John Rickford and Barbara Greaves

INTRODUCTION

Many school-children in Guyana are reluctant to express themselves in writing, even when the topic on which they are asked to write relates to their own interests and experiences. One of the reasons for this is that they are normally expected to express themselves in standard English. But their writing is influenced by the Creolese which they use naturally in their speech, and because of this, it is frequently returned to them disfigured by the marks and corrections of their tea-chers.

In some vague way, the children come to realize that they are not using "good English." But since the teachers them-selves often fail to indicate their reasons for underscoring the various "errors" in their work, or to suggest the "correct" forms which they should use, the children become increasingly disheartened and confused.

The inability of Guyanese school-children to write fluent, effective standard English is at the heart of the much dis-cussed but little-understood "English language problem" in Guyana. Positions are vociferously argued for one solution or the other. Some argue that children should be made to read more books; others argue that they should be taught more grammar; others say (or are reported to say) that children need not be taught standard English at all, but should be allowed to use Creolese in all types of writing as well as in speech.

Let us dispose of the last suggestion first. To begin with, we are not sure who is supposed to hold the position that children need not learn to use standard English effecti-vely. Even Guyana's leading folklorist and aficionado of

Creolese, Wordsworth McAndrew, has not denied the relevance or usefulness of standard English. In a recent public lect-ure, he stressed the need for holding on to our Creolese language while mastering the standard language, so we would have "two things instead of one."[1] But at no point did he suggest that we should abandon efforts to teach standard English, and we start this paper with the assumption that most Guyanese parents, teachers and policy-makers would oppose any such suggestion.[2]

As for the other two proposals, let us postpone further discussion of them until we have attempted to reach some more systematic understanding of what the "English language problem" involves.

A number of scholars have already begun research on the kinds of problems which children in Guyana and the Caribbean face in mastering standard English, particularly as these involve interference from the Creole languages spoken in each territory.[3] However, most of this earlier work has concen-trated on interference from Creole grammatical patterns (involving omission of the copula, e.g. "He sick", absence of plural inflections, e.g. "two boy", and so on). In this paper we will be considering the much more neglected lexical phenomena. Our aim is to discover the main kinds of non-standard words and expressions which tend to occur in child-ren's writing, even when they are trying to be on their "best linguistic behaviour."

METHOD

Children in forms 1, II, and III (approximately twelve to fourteen years old) from fifteen primary schools in George-town,[4] were asked to write essays on one of a number of topics chosen to elicit their interest.[5] From the hundreds of scripts collected in this way, one hundred and sixty-four were selec-ted for actual analysis, approximately twelve from each school, and four from each of the forms in each school. An attempt was made to maintain a balance in the number of scripts chosen from boys and girls. Beyond this, the

criteria for selection were: (i) Length--longer essays were chosen over shorter ones; (ii) Use of non-standard words and expressions--essays, with more non-standard usages were chosen over those with little or none, to provide a richer body of data.[6]

Non-standard usages in the scripts selected were then recorded separately, and grouped into the three broad categories which will be discussed below. We should add here that other categorizations and analyses of the data are certainly possible. In fact we went through several other possibilities before deciding on the ones represented in this paper. But we think that our final categories, chosen from the perspective of how the examples they contain differ from their standard equivalents, may be of the greatest practical value to the teacher, even though they are open to criticism from other prespectives.

CATEGORY I: NOT ENOUGH SPECIFICATION

The examples in this category are all characterized by the fact that they omit some additional specification which is required or conventional in standard English. Sometimes what is left out is only a preposition or minor function-word which would not seem to affect the meaning drastically, e.g. swing (into) the gate. But in other cases (like example 4 below) the non-standard expression leaves out so much that it might be completely misunderstood by standard speakers unfamiliar with the creole idiom.

Non-standard Example	Standard Equivalent
1. "The police started to charge the car-man."	"driver of the car"
2. "As soon as we swing the gate."	"swing into" or "swing through"
3. "My mother went to my uncle birth-night."	"birthnight-party"
4. "I took out my mother and father."	"took a photograph of"

CATEGORY II: TOO MUCH SPECIFICATION

From the point of view of standard English (this point must be emphasized again) these words and expressions contain redundant information, i.e. they specify more than is necessary.

Non-standard Example	Standard Equivalent
5. "He crept up behind her, then choke her neck, then rob off her jewels."	"choked her"
6. "... and she said, 'Don't worry your head'."	"worry"
7. "Shut up your mouth" ...	"shut up"
8. "... before I put one cuff on you."	"cuff you"

In all of the above examples, standard English renders with a single verb the meanings which are expressed here with a verb plus noun. In examples 5 - 7, the redundant noun refers to a body-part which is already implied in the verb. To choke already means "to suffocate by external compression of the throat,"[7] so it isn't necessary to add neck. Similarly, worry means "to feel distressed in the mind" (=Creolese head), and shut up means "to stop talking" (which obviously implies the mouth). However, we think what Creolese speakers seek in the "extra" nouns is a measure of additional intensity and vividness: shut up your mouth is a more emphatic command in Creolese than shut up. This is also true of example 8. To speak of putting a cuff on someone might sound, to the standard English speaker, like a long-winded way of saying simply cuff; but it does seem to add a more physical dimension to the threat.

"Greater intensity" also seems to be the motivating force in the following examples, in which the verbs are followed by an additional particle (up, off) which would not be used in standard English in these contexts (note also rob off for "rob" in example 5 above).[8]

Non-standard Example	Standard Equivalent
9. "ring up for the police."	"ring"
10. "... leave it to cool off."	"cool"
11. "... let it fry up a little."	"fry"
12. "... kicked her up."	"kicked her"

In the last example, of course, kicked her up implies a series of kicks, while "kicked her" does not. We would have to say "kicked her over and over" or "kept on kicking her" to express the same idea adequately in standard English, so the additional particle really has work to do here.

CATEGORY C: EQUAL SPECIFICATION BUT WRONG FORM FOR CONTEXT

In the preceding categories, it was possible to explain the non-standardness of the examples by suggesting that they provided either too little or too much information. If we look again at the sentences in which these non-standard words and expressions occurred, we notice that replacement by standard equivalents would involve using either more than the original sentence slot ("birth-night party" instead of birth-night), or less of it ("shut up" instead of shut up your mouth).

The examples in this broad final category are different in that their non-standardness cannot be attributed to any lesser or greater specification than acceptable standard English equivalents. In fact, their standard equivalents can fit neatly into the very sentence slots they occupy. Their non-standardness derives from the fact that they constitute the wrong selection for their particular contexts according to the rules of English grammar (sub-sections i and ii below), or the conventions of English vocabulary and idiomatic usage (sub-section iii). In some cases the non-standard form is unacceptable in any standard English context, i.e. it does not exist in the standard English lexicon at all.

c-i: Relative Pronouns

In talking about relative pronouns in this sub-section, and about prepositions in the next, we might seem to be going

back on our promise to stick to lexical phenomena. But the examples in both of these sub-sections lie on the boundary between grammar and lexicon: while they are subject to certain syntactic restrictions, they are usually thought of by children as words, unlike the grammatical inflections for number (plural-s) or tense (-ed). The value of including them in category C is that they help to make clearer the notion of contextual restrictions on forms, and other general characteristics of this category.

Non-standard Example	Standard Equivalent
13. "A lot of things go on what I do not like."	"which"
14. "These are the boys what was following us."	"who" or "that"
15. "She went away to her aunt which lives in Berbice."	"who"

These examples illustrate the general characteristic of this category. The standard equivalent "which" can simply be put into the same slot occupied by what in example 13. Similarly, "who" can replace what in 14, and which in 15. There can be no argument that the non-standard forms affect the meaning of these sentences, no matter how much the purists might disagree. Because no other noun-phrase is normally allowed to come between the subject of a relative pronoun and the relative pronoun itself in English, we have no difficulty in determining that what in 13 refers to the subject things, even if what is the wrong relative pronoun for that context.

In fact, however, what is not a relative pronoun at all in standard English, and this is what is really wrong with examples 13 and 14. What can be used as an interrogative pronoun in English. It can be used for asking direct questions, as in "What are you doing?", or for embedding such questions in reported speech: "He asked me what I was doing." But it cannot be used as a relative pronoun, for subordinating one declarative sentence to another.

It may be that the non-standard use of _what_ as a relative pronoun reflects some confusion with the standard English relative pronoun _that_. But it more probably reflects influence from the Creolese relative pronoun _wuh_ or _wah_ (derived historically from English _what_) which can be used for all subjects regardless of whether they are human, non-human, or inanimate, as the following examples show:

16. He find the ting _wuh_ did mekking the noise.
    "He found the thing _which_ was making the noise."

17. ... the man _wuh_ marry Suzie sister.
    ... "the man _who_ married Suzie's sister."

Example 15 is somewhat different from example 13 in that the child avoids the completely non-standard _what_ and uses a standard relative pronoun: _which_. But it is the wrong relative pronoun for that slot. Standard English _which_ is restricted to non-human or inanimate subjects, and the human subject in example 15 would require _who_. Here again, we can see the Creolese syntactic/semantic _rules_ operating, even when the English _forms_ are being used. The child, in using _which_ for a human subject, is essentially following the Creolese rules for _wuh_, which, as we have just pointed out, can be used for human, non-human, animate _and_ inanimate subjects.

C-ii: Prepositions

The use of prepositions in a language is often guided in obvious ways by the meaning one is trying to convey. Clearly "He went _to_ school" and "He went _from_ school" mean different things, and in this context the two prepositions could not be interchanged without drastically affecting the meaning. But sometimes there would seem to be no obvious semantic difference between one preposition and another in a particular context, and yet a language might allow only one of the two in that context. Since _go_ already carries the sense of movement. the use of _at_ instead of "to" in example 19 below would hardly seem to make much semantic difference. However, only _to_ is permitted in standard English.

Learning the (often idiosyncratic) restrictions on the contexts in which prepositions can be used in another language is often difficult, as anyone who has ever attempted to master another language like French or German knows from experience. The problem is compounded for the native speaker of Creolese, because the prepositions he encounters in standard English have the same _form_ as most of his Creolese prepositions, but different _privileges_ of _occurrence_. All of the prepositions used in the non-standard examples 18 - 23 below are standard English prepositions (we don't have anything comparable to the use of _what_ as a relative pronoun here). But they are being used in contexts usually reserved for other prepositions in standard English.

Non-standard Examples	Standard Equivalent
18. "when I arrived _to_ the fire"	"at"
19. "I will be going _at_ the 7.45 show"	"to"
20. "the smaller ones come over _in_ my house"	"to"
21. "anytime _at_ the day"	"of"
22. "... accident _with_ a car and a bicycle"	"between"
23. "He picked up the fruit, and asked the price _for_ it"	"of"

In addition, examples 18 and 19 perhaps reflect even more direct influence from Creolese. The confusion which they suggest about when _to_ or _at_ is appropriate may have its roots in the Creolese use of a single preposition--a--in contexts which would be restricted to either _to_ or _at_ in standard English, e.g.:

24. He gaan _a_ di market. "He has gone _to_ the market."
25. He deh _a_ market.   "He is _at_ the market."

C-iii: Other Words

The examples in this last sub-section share the general characteristics of examples in category C as a whole. They include neither more nor less specification than their standard equivalents (although the non-standard and standard words carry slightly different associations and connotations),

and the standard equivalents can again be "plugged" into the same sentence slots. However, they are not part of any small grammatical paradigm or sub-group like the examples involving relative pronouns and prepositions. They are simple lexical items, ordinary words, so to speak, which are non-standard either because they involve non-conventional contexts or us- ages for words which also exist in standard English (examples 26 -30), or because they are words which do not occur in any context at all in standard English (examples 31 and 32).

Non-standard Example	Standard Equivalent
26. "She always keeping a lot of noise"	"making"
27. "He was trying to bore the light"	"beat" or "go through"
28. "I used to come home late from games, and my mother used to pick up for me."	"stand up" or "support" or "defend"
29. "The boy went down to the back to see for a pipe"	"look"

Non-standard Example	Standard Equivalent
30. "They would keep a set of noise"	"lot"
31. "My neighbour is very warrish"	"warlike" or "bellic- ose" or "hot- tempered"
32. "I like the cinema because you get nuff excitement ...'"	"plenty" or "a lot of"

CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have now completed our discussion of the major cate- gories of non-standard examples which were found in the writ- ten essays collected. Before going on to suggest how the results might help to inform discussions about the "English language problem," we should like to make some additional

comments about the non-standard lexical items we found in the data.

Most striking, perhaps, was the small number of words which were not a part of the standard English lexicon at all. There were a few examples besides the cases of nuff, warrish, and relative pronoun what cited above. But by and large, children did not draw in their writing on the large stock of really Creolese and "non-English" words (like cofuffle, nyam, metcheh-metcheh) which are attested in several of the other papers in this volume. This may be because they come primarily from Georgetown, and the varieties of Creolese spoken in the capital are generally closer to standard English that varieties spoken in rural areas. But Georgetown child- ren differ from their rural counterparts more on syntactic aspects of Creolese usage, and they are surely familiar with many more Creolese words than their writing gives evidence of.

We interpret the absence of such words in the children's writing, not as evidence that they did not know them, but as evidence that the children were able to avoid them precisely because they were more saliently "Creolese" and not "standard." Most of the non-standard lexical usages which we encountered involved words and expressions which differed minimally from their standard English equivalents (Category A and B above) or which could not be used in the same contexts in standard English (most of those in category C). In short, the inter- ference from Creolese is not as blatant or direct in the area of lexical usage as those who urge us to "stamp it out" completely might have led us to expect.

There are more subtle and delicate kinds of interference, as we tried to show in our discussion of why certain relative pronouns and prepositions might have been used instead of the appropriate standard equivalents. But this only serves to support the contentions of earlier researchers that the prob- lems of learning the standard language in creole and post- creole speech-communities are not simply those of a native language-learner, nor those of a foreign language-learner, but something precariously in between.[9] And in fact these "quasi-foreign language" situations are often more difficult

to deal with, from a pedagogical point-of-view, than either of the other two situations. We believe that it would be easier to teach a child that a certain word (e.g. nuff) does not belong to the English language at all, and provide him with the appropriate equivalent, than to try to teach him that a certain word he uses (like to) does exist in standard English, but must be replaced by other words in certain contexts (even though it can be used correctly in other contexts).

We should also add the comment here that some of the examples cited in this paper might not be considered "non-standard" enough to require replacement by standard English equivalents. For instance, to keep noise is obsolete, the modern English idiom now being to make noise.[10] But the former does not sound so deviant either. The basic criterion we used to determine "non-standardness" was whether the word or expression was listed in the Oxford English Dictionary or in comparable American English equivalents like Websters Third. But we obviously have to be guided by the conventions of standard usage in our own communities too. Neither of these dictionaries includes the word feg, referring to a natural portion or division of an orange or grapefruit. Nor do they contain fire-reel, except as a Canadian variant of the more "standard" fire-engine. Words like cut-eye and paal-off are not listed at all. But these are so widely used among all classes of people in Guyana, even in the most formal contexts, that to deny them the stamp of acceptability would seem unduly pedantic.

In fact we in the Caribbean are sometimes so insecure about what constitutes "good English," that we occasionally eschew words and expressions which are listed in the standard dictionaries. We have heard of teachers correcting paaling in their pupils' writing to "fence" and replacing eyeing something with "scrutinizing something." These seem to us to be clear examples of "overdoing the do"--pitting the child against a series of obstacles which are more apparent than real.

Clearly, we will have to come to some common under-

standings about what should constitute a Guyanese or West Indian "standard." We cannot rely entirely either on established usage in England or America, nor on our own individual and often shaky intuitions. But it is of course precisely with difficulties of this nature that the proposed Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage will deal. (See the paper by Allsopp in this volume).

If we sometimes have difficulty in determining what words and expressions are in fact "non-standard," we sometimes also have difficulty in determining the most appropriate standard English equivalents. The particular examples discussed in this paper did not provide too much trouble in this respect, although the number of alternatives given for warrish, for example, begins to suggest the kinds of problems which we might face with other examples. Examples such as "He bused the lady" or "The picture was a big stick" introduce even further complications.

As the preceding discussion should amply demonstrate, we do not claim to have covered all the significant dimensions of the use of non-standard words and expressions in children's writing. There are undoubtedly other aspects of non-standard lexical usage which only further examination of actual examples will reveal, and other categorizations and analyses, as we have already suggested, are possible. But we hope that the categories and discussions contained in this paper will be of some limited value to teachers practising in the field, even if it helps to clarify only a fraction of their actual problems.

We can now return briefly to the other proposals mentioned at the beginning of this paper. We still do not believe anyone knows enough, from controlled research and experiment, to design in detail a program which could be guaranteed to solve the many facets of the "English language problem" in Guyana. But from the little we have learned in preparing this paper, and from the accumulated experience of other researchers, we have our reservations about the possible effectiveness of "reading more" or "teaching more grammar" if these strategies are to be pursued in and of

themselves.

The children, we believe, can certainly benefit from both experiences. But both of these solutions place the major burden on the child. It will be up to him, as he glances through Jane Austen, or grinds through Davidson and Alcock,[11] to stumble on the discoveries that <u>what</u> is not a relative pronoun, his prepositions are all mixed up, English sometimes puts in more than he does (but sometimes less), and so on. By the time he has unravelled all of this (things which could have been taught to him more efficiently and quickly by a teacher who systematically explored the nature of his language problems, and <u>then</u> directed him through Austen or Davidson and Alcock), his time is up. He has already "failed" in English Language and the other subjects which require clear expression in the English language. He is already out of school, and simply has to "catch as catch can."

As decades of experience should by now have shown, traditional methods of handling the "English language problem" work for some Guyanese school-children, but simply do not succeed fast enough for many others. We need to shortcut the traditional routes, and isolate the problems more precisely if we are to deal with them in time.

NOTES

1. In a talk entitled "The Significance of Folklore in a Developing Society," given at Toastmasters' Club, Georgetown, April 28, 1976.

2. What people often disagree on is whether Creolese should be "stamped out" or "allowed to continue" in the process. This is an idle issue, insofar as history bears witness to the fact that languages can rarely be "stamped out" (or "allowed to continue") by fiat. Most Guyanese who use standard English on the occasions when they are required to do so, also use some variety of Creolese on more informal occasions, and they do not require any policy-decisions to do so.

3. The following are <u>some</u> of the relevant publications in this area:

Allsopp, R.   "The English Language in British Guiana," English Language Teaching 12, 2 (1958).

Bailey, B.   "Teaching of English Non-Verb Concord in Primary Schools in Jamaica," <u>Caribbean Quarterly</u>, 9, 4 (1963).

Carrington, L. and Borely, C.   <u>The Language Arts Syllabus 1975: Comment and Counter-Comment</u> (School of Education, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad, 1977).

Cave, G.   Primary School Language in Guyana, (Guyana Teachers' Association, 1971).

Craig, D.   An Experiment in Teaching English (Caribbean Universities Press, 1969).

Le Page, R.   "Problems to be Faced in the Use of English as a Medium of Education in Four West Indian Territories," in J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta (eds.), <u>Language Problems of Developing Nations</u> (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969).

Trotman, J.   The Teaching of English in Guyana: A <u>Linguistic Approach</u> (Faculty of Education, U.G., 1972).

Tyndall, B.   English Language Curriculum: BV and <u>Lodge Experimental Projects</u> (Faculty of Education, U.G., 1974).

U.W.I. Faculty of Education   <u>Language Teaching, Linguistics and the Teaching of English in a Multi-lingual Society.</u> (U.W.I., Mona, 1965).

4. We are grateful to the Head-teachers and staff of the following schools for their co-operation and support: Bedford Methodist; Campbellville Government; Comenius Moravian; Dolphin Government; East La Penitence Government; Kingston Government; Lodge Community High; St. Andrew's Presbyterian; St. Cyril's Anglican; St. George's Anglican; St. Pius R.C.; St. Sidwell's Anglican; St. Stephen's C of S; Tucville Government; West Ruimveldt Government.

5. Essay topics included: "An Incident at the Market," "A Choke-and-Rob Incident," and "The Corner Shop," among others.

6. Many of the children wrote less than one exercise-book page, and many of those who wrote longer essays seemed only to be stringing words together in an effort to achieve greater length. However, those children who 'lapsed' into Creolese more often (resulting in a higher

proportion of non-standard words and expressions) seemed freer and more expressive in their writing. All of this provides convincing evidence that the children are by no means comfortable when asked to express themselves in written standard English. Unfortunately, the numerous grammatical, stylistic and other (non-lexical) problems which are involved fall outside the scope of this paper. Some of the difficulties revealed have already received consideration in the references listed in footnote 3 above. Others still await systematic treatment.

7. Oxford English Dictionary (Clarendon, 1933), Vol. 2, p. 371.

8. A generally effective test for identifying verb and particle constructions is whether the particle can be postposed to the right of a following noun-phrase:

(i) He kicked up the lady.
(ii) He kicked the lady up (Particle post-posed).

If the up were functioning as a real preposition here, instead of as a verbal particle, this would not have been possible; e.g. you can say (iii) He walked up the street but NOT (iv) *He walked the street up (Preposition postposed).

Because verb and particle constructions are a frequent source of non-standard "errors" in children's writing, it is useful to be able to identify them. For more information, see James B. Fraser, "Some Remarks on the Verb-Particle Construction in English," in F.P. Dineen (ed.) Proceedings of the 17th Annual Round Table (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, No. 19, 1966), p. 45-61.

9. Dennis Craig, An Experiment in Teaching English p. 3-5.

10. Oxford English Dictionary, Vol. 6, p. 179. The most recent citation there for keep noise is dated 1775.

11. William Davidson and Joseph Alcock are the authors of several grammar books (including Intermediate English Grammar and Analysis, London: Allman and Son, n.d.) which are frequently cited when voices are raised in support of teaching more grammar. However, their grammars are based on Latin models (complete with declensions and conjugations), and are outdated in several other respects. We would hope more up-to-date substitutes would be used when the attempts to teach more grammar are implemented.

DISCUSSION

(NOTE: The following discussion followed a brief summary by Barbara Greaves of the preliminary results she had obtained

at the time the Festival was held in December 1975. Since that presentation, we have revised the analysis completely, and cast the paper in an entirely different framework. As a result, the discussion from the Festival which follows, some-times refers to words and analyses which are not contained in the final version of the paper, includes suggestions which have already been incorporated, and omits reference to most of the new elements which have been added. -- Editor).

Edna Cadogan: I suggest that we give synonyms for the adjectives, because I think usage of Creolese (in writing) is because the child lacks the vocabulary, and you will be helping him in standard English by helping him with suitable adjectives.

Barbara Greaves: I agree with what you said about the adjectives. There are other things like that--relative pronouns, prepositions--which the children use quite differently to how they're used in standard English. I don't know, probably it is that they don't know the right standard English word to use in each case.

All this comes back to the problem which hasn't been resolved, and which I can't resolve here, about what we are going to do about Creolese in our classrooms. Are we going to accept some of it? Probably Dr. Allsopp may be able to say something about this when he is talking, because he will be looking at the Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage. Take words like feg and red-lady: do we say they are Creolese and it is be-cause the child's vocabulary is limited that he is using these words? Why shouldn't he use them if they are describing what he wants to say? So that, I mean, this whole thing has to be looked into and some decision made. And I don't think I can make the decision here.

Edna Cadogan: May I say something else? My point is that if we are going to be involved in world activities--meeting people for whom English is not a first language, or who have to be learning English as a second language--then, since they would be using standard English, our students will have to learn that standard English so that the people would know what they are talking about. When we are together, we can talk about foot-bottom and so on. But if we are meeting people for whom English is a first or second language, then we should say sole. Our children must learn sole because that is standard English.

Barbara Greaves: I think we accept what you're saying. But then there would still be instances, it doesn't matter what we do, when we'll use a word which that other person isn't going to understand. He is going to understand most of what we say, but there are still going to be times when certain (obscure) words will be used. You have to be in a community for some time before you pick up certain things. We can't make things so international that everything one community says will be understood by other communities.

Richard Allsopp: Comrade Greaves spoke of a number of words, and some which come to mind are light-up, fight-up, beat-up, fry-up. We have to be careful, for there is nothing especially Guyanese about beat-up. The "up" as an adverbial extension to a verb is a frequentative or intensifier. You "light a place," but you "light it up." That is perfectly good English. You "tie a bag," but you "tie it up." We have heard about beat-up. There's nothing too special about that. Basically what we have is extension by analogy - "fry up" and "fry down."

Barbara Greaves: Thank you.

A. Fenty: (Exact words obscure, but question is about different kinds of Creolese in Guyana, and what Mrs. Greaves would have to say about whether certain other examples were "Creolese," and of what kind).

Barbara Greaves: First of all, Mr Fenty, let me remind you that as Mr. Rickford said at the beginning, we are not experts here. So that I won't be able to answer all your questions on Creolese. What I did was look at the scripts of children in Georgetown. Now spoken Creolese and written Creolese are two different things. You don't see the same things happening when children write, because when they write they are trying to use standard English. So that you don't get some of those examples you gave coming into the written work. I wouldn't be able to say what kind of Creolese it is, but I speak Georgetown Creolese.

Roy Brummel

Yuh 'ead bite yuh
Yuh fly a dactah
Yuh belly grumble
Yuh gaan a dactah
Yuh get Wite Mout...dactah
Yuh 'air staat drap out...dactah
Belly Wuk...dactah
Boun' Belly...dactah
Stiff Neck...dactah
Weak Back...dactah
Yuh picknie gah Trush
Yuh gaan wid am ah dactah
An sometime ah wan bleddy
Mack dactah!

Yuh get Ring Worm...dactah
Dactah fuh Runnin' Ears
Fire barely bun yuh...dactah
Dactah fuh wan lil sore
Dis ah fuh dactah
dactah fuh de tara
de nex' fuh dactah
Every lil ting...dactah

Hey, ayuh ever 'ear bout some dactah
name OLE PEOPLE?
An ayuh ever 'ear wan ting name
OLE PEOPLE SEH?
An yuh know wah OLE PEOPLE SEH?
Dem seh 'e gah bush fuh aaany
aaaany sickness ah worl'
Nah laaf OLE PEOPLE—
OLE PEOPLE SEH EVERY CHUPIT
MAAN GAT 'E OWN SENSE
An ayuh wid aal ayuh edication
da nah mek sense to yuh?

OLE PEOPLE SEH Daisy good fuh col'
An yuh mus' poun' up Marabunta Bush
An put am pun yuh sore
Hey, yuh wife ah geh picknie?
She kidney gah she ah big big puckatery?
Aaa chach--gie de 'oman some
Conguh Pump
Compey, yuh lil bwai gettin' fevah