp. 197–8, 200, 204–7, 214–5, 228, 350–1
Ivan – Hilton	pp. 248–9, 282–3, 284
Ivan – Pedro; Man–I	pp. 300, 306–8, 309–10, 329, 333–5, 337, 339–40, 343, 375–7; 327
Elsa: Elsa – Preacher	pp. 183, 189, 219–20, 235, 255, 263–4, 387–8
Elsa – Ivan	pp. 188–9, 223–5, 234, 251–3, 275, 277, 279–80, 291–2, 301, 306–7 323, 324, 328, 329, 330, 352–3
Elsa – other people	pp. 221, 277, 278, 383, 384–5
Elsa – (1st. ps. narrator)	pp. 233–5
Elsa – Pedro	pp. 304, 340, 365, 381–2, 387, 390
Elsa – Man–I	pp. 351–2, 353, 364, 381, 383–4
Jose: Jose – other people	pp. 132, 144–5, 150–1, 258–9, 262, 295, 327, 360–1, 378–80
Jose – Ivan	pp. 133, 140–2, 143, 145, 146, 147, 149–54, 155, 294–7, 299, 332–3, 338
Jose – (1st. ps. narrator)	pp. 259, 339, 361
Jose – Ray Jones	pp. 259–61, 287, 339, 360, 372
Jose – Pedro	pp. 298–9, 337–8
Ray Jones: Ray Jones – other people	pp. 215–6, 246, 289–90, 359, 368, 369, 372, 386, 390
Ray Jones – Jose	pp. 259–62, 287, 359–60, 372
Ray Jones – Commissioner	pp. 288–9, 366
Ray Jones – Sidney & Pedro	pp. 367–8, 385–6
Ray Jones – Hilton	pp. 369–71
Pedro: Pedro – Jose	pp. 298–9, 337–8
Pedro – Ivan	pp. 300, 301, 306–8, 309–10, 323, 327, 329, 333–5, 337, 339–40, 343, 375–7
Pedro – Elsa	pp. 303, 304, 324, 340, 365, 366, 378, 381–2, 387, 390
Pedro – traders	pp. 308, 363–4, 380
Pedro – Ray Jones	p. 386
Hilton: Hilton – American tourist	pp. 238–44
Hilton – other people	pp. 239, 242, 244–5, 248, 278, 280, 283, 285, 355
Hilton – Ivan	pp. 248–9, 282–3, 284
Hilton – Ray Jones	pp. 369–71
Maas' Nattie: Maas' Nattie – Miss 'Mando	pp. 45–6
Maas' Nattie – other people (speeches)	pp. 47–8, 53, 81–2, 86, 87, 89, 94, 97, 99
Maas' Nattie – Ivan	pp. 72–3, 74–5, 78, 80, 85, 96, 109–12
Miss 'Mando: Miss 'Mando – children	p. 17
Miss 'Mando – Ivan	pp. 16, 18, 31–2, 34–5, 37–8, 40–1, 42, 43, 69, 79
Miss 'Mando – Joe Beck	p. 35
Miss 'Mando – Maas' Nattie	p. 45–6
Longah: Longah – (1st. ps. narrator)	pp. 230–3

Longah – Ivan; other people	pp. 190, 225, 231, 255–6; 226, 231
Longah – Preacher	p. 232
Preacher: Preacher – Elsa	pp. 183, 189, 219–20, 235, 255, 263–4, 387–8
Preacher – Ivan	pp. 183–4, 189–90, 193, 220, 233, 250–1, 254–5
Preacher – Longah	p. 232
Bogart: Bogart – Ivan; story	pp. 197–8, 200, 204–7, 213, 214–5, 216, 226, 350–1; 228–9
Bogart – Jose	p. 361
Joe Beck: Joe Beck – (telling story)	pp. 50–2
Joe Beck – other people	pp. 35, 49, 53, 56, 92, 95, 96
Mirriam: Mirriam – Ivan	pp. 56–7, 57–8, 64–7, 83–4
Ras' Sufferah: Ras' Sufferah – Ivan	pp. 161–3, 166
Ras' Sufferah – bottle clerk	pp. 164–5

Appendix 2: Frequency distributions of variants by speakers (raw data)

Table A2-1. Final consonant deletion: single consonants

	I	RS	B	JB	PE	MN	J	MM	M	L	E	H	RJ	PR
Ø	37,8	33,3	31,3	30,0	28,2	24,4	22,9	19,4	18,2	16,7	10,6	9,3	3,7	–
	(53)	(4)	(5)	(3)	(11)	(10)	(11)	(6)	(2)	(3)	(9)	(5)	(2)	–
C	62,2	66,7	68,7	70,0	71,8	75,6	77,1	80,6	81,8	83,3	89,4	90,7	96,3	100,0
	(87)	(8)	(11)	(7)	(28)	(31)	(37)	(25)	(9)	(15)	(76)	(49)	(52)	(25)

Table A2-2. Final consonant deletion: consonant clusters

	PE	B	J	MN	I	M	RS	JB	H	MM	E	L	RJ	PR
CØ	88,1	87,2	82,4	81,3	76,8	73,3	71,4	69,0	64,3	56,9	53,3	42,9	26,0	13,7
	(89)	(41)	(108)	(87)	(149)	(44)	(20)	(49)	(63)	(33)	(65)	(33)	(25)	(7)
CC	11,9	12,8	17,6	18,7	23,2	26,7	28,6	31,0	35,7	43,1	46,7	57,1	74,0	86,3
	(12)	(6)	(23)	(20)	(45)	(16)	(8)	(22)	(35)	(25)	(57)	(44)	(71)	(44)

Table A2-3. Voiced dental fricative replacement

	RS	J	PE	I	L	MN	B	MM	E	H	M	RJ	JB	PR
d	100,0	96,0	92,1	79,9	71,4	69,3	60,3	54,5	47,4	39,0	37,3	29,4	27,5	2,1
	(32)	(242)	(117)	(243)	(70)	(79)	(47)	(42)	(72)	(55)	(19)	(52)	(25)	(2)
ð	–	4,0	7,9	20,1	28,6	30,7	39,7	45,5	52,6	61,0	62,7	70,6	72,5	97,9
	–	(10)	(10)	(61)	(28)	(35)	(31)	(35)	(80)	(86)	(32)	(125)	(66)	(92)

Table A2-4. Voiceless dental fricative replacement

	RS	PE	I	MN	J	M	JB	E	RJ	B	MM	L	H	PR
t	87,5	86,1	78,8	75,7	67,8	37,5	31,6	26,7	22,9	20,0	19,0	16,7	9,4	–
	(7)	(31)	(56)	(28)	(38)	(3)	(6)	(12)	(11)	(3)	(4)	(3)	(3)	–
θ	12,5	13,9	21,2	24,3	32,2	62,5	68,4	73,3	77,1	80,0	81,0	83,3	90,6	100,0
	(1)	(5)	(15)	(9)	(18)	(5)	(13)	(33)	(37)	(12)	(17)	(15)	(29)	(17)

Table A2-5. Deletion of initial h-

	JB	PE	J	MM	L	B	M	I	MN	E	RJ	H	RS	PR
Ø	48,4	41,3	38,2	34,1	30,8	29,5	25,9	21,3	16,5	13,8	13,5	9,2	4,5	–
	(31)	(52)	(60)	(30)	(40)	(31)	(7)	(54)	(15)	(23)	(18)	(8)	(1)	–
h	51,6	58,7	61,8	65,9	69,2	70,5	74,1	78,7	83,5	86,2	86,5	90,8	95,5	100,0
	(33)	(74)	(97)	(58)	(90)	(74)	(20)	(200)	(76)	(144)	(115)	(79)	(21)	(43)

Table A2-6. Phonology–total

	J	PE	RS	I	MN	B	M	JB	L	MM	H	E	RJ	PR
basilect	71,3	69,9	62,7	57,6	56,2	48,7	47,8	44,7	43,7	41,8	32,5	31,7	21,3	3,9
	(459)	(300)	(64)	(555)	(219)	(127)	(75)	(114)	(149)	(115)	(134)	(181)	(108)	(9)
acrolect	28,7	30,1	37,3	42,4	43,8	51,3	52,2	55,3	56,3	58,2	67,5	68,3	78,7	96,1
	(185)	(129)	(38)	(408)	(171)	(134)	(82)	(141)	(192)	(160)	(278)	(390)	(400)	(221)

Table A2-7. 3rd ps. sg. pres. of main verbs

	J	I	MM	M	MN	RS	B	JB	L	E	PE	H	RJ	PR
Ø	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	93,8	93,3	91,0	75,0	64,0	–
	(43)	(31)	(14)	(11)	(10)	(8)	(4)	(4)	(15)	(28)	(20)	(18)	(16)	–
-s	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	6,2	6,7	9,0	25,0	36,0	100,0
	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	(1)	(2)	(2)	(6)	(9)	(1)

Table A2-8. Past/anterior marking

	RS	J	B	PE	L	MM	JB	M	I	E	MN	H	RJ	PR
Ø	100,0	98,3	98,0	96,3	95,8	95,0	92,0	87,5	86,0	80,4	74,8	69,0	64,3	–
	(8)	(58)	(50)	(26)	(90)	(19)	(57)	(7)	(98)	(74)	(37)	(20)	(18)	–
did	–	1,7	2,0	3,7	4,2	5,0	4,8	12,5	8,8	2,2	14,0	–	–	–
	–	(1)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(10)	(2)	(7)	–	–	–
-(e)d, v.m.	–	–	–	–	–	–	3,2	–	5,2	17,4	12,0	31,0	35,7	100,0
	–	–	–	–	–	–	(2)	–	(6)	(16)	(6)	(9)	(10)	(8)

Table A2-9. Progressive marking

	B	JB	J	M	PE	RS	MN	I	L	E	MM	H	RJ	PR
a/da/de+V	91,0	63,6	52,8	50,0	48,0	33,3	23,1	22,2	18,5	8,3	5,0	–	–	–
	(10)	(7)	(19)	(3)	(12)	(1)	(6)	(18)	(5)	(3)	(1)	–	–	–
Ø+V–ing	9,0	27,3	47,2	50,0	52,0	33,3	57,7	60,5	63,0	75,0	85,0	100,0	67,9	38,9
	(1)	(3)	(17)	(3)	(13)	(1)	(15)	(49)	(17)	(27)	(17)	(13)	(19)	(7)
'to be'+Ving	–	9,1	–	–	–	33,4	19,2	17,3	18,5	16,7	10,0	–	32,1	61,1
	–	(1)	–	–	–	(1)	(5)	(14)	(5)	(6)	(2)	–	(9)	(11)

Table A2-10. Copula forms, pre–nominal (token frequencies)

	I	PE	MM	J	JB	MN	B	E	H	L	RJ	PR	M	RS
a	5	3	1	4	1	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–
Ø	28	3	2	14	2	4	4	4	4	–	2	1	–	–
to be	39	10	5	37	7	18	15	26	34	9	19	14	5	–

Table A2-11. Copula forms, pre–adjectival

	B	L	J	RS	H	PE	I	E	M	JB	MM	MN	RJ	PR
Ø	87,5	87,5	86,2	83,3	80,0	76,5	75,9	75,0	70,6	68,2	65,0	55,0	47,6	8,3
	(14)	(14)	(50)	(10)	(20)	(26)	(63)	(33)	(12)	(15)	(13)	(22)	(20)	(2)
to be	12,5	12,5	13,8	16,7	20,0	23,5	24,1	25,0	29,4	31,8	35,0	45,0	52,4	91,7
	(2)	(2)	(8)	(2)	(5)	(8)	(20)	(11)	(5)	(7)	(7)	(18)	(22)	(22)

Table A2-12. Copula forms, pre–locative (token frequencies)

	JB	MM	B	J	I	M	PE	RS	H	L	MN	E	RJ	PR
de	2	1	–	10	10	5	2	–	–	1	2	2	1	–
Ø	1	2	4	9	5	–	4	2	4	2	2	4	1	–
to be	–	–	1	5	6	2	3	1	3	4	8	12	12	7

Table A2-13. Forms of the negator (token frequencies)

	RS	J	PE	I	MN	M	E	JB	B	L	RJ	H	MM	PR
no	3	15	16	24	10	2	8	3	6	1	1	–	2	–
nah	2	6	8	7	3	–	4	–	–	–	2	–	1	–
duon	–	13	16	30	–	2	10	4	2	6	10	13	4	1
neba	1	1	4	11	7	–	7	1	–	5	–	1	–	–
aux.+not	–	2	4	19	9	2	18	5	7	12	13	18	15	15

Table A2-14. Plural marking (token frequencies)

	M	RS	MM	JB	B	PE	J	MN	I	E	H	L	RJ	PR
dem	5	6	7	11	6	9	12	12	15	6	2	2	2	–
Ø	6	6	13	8	4	6	16	12	20	5	7	–	4	–
-s	1	1	5	4	5	8	13	18	24	12	31	7	57	18
-s + dem	–	1	–	3	–	–	2	1	4	–	–	–	2	–

Table A2-15. Possessive marking

	PE	I	J	L	MM	B	M	RS	RJ	MN	E	JB	H	PR
juxtap.	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	83,3	75,0	50,0	–	–
	(9)	(7)	(5)	(5)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(5)	(3)	(1)	–	–
's	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	16,7	25,0	50,0	100,0	100,0
	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(8)

Table A2-16. 1st person singular pronouns, subject function (token frequencies)

	I	E	J	RJ	PE	H	MN	MM	L	PR	B	JB	M	RS
me	55	3	23	–	13	–	9	–	5	–	4	6	10	15
Ah	100	22	36	10	17	12	37	15	22	1	9	21	8	6
I	120	83	53	59	31	46	5	6	44	33	7	5	5	6

Table A2-17. 1st person singular pronouns, object function (token frequencies)

	I	E	J	RJ	PE	H	MN	MM	L	PR	B	JB	M	RS
Ah	3	–	6	2	4	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2
me	70	35	28	28	11	25	12	10	10	7	9	2	6	5

Table A2-18. 1st person singular pronouns, possessive function (token frequencies)

	I	E	J	RJ	PE	H	MN	MM	L	PR	B	JB	M	RS
me	27	22	6	2	14	2	10	2	8	–	2	7	7	5
my	7	5	6	13	5	1	1	–	2	12	2	–	–	6

Table A2-19. 2nd person singular pronouns, possessive function (token frequencies)

	I	E	J	RJ	PE	H	MN	MM	L	PR	B	JB	M	RS
you	15	12	12	3	4	3	33	10	1	1	1	1	2	–
your	3	1	7	11	1	6	1	–	1	19	–	–	–	–

Table A2-20. 2nd person plural pronouns, subject function (token frequencies)

	I	E	J	RJ	PE	H	MN	MM	L	PR	B	JB	M	RS
unu	3	1	7	18	–	4	–	1	1	–	–	1	–	–
you	2	2	7	11	–	3	12	2	2	–	–	4	–	–

Table A2-21. 3rd person singular masculine pronouns, subject function (token frequencies)

	I	E	J	RJ	PE	H	MN	MM	L	PR	B	JB	M	RS
(h)im	35	36	46	21	29	9	7	21	50	–	34	21	8	1
he	–	6	–	–	1	9	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	–

Table A2-22. 3rd person singular masculine pronouns, possessive function (token frequencies)

	I	E	J	RJ	PE	H	MN	MM	L	PR	B	JB	M	RS
(h)im	5	11	10	2	7	–	2	13	6	–	11	10	2	–
his	2	2	–	1	2	–	–	–	2	1	–	–	–	–

Table A2-23. 3rd person plural pronouns, subject function (token frequencies)

	I	E	J	RJ	PE	H	MN	MM	L	PR	B	JB	M	RS
them/dem	34	9	31	9	20	10	17	2	2	–	11	11	3	1
they/dey	1	–	1	–	1	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	–	–