CHAPTER FIVE

LIGHT ENGLISH, *LOCAL* ENGLISH AND *FICTITIOUS* ENGLISH: CONCEPTUAL STRUCTURES IN NORTH-EASTERN NIGERIAN ENGLISH AND THE QUESTION OF AN ENGLISH-LANGUAGE IDENTITY

HANS-JÖRG SCHMID

1. Introduction

Research over the past 30 years has established beyond doubt that the post-colonial, 'new' varieties of English have adapted to their respective ecologies and been indigenized by their speakers. There is a wealth of evidence from micro-analytical studies of phonetic, phonological, morphological, lexical, grammatical, textual and discoursal features supporting this idea.[1] Note that this remains true irrespective of whether one does or does not believe in the existence of individual, linguistically definable regional or national Englishes such as Indian, West African, East African, Ghanaian, Nigerian, Kenyan, or Singapore English.

There is also a considerable body of evidence showing that the majority of today's speakers of post-colonial Englishes have a positive attitude towards English (cf., e.g., Schmied 1991: 171ff., Babajide 2001, Igboanusi 2001, Oyetade 2001). What is more, in contrast to the years following independence, more and more speakers are reported to have a more positive attitude towards local, indigenized varieties than towards the aping of native British or, less often, American varieties by the notorious 'been-tos' of the 1970s and their latter-day successors (cf. e.g. Kachru 1985: 217, Banjo 2000, Anchimbe 2006a: 34f, Omoniyi 2006). This clearly suggests that there is an increasing tendency to identify with the indigenized varieties of English, in particular presumably in those countries where English has the status of national or official language either alone or alongside other languages.

However, what we know very little about so far is whether this apparent overt identification with indigenized English varieties also has an internal counterpart, i.e. whether the speakers of these varieties have internalized English in a way similar to the languages acquired earlier than English in their individual lives. As conceived of here, this is not a question of whether English has a cherished place in people's hearts, i.e. a question of attitudes and feelings, but of the degree of entrenchment and richness of English concepts in their minds.[2] The issues addressed in this chapter are thus cognitive rather than affective or social ones (even though of course these levels are difficult to disentangle in actual practice). The central questions are:

- What is the nature of the concepts that speakers of indigenized varieties of English associate with the words in that language?
- How do these concepts compare with the concepts activated by the same words in the minds of native speakers of native Englishes?
- And how do they compare with the concepts activated by referentially equivalent words in the indigenous local languages?

Obviously, in order to investigate these questions, it is necessary to take the lid off the notorious black box that seals off our ideas and concepts from external inspection. This is accomplished by means of rather unsophisticated psycholinguistic tests recruited from the methodological toolbox of Prototype Theory (see Section 3 below for more details).

This chapter is structured as follows: In Section 2, a survey of the linguistic situation in North Eastern Nigeria will be given, which is necessary for assessing the results of this study. Section 3 will provide a brief outline of the theoretical assumptions underlying this investigation and specify its aims as well as the method used. The results of the study will be presented in Section 4, focusing on a number of case studies representing the major types of conceptual characteristics associated with English words by Nigerian (and American) speakers of English. The data on English will be compared to material elicited with the same method using Hausa stimuli. The chapter closes with a summary of the findings and their discussion in the light of the question of an English-language identity of the speakers (Section 5).

2. The linguistic situation in North Eastern Nigeria

The fieldwork for this study was carried out with multilingual informants in Maiduguri in the North Eastern part of Nigeria. With the characteristic three-level pattern of small, local languages vs. regional

languages vs. former European language of the colonizers, the linguistic situation in North Eastern Nigeria is quite typical of many post-colonial societies. In Maiduguri, the capital and largest city of the Nigerian state of Borno bordering Chad and Cameroon, the colonial language is English. The most dominant regional language is Hausa, an Afro-Asiatic language of the Chadic branch. Hausa is the first language of about 22 million speakers in Nigeria as well as Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Ghana, Niger and Togo (Hayward 2000: 74-78, Omoniyi 2006: 179). According to *Wikipedia* (s.v. *Hausa*), about 15 million people speak Hausa as a second language. Alongside Igbo and Yoruba, Hausa is a major language of interethnic communication in Nigeria, mainly based in Northern Nigeria and neighbouring areas.

As regards local languages, the original ethnic tongue of the area is Kanuri, a Nilo-Saharan language. As a recent sociolinguistic survey reported by Broß (2002) has shown, Kanuri has been losing out to Hausa even in typical situations like in the market and is no longer rated the most important language at work in Maiduguri (Broß 2002: 108). Shuwa Arabic, a spoken dialect of Arabic spread throughout the Lake Chad region, is also quite strong, due to the fact that the majority of the population are Muslims. According to Hansford *et al*. (1976) other smaller languages in the area are Buduma, Putai, Mober and Gamargu. Broß (2002: 104) mentions the existence of speakers of Bura, Margi, Dghwede, Mafa, Kanembu, Malgwa and Mandara in Maiduguri.

What is quite specific of the Maiduguri region, as post-colonial societies go, is that English is not an important means of everyday communication for most people, since many of its classic functions in interethnic discourse are taken over by Hausa. Babajide (2001: 5) reports on a questionnaire study carried out in Nigeria which states that "75% of the Yoruba respondents are comfortable with the use of English at almost all the time while only 37.5% of the Hausa respondents are in this category". This is supported by the findings in Broß's (2002: 105) survey for urban Maiduguri: "Hausa is the language of wider communication in Maiduguri in five of […] six sociolinguistics situations", i.e. at work/school, in the market, for writing notes, for religious and for political discussions.

As a consequence, even Pidgin English is of little importance compared to other regions in Nigeria and West Africa. While there exists a basilectal variety of the 'broken English' type (Ferguson and DeBose 1977: 100), the dominant manifestation of English is acrolectal speech prevalent in the domains of administration, the media, business, international contacts and tertiary education.

Of course English also plays an important role in secondary education, but again a less prominent one than in neighbouring regions, as many Hausa families send their children to Koranic schools. Since the Hausa are also the economically and politically dominant group in the area, they do not have to rely on higher and English-speaking education to climb the political ladder. Thus in Broß's (2002: 114) survey more than 70% of the native speakers of Hausa preferred the use of Hausa in schools, followed by 12% favouring English and 6% Shuwa. According to Adegbija (1994: 151; quoted in Babajide 2001), in Northern Nigerian states "like Kano, Katsina, and Sokoto, the attitude of the majority of the population towards English is generally indifferent, negative, or downright hostile, especially when spoken by anyone in black skin". A problem with the findings presented by Adegbija (1994), Babajide (2001) and Broß (2002) is that English was apparently treated as one monolithic language without regard for the wide range of varieties from 'broken' and Pidgin English to 'Nigerian Standard English' (cf. Bamgbose 1992: 149f.).

3. Aims, methods and theoretical background of the study

The semantic peculiarities of the New Englishes have traditionally been described in categories used by historical linguists to classify semantic change (e.g., Sey 1973, Adegbija 1989, Bokamba 1992, and Simo Bobda 1994). Bokamba (1992), for instance, talks of four principal ways of semantic "deviation": semantic extension, semantic shift, semantic transfer, and coinage. In a more recent example of this type, Dako (2001: 28-32) arranges his material on Ghanaianisms in terms of semantic extension, semantic restriction, semantic pejoration, semantic amelioration and semantic shift.

In the present chapter, a wider notion of meaning is subscribed to, which denies the existence of an objectively determinable boundary between semantic and conceptual information. This means that there is no principled difference between the lexical meaning of a word and its conceptual content. The aim of this study is to unveil the conceptual structures associated with everyday lexemes in Northern Nigerian English and to compare them to corresponding concepts in the minds of native speakers of American English, on the one hand, and to the concepts activated by referentially equivalent words in Hausa, on the other. The main interest is how lexicalized English concepts are represented in the minds of multilingual speakers, and whether the nature of these concepts can be interpreted as symptoms of the existence of an English-language identity.

The theoretical basis of this chapter is the so-called Prototype Theory of meaning, whose main assumptions can be summarized as follows (cf., e.g., Lakoff 1987, Taylor 2003, Ungerer and Schmid 2006: Chs. 1 and 2):

- Word meanings are reflections of concepts or cognitive categories;[3] for example, the meaning of the word *dog* corresponds to a mental category, DOG, subsuming a set of real-world entities.
- Cognitive categories of concrete entities (as opposed to abstract ideas) are construed in the mind on the basis of our perception of the real-world entities and our experience in interacting with them.
- Concepts have an internal structure consisting of typical representatives, the so-called prototypes, and less typical as well as bad or peripheral ones. They have fuzzy boundaries, i.e. words have fuzzy meanings.
- The structures of cognitive categories can be accounted for by the distribution of attributes, i.e. properties of the real-world entities as perceived and conceived by the language users and associated by them with the cognitive category. Attributes are thus theoretical constructs located to the cognitive level; they must be distinguished from properties of referents, on the one hand, and classical semantic features, on the other, which are posited for the language-internal level.

In order to lay open the concepts underlying everyday lexemes a method called *attribute-listing task* is applied. It was introduced by Eleonor Rosch (1973, Rosch and Mervis 1975; see Ungerer and Schmid 2006: Ch. 1 for a survey) in her well-known studies which laid the foundation for what is now known as Prototype Theory. In this task, subjects are presented with individual lexemes (*car, house, fence, garden*) and have to name attributes, i.e. properties that they believe to be shared by the possible referents of the words. A typical response to the stimulus *car*, for example, would include attributes like 'has four wheels', 'has an engine', 'carries people', and 'is made from metal'. The attributes given by the individual informants are accumulated and ranked according to the number of informants who named them. Attributes listed by a large proportion of subjects (e.g. 'has wheels' for *car*) are considered to play a crucial role in the category structure, while idiosyncratic attributes named by single informants (e.g. 'loud music' for *car*) are of minor importance and therefore neglected in the analysis.

The lexemes used as test stimuli were simple words recruited from everyday areas. The focus in this chapter is on selected concepts from the field 'house and home', but a small number of other items will also be used for illustration. 71 students from Maiduguri University participated in the Nigerian study taking centre stage here. Their attribute lists for English as well as Hausa concepts, which were collected in different sessions

separated by several days, are compared to material elicited from 24 students in New York City. The American informants had 30 seconds to write down the attributes that came to their minds, the Nigerian students were allowed 60 seconds because their writing speed was much slower.

One crucial caveat should be added before I look closer into the results of the study. What this study wants to show is that everyday English words are likely to be associated with specifically 'African' or 'Nigerian' concepts in the minds of the Nigerian speakers and thus have specific meanings in this context, which may differ from the meanings of the same words in other varieties of English. Obviously, however, English words are also used to name the attributes in the attribute listing task, and these in turn are equally prone to have meanings specific to the local ecology. For example, when 69% of the Nigerian informants give a variant of the verb *bathe* in response to the stimulus *bathroom*, it would be misleading to assume that they have in mind the activity of 'submerging in water in a container', since in Nigerian English *bathe* is more or less synonymous with *wash*. Therefore one must beware of interpreting the Nigerian informants' attributes from a Western point of view. Yet, even if this is kept in mind, in the terms taken by Pike (1967: Ch. 2) from linguistics into the social sciences, the following analysis of Nigerian English concepts will largely remain an *etic* endeavour representing an outsider's view of the matter rather than an *emic* one.

4. Results

It is tempting to regard the conceptual structures collected from the native speakers of American English as a standard, against which the peculiarities of the elicited Nigerian concepts are described in terms of adaptations of 'original' and 'proper' English concepts to the local ecology. However, such an account would presuppose the dubious deviance approach (cf. Bamgbose 1992: 151-154), epitomized in the famous *Quirk concerns* (Quirk 1990, Kachru 1991), that the New Englishes are no more than (corrupted) descendants of the native Englishes. In order to steer clear of this bias I will avoid the use of process nominalizations of the type *adaptation, contextualization, indigenization, acculturation* or *Africanization*, since these invariably imply an idea of 'this is what proper native English has been turned into in the mouths and minds of African speakers'. The American and the Nigerian datasets will therefore be presented each in its own right as equally valid representations of lexicalized categories of things in the world.

Nevertheless it is unavoidable that the characteristic features of the lexicalized conceptual structures observed in the North-Eastern Nigerian field are described in terms of their differences to those represented in other Englishes and classified accordingly. The categories suggested by an inductive approach, i.e. relying on the findings, are the following:

- 'light' concepts, having comparatively lean conceptual structures;
- 'local' concepts, exhibiting more or less distinct reflections of the local culture and ecology;
- 'fictitious concepts', showing a surprising lack of cultural and ecological characteristics.

Evidence for the plausibility of these categories will be discussed in greater detail in the ensuing sections.

4.1 Light English

The notion of 'light English' captures phenomena that one would typically expect to find in a learner's or second-language variety. The concepts associated with words are much less rich and less complex than those that can be elicited from L1-speakers of native varieties. To be sure, concepts of this type are quite rare in the data discussed here, and, as we will see in Section 4.2, are part and parcel of all varieties of English. Typical Nigerian examples from the area of food (not in the focus of attention here) are Western concepts like CHEESE or (as yet) PIZZA that call up a very limited amount of attributes in the minds of the Nigerian informants. In fact, only very few Nigerian informants were able to come up with attributes at all and the ones they mentioned tended to be of the very general type 'made from milk' for CHEESE or 'food', 'round', 'flat' for PIZZA. Quite tellingly some informants add the attributes 'Western' or 'European' to their lists.

Examples from the conceptual area 'compound' include the concepts PORCH and STAIRCASE. The only attribute of PORCH named by more than 5% of the Nigerian informants is 'outside the house'; the attributes 'frontage/in front of the house', 'part of the house', 'back yard', 'place for parking cars' and 'place for relaxation' are each named by no more than two informants and suggest—just like even more idiosyncratic attributes like 'car', 'fire' or 'valley-like'—that the notion of PORCH does not seem to be of great importance to most Nigerian informants. Similarly, 30 out of the 71 Nigerian informants did not produce even a single attribute in response to the stimulus STAIRCASE. And some of those who did try to respond apparently focused their attention on the second component, –

case, when coming up with attributes such as 'small bag' or 'to put a pillow in'.

As already mentioned above, examples of the type 'light English' are not numerous in the dataset. The cases found are all notions that have remained more or less foreign to the local ecology and do not play an important role in Hausa culture. For example, while porches of the American type are parts of the modern urban Nigerian homes of affluent people, they are still quite rare and therefore there is hardly a need for the corresponding word in Hausa English. Applying Anchimbe's (2006a) filtration model of integration, which is mainly designed to explain the influence of indigenous languages on New Englishes, we could say that the native English lexemes do not pass the integrational filter to the New African variety because of a lack of necessity (see Anchimbe 2006a: 191f.).

Phenomena of the 'light-English' type are to a large extent predictable from experience with the local culture. As far as the issue of identity is concerned, I feel unable to interpret findings of this type as evidence either for or against the existence of an English-language identity in the minds of the Nigerian informants.

4.2 Local English

Unlike 'light English' concepts, 'local English' ones are undoubtedly fully-fledged notions of word meanings in the informants' minds. The conceptual structures observable in the material collected show different ways in which these local concepts differ from those stored in the minds of the American speakers questioned. A fairly typical example of 'local English' is the concept ROOF (see Table 1). While the American and Nigerian informants agree on the protecting and covering function of roofs as well as on their topological locations on top of buildings, their differing ideas about the materials of roofs—'shingles' (US) as opposed to 'zinc', 'wood/timber', 'iron/metal/steel', 'grass' and 'thatch' (Nigeria)—are indisputable reflections of ecological differences. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of the Nigerian informants (18.3%) associate the concept ROOF with CEILING. In the traditional Hausa compound (cf. Moughtin 1964, 1985), the 'rooms' are typically separate 'huts' (as reflected in the polysemy of the Hausa word *dàki* meaning 'room' and 'hut'; see below). The Nigerian English word *ceiling* refers to the wooden inner surface of the top part of these rooms, which is inserted below the roof proper (often made of corrugated iron) to shield the room from heat. It also refers to the chipboards themselves that are used for this purpose.

The strong conceptual association between ROOF and CEILING is also reflected in the Nigerian informants' reactions to the Hausa stimulus *rufi* (a deverbal noun derived from *rufe* 'to cover'): as many as 48% of the native speakers of Hausa included the attribute 'ɗaki' ('room', 'hut') in their attribute lists for this Hausa word. It is thus very likely that the association with CEILING results from a conceptual transfer from cognitive models that are part of Hausa culture and lexicalized in the Hausa concept RUFI.[4]

Table 1. Results of attribute listing for ROOF[5]

RATING USA			RATING NIGERIA	
roof	**weight**		**roof**	**weight**
house	45.8%		covers/coverage of a room/a house/a building/a shed	43.7%
top of building/ house/home	37.5%		zinc	43.7%
top	29.2%		top (of a house/ building/room)/top cover	38.0%
cover(ing)	25.0%		wood/timber	26.8%
protect(ion)	20.8%		ceiling (in a room) (comprises the ~)	18.3%
shingles	20.8%		nails	15.5%
keep dry/keeps rain out/keeps snow out	16.7%		protects (room against rain, heat, cold, sun, weather)/ protection	15.5%
santa	12.5%		iron (sheets)/metal/ steel (made of ~)	14.1%
brick	8.3%		grass	7.0%
ceiling	8.3%		part of house	7.0%
hard	8.3%		provides shade/ prevents sun	5.6%
leaks	8.3%		shade/shelter (for ~)	5.6%
rain	8.3%			
shelter (provides ~)	8.3%			
snow	8.3%			

The degree of local particularity found in the data spans the gamut from concepts just tinged or 'flavoured' by the local ecology to more obtrusive conceptual peculiarities reflecting, so to speak, local conceptual 'specialties'. Distinctly different from the US-American concepts lexicalized by the same form, and at the same time noticeably different from the corresponding Hausa concepts, these 'specialties' can be regarded as newly emergent concepts unique to the speakers of English in that particular region or related cultures. They are, so to speak, 'conceptual Nigerianisms' or, to be precise, 'Hausaisms'.

Table 2. Results of attribute listing for BOYS' QUARTERS

RATING USA			RATING NIGERIA	
boys' quarters	**weight**		**boys' quarters**	**weight**
locker rooms	20.8%		boys (only) (for ~)/boys stay there/ made for boys/used by boys/ belonging to boys/boys' area of residence/boys' house	46.5%
beds	16.7%		room(s) (two) (small ~)	26.8%
bedroom	12.5%		beds/beddings/sleeping place	21.1%
dirty	12.5%		for children/children's place in a house/children's room	21.1%
hang out (~places)	12.5%		house	18.3%
room	12.5%		at back (yard) of/behind the house	15.5%
blue or other masculine colored walls	8.3%		building	15.5%
boys	8.3%		locality separate from main/ major house/near main house/outside main house	15.5%
dorm(s)	8.3%		belonging to/for servants/boys that work in the house	9.9%
gyms	8.3%		apartment	7.0%
loud	8.3%		bathroom(s)	7.0%
messy	8.3%		part of house	7.0%
private/privacy	8.3%		toilet(s)	7.0%
smelly	8.3%		visitors (place for ~)	5.6%

The most extreme pole on the cline of conceptual differences is reached by concepts that are lexicalized by English forms but are nowadays apparently unique to the post-colonial African context. Examples of this type are *boys' quarters* (Table 2) and *compound* (in the sense of 'area enclosed by a wall or fence including a yard and houses inhabited by a(n extended) family'; Table 3).

Table 3. Results of attribute listing for COMPOUND

RATING USA			RATING NIGERIA	
compound	**weight**		**compound**	**weight**
two things put together	25.0%		surrounding (of house)/around house/near house	23.9%
complicated/difficult/complex	20.8%		place where (many) people live	18.3%
mix	20.8%		area	15.5%
combine	16.7%		family house/harbours people of the same family	12.7%
more than 1	16.7%		house	12.7%
chemistry	12.5%		part of house/space within a house	12.7%
element	12.5%		big/large	11.3%
science	12.5%		open space/area	11.3%
together	12.5%		environment	9.9%
compound word/noun	8.3%		fence(d)	7.0%
			premises	7.0%
			school compound	7.0%
			collection of houses in one place/houses put together in one place/ contains many buildings	5.6%
			field	5.6%
			flowers (around)	5.6%

These examples show that the notion of 'light English' concepts is by no means restricted to the New Englishes, but applies to native speakers of the native varieties as well (cf. Section 4.1 above). The data provided by the American students clearly demonstrate that they do not seem to be

familiar with the concepts in question. Like 'light English', these extreme cases of 'local English' are of less concern to me here as proof of their particularity would not have required painstaking experimental testing.

What should not go unnoticed in the Nigerian list for *compound*, however, is the fairly low weight score for the top attributes, which suggests that there is not much agreement on the dominant aspects of this concept. This is in contrast with the findings on the Hausa word *gida*, where the top attributes *ɗaki (*'hut, room', 52%), *gini* ('building', 43%) and *ƙofa* ('door', 36%) boast considerably higher weight scores (Wießner 2005: 33). The intersubjective variability in the responses to COMPOUND suggest that *c*ompared to Hausa *gida* the English-language notion of COMPOUND does not seem to play a prominent role in the informants' everyday lives.

In what follows, I will carve out two sections from the cline of localizations and focus on 'locally flavoured concepts' and 'local conceptual specialties' in turn. The usual reminder applies, of course, that classes established more or less arbitrarily along continua have fuzzy boundaries.

4.2.1 Locally flavoured concepts

Examples of the 'locally flavoured' type of concepts include the notion of ROOF already discussed as well as DOOR and FENCE. As in the case of ROOF, the Nigerian informants are more concerned with the material of doors ('wood/timber', 'metal/steel/iron/aluminium') than the American informants (Table 4). In addition, a larger number of the Nigerian students mention the function of doors, 'entrance' and 'exit'. Again as with *roof* above, it is possible that this is a transfer from the Hausa culture and language: the extract from the data collected by Wießner (2005) in Table 5 shows that the top attributes produced by the Nigerian informants in response to *door* are almost identical to the ones for its Hausa equivalent, ƘOFA, except that the weight of the attributes, i.e. the agreement among the informants, is in general higher for the Hausa stimulus than for the English.

Table 4. Results of attribute listing for DOOR

RATING USA			RATING NIGERIA	
door	**weight**		**door**	**weight**
open	62.5%		entrance (into building/room) (house ~)/inlet/wide ~	52.1%
close(d)	54.2%		wood/timber (made of)	28.2%
doorknob/knob	33.3%		metal/steel/iron/aluminium (made of ~)	18.3%
house	29.2%		room	16.9%
handle (door~)	25.0%		exit (point)/outlet of a building	14.1%
lock	20.8%		key(hole)	14.1%
shut	20.8%		lock	9.9%
wooden	20.8%		passage (opening~)	9.9%
entrance	16.7%		close(d)	8.5%
window	16.7%		handle	8.5%
front	12.5%		open	8.5%
key	12.5%		part of building/house	7.0%
back	8.3%		rectangular/rectangle	7.0%
barrier	8.3%		frame	5.6%
big	8.3%		glass	5.6%
doorbell	8.3%		house (found in ~)	5.6%
exit	8.3%		in & out (to get ~)	5.6%
heavy	8.3%		padlock	5.6%
in	8.3%			
mail box	8.3%			
opportunity	8.3%			
out	8.3%			
privacy	8.3%			
room (to a ~)	8.3%			
screen	8.3%			
steel	8.3%			

Table 5. Extract of results of attribute listing for Hausa ƙOFA (‘door’) from Wießner (2005: 54)

RATING Nigeria Hausa	
ƙofa ‘door’	**weight**
ƘarfeIron’ / kwano ‘zinc’	52%
shiga/mashiga ‘entrance’	51%
katako ‘wood’	49%
ɗaki ‘hut, room’	40%
gida ‘compound’	33%
makulli ‘key’	22%

Differences in the typical material of artefacts are also conceptually reflected in the lists for FENCE (Table 6), where ‘(made of) wood’ is the dominant attribute for the American students as opposed to ‘wire(d)/barb wire’ on the Nigerian side.

What is more striking about the Nigerian list is that with a weight score of no more than 29.6% this is another case with a low degree of intersubjective agreement even on the most prominent attributes. The material attributes ‘(made of) blocks’ and ‘bricks’, as well as the mention of ‘(kind of) wall’ also reflect a degree of uncertainty regarding the difference between WALL and FENCE. This is supported by the occurrence of the attribute ‘(part of) fence’ in the list for the concept WALL (Table 7). It is likely that this conceptual peculiarity is also caused by interference with Hausa, where three words correspond to English *wall*: *bango* ‘a wall of any kind whatever’, *katanga* ‘the wall of a house or compound’ and *garu* ‘a wall, applied to that of a town, compound or house, but rarely to that of a room’ (all definitions taken from Bargery 1993). The conceptual uncertainty with regard to the English notions of WALL and FENCE could be a result of the fact that Hausa walls, in particular those referred to as *katanga*, serve the function of delimiting a property (the typical Hausa attribute named by the informants is *kewaye* ‘enclosed’); yet the typical material is of course blocks of clay and bricks and this conflation of function and material has an effect on the conceptualization of English WALL.

Table 6. Results of attribute listing for FENCE

RATING USA			RATING NIGERIA	
fence	**weight**		**fence**	**weight**
wood (made of ~)	54.2%		wire(d)/barb wire	29.6%
white	37.5%		protects territory/for protection/ protects from harm/against intruders/security	21.1%
metal (made of ~)	33.3%		rounding (~ boundaries)/round a place/surrounds house/surrounding	16.9%
picket	33.3%		demarcation	11.3%
gate	25.0%		(made of) metal/iron	9.9%
house (around ~)	16.7%		built	9.9%
protects what's inside/ protection	16.7%		around house/building/field	8.5%
surrounds (~ property)	16.7%		cover (~wall) (~ of a place/ environment)	8.5%
dog(s)	12.5%		(made of) blocks	7.0%
high	12.5%		bar people/animals from getting through environment/area/ stops trespassing/ prevents entering	7.0%
keep out	12.5%		Bricks	5.6%
barbed wire	8.3%		high (erected ~)	5.6%
barrier	8.3%		(kind of) wall	5.6%
chain	8.3%		Wood	5.6%
climb	8.3%			
closed in	8.3%			
containment/contai ns things	8.3%			
keeps things in	8.3%			
linked	8.3%			
low	8.3%			
privacy	8.3%			
separate	8.3%			

separates properties/ pieces of land	8.3%		
yard	8.3%		

Further examples of the category 'locally flavoured' concepts include GATE, HOUSE and TOILET.

4.2.2 Local specialties

'Local specialties' are defined here as distinctly localized English language concepts that are apparently influenced by the Hausa culture and/or language, and yet distinctly different in their structure from the corresponding Hausa concepts. To appreciate their structure it is important to compare them not only to data from the American students but also to the attribute lists that the same Nigerian informants produced in response to Hausa stimuli.

Table 7. Results of attribute listing for English HUT and Hausa ɗAKI

RATING USA			**RATING NIGERIA: ENGLISH**			**RATING NIGERIA: HAUSA**	
hut	**weight**		**hut**	**weight**		**ɗaki 'hut, room'**	**weight**
small	29.2%		small/short/smaller than house	28.2%		ƙofa 'door'	74%
pizza	25.0%		round/circular	25.4%		taga/windo 'window'	55%
straw	25.0%		grass (made with)	23.9%		gado 'bed'	43%
wood/sticks/ branches (made of ~)	25.0%		mud/clay (built with ~)	18.3%		gini/gina 'building'	43%
shelter (form of ~)	20.8%		door (small ~)	14.1%		barci/kwana 'sleep'	33%
home (type of ~)	16.7%		roof	14.1%		rufi/marfi 'roof'	29%
house	12.5%		room	14.1%		kwanciya 'lie down'	26%

grass (~ used to build it)	8.3%		building (type of ~)/built	12.7%		ƙasa ‘mud, clay’	19%
Hawaii	8.3%		thatch (~ed roof)	12.7%		gida ‘compound	17%
hay	8.3%		in village/rural	9.9%		bulok/bulo ‘block, brick’	14%
live (place to ~ in)	8.3%		window(s) (small ~)	9.9%		kwano ‘corrugated iron’	14%
not strong/unstable	8.3%		house	8.5%		ciyawa ‘grass’	14%
protection	8.3%		shelter	8.5%		katifa ‘mattress’	14%
safety	8.3%					kujeru ‘chairs’	14%
shack	8.3%					labule ‘curtain’	14%
??tikki	8.3%					shinfida ‘linen’	12%
tipi	8.3%					tabarma ‘mat’	12%
						zama ‘sit together’	12%

A good case in point is the concept HUT (Table 7). On the one hand, a comparison of the Nigerians’ and the Americans’ reactions to HUT demonstrates that the two groups have different objects before their minds’ eyes. While the Americans imagine a small detached building, the Nigerians also mention the attribute ‘room’. Since, as already mentioned, the Hausa lexeme *ɗaki* has the polysemous meaning of ‘hut’ and ‘room’, this local characteristic of HUT is another case of transfer in line with the locally flavoured concepts discussed above. On the other hand, there is also a noticeable difference in the Nigerian respondents’ reaction to English *hut* and Hausa *ɗaki*. Whereas the attributes named for HUT reflect a presumably accurate picture of the physical characteristics of the typical referents, those given for *ɗaki* invite us, so to speak, into the hut or room: not only do they include references to the furniture typically found in a *ɗaki* (i.e. bed, mattress, chairs,—apparently rather recent additions to more

traditional pieces of furniture (Wießner 2005: 43)—linen, curtains and mats), but they also illustrate family life there, covering the activities of sleeping, lying down and sitting together. All in all, the mental concept activated in the Nigerian subjects' minds by the stimulus HUT is not only much less rich and fleshed-out in detail with regard to conceptual content, but also more emotionally detached than the one conjured up by Hausa *ɗaki*. In a manner of speaking, the respondents seem to look at, and think about, a *hut* from an outside perspective, but apparently imagine going about their daily business inside a *ɗaki*, therefore bringing their attitudes and feelings into play. The impression that ƊAKI seems to have a much firmer place in the minds (and hearts) of the Nigerian respondents than HUT does is supported by the high weight scores for the top attributes in the list for the Hausa concepts. The notion of HUT thus turns out to be a localized English concept in its own right displaying only fairly superficial reflections of the outer physical characteristics of local referents but lacking the conceptual and emotional richness typical of the corresponding Hausa word.

One reason for the relative autonomy of the Hausa English concept of HUT could be that, as we have seen, *hut* and *ɗaki* are actually not referentially equivalent, since *ɗaki* covers 'hut' as well as 'room'. In fact, a more appropriate Hausa equivalent for *hut* would presumably have been the less common lexeme *bukka*, denoting according to Bargery (1993), "a hut made of stalks or grass". A similar reason for the emergence of a concept emancipated from both English and Hausa seems to be valid for a second example of this type, the concept WINDOW (see Schmid *et al*. in press). Here the interference arises from two facts: first, the main Hausa equivalent to *window*, the lexeme *taga*, has the two related meanings of 'window' and, more generally and presumably older, 'hole in the wall'; and second, this Hausa word is accompanied by the English loanword *windo* 'window'. Interestingly, *windo* is not named by the Hausa informants as an attribute of *taga* but is included in the lists for other words including *ɗaki* 'hut, room' (Wießner 2005). This suggests that it does have a place in speakers' minds, but is apparently not closely connected to the concept TAGA. The findings for WINDOW/TAGA are analogous to those for HUT/ƊAKI insofar as the conceptual structure associated with the English word in the minds of the Nigerian speakers is a reflection of the local ecology and thus different from the concept in American speakers' minds, but again less rich than the Hausa concept. Signs of attitudes and emotions as well as imagined interactions with the referents given in the Hausa lists such as 'close', 'look out', 'open' and

'has a lock' as well as 'has nails' are missing in the same informants' responses to the English stimulus.

Another interesting case of a fairly special local concept is the notion of HOME. Both the American and the Nigerian informants provide a mixture of physical, objective attributes relating to the conceptual complex of HOUSE that is undoubtedly part of the notion HOME, among them 'house', 'rooms', 'windows', 'doors', and 'wall'. But while both groups also name attitudinal and emotional attributes related to the 'homeliness' of homes, these differ considerably, except for the mention of 'family', which is found in both lists (but is also very likely to have different meanings for the two groups of informants): the focus of the American informants lies on the security and 'warmth' associated with HOME: 'safe/ safety/security', 'comfort/comfortable/comforting', 'shelter', 'protection', 'love', 'warmth'. The Nigerian informants' concepts are also affective and emotional but in a different way. They reflect the strong social ties that most urban Nigerians have to their birthplace; attributes pointing in this direction include 'town', 'birthplace/place of birth', 'village' and 'where parents live/parents live there'. This notion of HOME does not appear to be influenced by a specific Hausa word, since the only Hausa correspondence given to English *home* by Bargery (1993) is *gida* 'house, compound'. The notion is one of the rare cases where a linguistic transfer can more or less be ruled out in favour of a purely cultural one. The Hausa English word *home* is thus a good example of an autonomous new concept emerging from the blending of English language and African-culture input.

Table 8. Results of attribute listing for English HOME

RATING USA			RATING NIGERIA	
home	**weight**		**home**	**weight**
family	41.7%		place to live/place of living/living place/ where people live	38.0%
house	41.7%		house	29.6%
live (where you ~)	37.5%		rooms (kitchen, toilet, bathroom)	28.2%
safe/safety/security	25.0%		familiar terrain/family lives there/family	25.4%
comfort/comfortable/comforting	20.8%		residence	14.1%
shelter	20.8%		town	14.1%
protects you/protection	16.7%		birthplace/place of birth	9.9%
room(s)	16.7%		building	9.9%
sleep	16.7%		shelter/protection	8.5%
love	12.5%		village	8.5%
place	12.5%		kitchen	7.0%
warmth	12.5%		where parents live/ parents live there	7.0%
windows	12.5%		wall	5.6%
apartment	8.3%			
bed	8.3%			
bedrooms	8.3%			
dog	8.3%			
doors	8.3%			
garage	8.3%			
kitchen	8.3%			
living room	8.3%			
residence	8.3%			
roof	8.3%			
walls	8.3%			

4.3 Fictitious English

Of the three major categories proposed in this chapter, the concept of 'fictitious English' is probably the one most likely to be accused of a strong 'etic' eurocentrism. The category subsumes cases where there is a surprising mismatch of the—or better: a European's—perception of the Nigerian ecology and the attributes named by the informants. Therefore, it is particularly important to take into account local information. In his *Dictionary of Nigerian English Usage* (2002), Igboanusi makes the following comments on the word *garden* in Nigerian English (NE):[6]

> In NE, "garden" seems to be devoted only for vegetables. In BE, "garden" is "a piece of private ground used for growing flowers, fruit, vegetables, etc., typically with a lawn or other open space for playing and relaxing" (Igboanusi 2002, s.v. *garden*)

In view of this account of the "Nigerian" notion of GARDEN, some aspects of the data provided by our informants do come as a surprise (see Table 9).

For once, what is interesting in the lists presented in Table 9 are not the differences between the American and Nigerian findings but the astonishing similarities. Of course, there are straightforward symptoms of 'local English' as suggested by Igboanusi's explanation of Nigerian English (e.g. 'farm-like'); but especially the top scoring attribute 'flowers' as well as the less frequently named 'relaxation/resting area/recreation', 'green vegetation etc.', 'beauty/ good-looking', 'chairs' and 'cool (place)/cold' are more in line with his account of British English than with the Nigerian ecology. We must take into consideration here that the meaning of *flower* is wider in Nigerian English than in American English and may in fact include shrubs. Nevertheless, the additional attributes mentioned suggest that what the Nigerian informants have in mind are the gardens surrounding expensive villas of rich people or public buildings (including the university!), or give a fictitious idea of their image of a Western-style garden. Be that as it may, with the exception of the university's park, none of these options would be reckoned to be firmly entrenched in everyday speakers' minds.

Table 9. Results of attribute listing for English GARDEN

RATING USA			RATING NIGERIA	
garden	**weight**		**garden**	**weight**
flowers	83.3%		flowers (well arranged)	40.8%
vegetables	62.5%		vegetables (where farmers grow ~)	29.6%
fruit	33.3%		fruit (cultivation) (~ grow there)	28.2%
plant(s)	33.3%		trees (many ~)	23.9%
dirt	25.0%		farm-like field/small farm/place for farming	21.1%
green	25.0%		water/watery/watered/watering	16.9%
growth/grow	25.0%		fence (surrounded by ~/to protect from animals/covered with ~)	15.5%
water (needs ~)	25.0%		grow	15.5%
soil	16.7%		plant(s)	14.1%
trees	16.7%		relaxation/resting area/recreation	11.3%
colorful	12.5%		land near house/place behind house/beside house	9.9%
food	12.5%		place/area/piece of land	9.9%
backyard (in ~)	8.3%		green vegetation/green areas/ greenish/vegetation area	7.0%
bushes	8.3%		beauty/good-looking	5.6%
crops	8.3%		chairs	4.2%
grass	8.3%		cool (place)/cold	4.2%
roses	8.3%		grass	4.2%
seed	8.3%		green/fresh leaves / leaves	4.2%
side of house/ near house	8.3%		tomato(es)	4.2%
small	8.3%			
springtime	8.3%			
sun (needs ~)	8.3%			
tomatoes	8.3%			

To a lesser extent, attributes that can be interpreted as reflecting a 'fictitious English' concept can be spotted in the response to the concept BATHROOM (see Table 10):

Table 10. Results of attribute listing for English BATHROOM

RATING USA			RATING NIGERIA	
bathroom	**weight**		**bathroom**	**weight**
toilet	75.0%		bath(ing) (~ material)(place for ~)	69.0%
shower	66.7%		shower	29.6%
sink	66.7%		soap (keeping ~)/soapdish	28.2%
soap	37.5%		water (abundant) (~ system)	23.9%
water	37.5%		room	15.5%
towel(s)	33.3%		sink	14.1%
toilet paper	29.2%		part of house/part of building	12.7%
mirror	25.0%		tap (water ~)	12.7%
shampoo	25.0%		mirror	9.9%
bath	16.7%		bathtub	7.0%
toothbrush	16.7%		sponge	7.0%
tub (bath ~)	16.7%		towel	7.0%
conditioner	12.5%		washing (room for ~)	7.0%
medicine cabinet	12.5%		basin (wash~)	5.6%
pee	12.5%		bucket	5.6%
privacy/private	12.5%		door	5.6%
tiles/tile walls/tile floors	12.5%		window	5.6%
cleans	8.3%			
dirty/filthy	8.3%			
get dressed/dressing up	8.3%			
make-up (put on ~)	8.3%			

The attribute list provided by the Nigerian informants for BATHROOM reads more or less like a description of a state-of-the-art fully-fitted Western bathroom including 'shower', and 'bathtub'. Even though these concepts

are of course familiar to the large majority of Nigerians and definitely to the students who serve as informants, these amenities are not yet standard in most homes in Maiduguri. As already noted in Section 3 above, one must read the first attribute 'bathing' as referring to 'washing oneself' (often with water carried into the bathroom) rather than 'having a bath'.

It would be rash to interpret these fictitious concepts as recent manifestations of the notorious 'aping' of native English by the "been-tos", because none of the Nigerian informants made it known in the personal questionnaires they had to fill in that they had spent an extended period of time in Britain or the USA. While there is presumably not much point in speculating about the sources of these concepts, what seems most likely to me is that—partly influenced by the academic context in which the experiments took place—informants seem to call upon stereotypical knowledge about the features and functions of the referents of these words in a Western context and include these in their lists. It does not seem unlikely that the audiovisual impact of the mass media plays a role here.

5. Summary and discussion in the light of the identity question

Essentially, I have discussed experimental evidence for five types of locally specific concepts associated with English words:

- 'African' concepts (expressed by English language words) more or less unique to the Nigerian (or Hausa or African) environment (e.g. *boys' quarters, compound)*;
- 'light English' concepts foreign to the local ecology and poor in conceptual content (*porch, staircase; pizza, cheese*);
- 'locally flavoured' English concepts showing more or less distinct reflections of the local ecology, often under the influence of Hausa terms whose equivalence with the English language concepts is skewed (*roof, door, fence*);
- 'local conceptual specialties' with conceptual structures considerably remote from the corresponding American concepts but also emancipated from corresponding Hausa concepts, often due to the lack of a semantically equivalent word in Hausa and a noticeable attitudinal, emotional and interactional detachment (*hut, window, home*);
- 'fictitious English' concepts, possibly including reflections of stereotypical knowledge of Western-style referents (*garden*, *bathroom*).

All these types confirm Adegbija and Bello's (2001: 96) statement that

> Nigerian speakers of English need to be keenly sensitive to the fact that although they speak English, and may be using English lexical items, the meanings they intend their words to have may not always be those which speakers of English in other contexts will derive from their utterances. […] We also have seen that the sociolinguistic and pragmatic contexts of the use of English in Nigeria can infuse new life into English words in the Nigerian context.

The findings on conceptual transfer from the Hausa culture and/or language put some doubt on Bamgbose's (1992: 152) claim that "the interference approach is even less justifiable in lexis" than in pronunciation.

As far as the question of identity is concerned, the evidence from the five categories does not completely converge and is therefore not entirely conclusive. Some interpretations seem to be licensed, however.

Firstly, the juxtaposition of the nature of 'light English' concepts and the locally specific ones shows that relevance for the local ecology and culture is of key importance. There is a selective mechanism in place—very similar to the filtration gates proposed by Anchimbe (2006a) allowing only necessary material from the indigenous languages into the local English—which keeps unnecessary lexical material outside the local variety of English. This selective attitude is a sign of a considerable degree of autonomy of the local English from its historical mother, British English, and the variety currently gaining global influence, American English (cf. Anchimbe 2006b). While this in itself is not a symptom of an English-language identity on the parts of the speakers of Hausa English, the existence of a large number of culturally irrelevant concepts would in fact constitute evidence for a lack of identity with English.

Secondly, those English language concepts that may be of importance for the local culture are without a doubt tailored to the needs of the local speakers and reflect their communicative needs. Their interpretation with regard to identity differs according to the types. The 'locally flavoured' concepts do not represent a fully-fledged identification with the English concepts, since essentially they appear to be what their name says, i.e. foreign notions borrowed from a different conceptual system and flavoured with a modicum of local spices. The 'local conceptual specialties' constitute ambivalent evidence: on the one hand, their conceptual autonomy from both native English and Hausa can be interpreted as the result of a firm entrenchment in the minds of these multilingual speakers. If these concepts are indeed stored, so to speak, as entries in their own right in the mental lexicon, it could be argued that this is where the seat of a genuinely English language identity can be found.

On the other hand, it was found that these 'local conceptual specialties' tend to be lacking what is traditionally known as connotative meaning. In contrast to the corresponding Hausa terms, the English notions HUT, WINDOW and HOME elicited hardly any attributes referring to attitudes and emotions or to typical everyday interactions with the referents. One would presumably say that if there is an essential part of a concept that points to a strong identification with what is experientially and culturally fossilized in that concept, then it is the connotative, associative and attitudinal part more than the purely denotative or cognitive (in a narrow sense) part. The potential of the 'local conceptual specialties' as evidence for an English-language identity is thus also limited.

Thirdly, as already argued above, the 'fictitious English' concepts can hardly be said to reflect an entrenched English-language identity, because like 'light English' concepts they represent an outsider's view of a still largely foreign notion. In contrast to light concepts, fictitious ones apparently reflect attempts to add stereotypical knowledge of Western-style referents, possibly gained from exposure to imported mass media.

In sum, this study presents more evidence against the existence of an identification with the English language in the minds of our Nigerian informants than for it. By and large, English does appear to remain "the other tongue" (Kachru 1992), i.e. a dispreferred cognitive vehicle for making sense of the speaker's world. The concepts that are of sufficient relevance to be fully entrenched turned out to be either local versions of essentially foreign concepts or attitudinally impoverished representations of the local ecology.

Having said that, a whole list of reservations and caveats should be added to keep readers from jumping to the conclusion that the New Englishes do not have a firm place in people's minds, let alone hearts. The first caveat concerns the method used: the attribute-listing task applied in this study is a classic off-line method, where informants stop to think about issues that are normally resolved during on-line speech in fractions of seconds. This means that some of the attributes listed may not be part of the everyday concepts stored in the informants' minds, but come up as artefacts of the test situation. Specifically, it is possible that multilingual speakers are much more prone to resort to conceptual knowledge attached to the corresponding word in their first language. This would emerge as L1 transfer from the tests, but may not play a role in authentic ongoing language use.

As a second reservation, the sociolinguistic situation should be brought back to our attention. The findings could very likely be different in other areas. Thus, it was made clear in Section 2 above that the vitality of

English is probably much lower in the region under investigation than in many other typical post-colonial societies. The comparable vitality of the regional indigenous language Hausa no doubt has a strong effect on the propensity of the multilingual speakers to identify with English.

Thirdly, the conceptual area investigated may have contributed to the lack of evidence for identification. Being a domain of everyday family and personal lives, the field of 'house' and 'compound' is presumably less frequently dealt with in English than in any of the indigenous languages. Since English is very much the language of administration and tertiary education in this area, the results for concepts from these domains could easily have been completely different. In fact, it would seem quite likely that students in particular, who constantly move between their Kanuri village, the Hausa-dominated city of Maiduguri and largely English-speaking university life, change their linguistic allegiances and identities in accordance with the social roles they play in these different worlds. This would suggest, rather plausibly in fact in view of the extensive research on code-switching, that situationally accommodated multiple identities exist which are adopted when triggered by the pragmatic requirements of the context. Whether multilingual Africans have a superordinate and stable personal identity spanning these changing situations, for example as 'multilingual speakers of a couple of indigenous languages plus local English', could not be shown in the framework of this study.

In view of the ambivalent results presented here, it would appear to promise interesting insights to apply the same method to study the concepts associated by the same informants with lexemes from administrative and other more formal contexts, and to compare the material discussed here with data collected in areas in West Africa where English has a stronger position than in Hausaland.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as part of the project "Local action in Africa in the context of global influences" located at Bayreuth University, Germany. The research reported here was carried out in Maiduguri/Nigeria and New York City/USA by Karina Kopatsch (Bayreuth); some parts of the material were analysed and interpreted by Ines Wießner (2005) and Christian Götz (2006). I am also indebted to Peter Gottschligg (Vienna) and Abubakar Girei (Maiduguri) for advice on Hausa and Northern Nigerian English, to Dymitr Ibriszimow (Bayreuth) for advice on Hausa, and to the editor of this volume, Eric Anchimbe, for his valuable comments on this chapter. It

is not needless but indeed important to say that all remaining infelicities, as well as the glaring Eurocentrism, are entirely my own.

References

Abraham, Roy Clive. 1968. *Dictionary of the Hausa language.* London: University of London Press.

Adegbija, Efurosibina. 1989. Lexico-semantic variation in Nigerian English. *World Englishes* 8(2), 165-177.

—. 1994. The context of language planning in Africa: An illustration with Nigeria. In Martin Pütz (ed.). *Language contact and language conflict*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: Benjamins, 139-163.

Adegbija, Efurosibina and Janet Bello. 2001. The semantics of 'okay' (OK) in Nigerian English. *Word Englishes* 20(1), 89-98.

Anchimbe, Eric A. 2006a. *Cameroon English. Authenticity, ecology and evolution*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.

—. 2006b. World Englishes and the American Tongue. *English Today* 22(4), 3-9.

—. 2006c. Local meaning in the English of West Africa. *English Today* 22(2), 50-54.

Babajide, Adeyemi O. 2001. Language attitude patterns of Nigerians. In Igboanusi (ed.). 2001., 1-13.

Bamgbose, Ayo. 1992. Standard Nigerian English: Issues of identification. In Kachru (ed.). 1992., 148-161.

Banjo, Ayo. 2000. English in West Africa. In *Sociolinguistics in West Africa.* Special issue of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 141, 27-38.

Bargery, G.P. 1993. *A Hausa–English dictionary and English–Hausa vocabulary*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Press.

Bokamba, Eyamba G. 1992. The Africanization of English. In Kachru (ed.) 1992., 125-147.

Broß, Michael. 2002. State and perspective of languages in Maiduguri. In Rupert Kawka (ed.). *From Bulamari to Yerwa to Metroplotan Maiduguri. Interdisciplinary studies on the capital of Borno State, Nigeria*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 103-116.

Ferguson, Charles A. and Charles E. De Bose. 1977. Simplified registers, broken language, and pidginization. In Albert Valdman (ed.). *Pidgin and creole linguistics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 99-125.

Götz, Christian. 2006. *Conceptualization of HOUSE and HOME. A contrastive-lexico-semantic study of the semantic field HOUSE and*

HOME in Nigerian and American English. Unpublished thesis for teacher's state exam, Munich University.
Hansford, Keir, Johu Bendor-Samuel and Ron Stanford. 1976. *Studies in Nigerian languages*. Accra: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
Hayward, Richard J. 2000. Afroasiatic. In Bernd Heine and Derek Nurse (eds.). 2000. *African languages: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 74-98.
Igboanusi, Herbert (ed.). 2001. *Language attitude and language conflict in West Africa*. Ibadan: Enicrownfit Publishers.
—. 2002. *Dictionary of Nigerian English usage*. Ibadan: Enicrownfit Publishers.
Kachru, Braj B. 1985. Institutionalized second language varieties. In Sidney Greenbaum (ed.). *The English language today*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 211-226.
—. 1991. Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern. *English Today* 25(7), 3-13.
—. (ed.) 1992. *The other tongue. English across cultures*. 2nd ed. Urbana-Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
Kachru, Braj B., Yamuna Kachru and Cecil L. Nelson (eds.). 2006. *The handbook of varieties of English*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Moughtin, J.C. 1964. The traditional settlements of the Hausa people. *Town Planning Review* 35, 21-34.
—. 1985. *Hausa architecture*. London: Ethnographia.
Omoniyi, Tope. 2006. West African Englishes. In Kachru, Kachru and Nelson (eds.). 2006., 172-187.
Oyetade, S. Oluwole. 2001. Attitude to foreign languages and indigenous language use in Nigeria. In Igboanusi (ed.). 2001., 14-29.
Phillipson, Robert. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Pike, Kenneth. 1967. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour*, 2nd ed., The Hague: Mouton.
Quirk, Randolph. 1990. Language varieties and standard language. *English Today* 21, 3-21.
Rosch, Eleonor. 1973. On the internal structure of perceptual and semantic categories. In Timothy E. Moore (ed.). *Cognitive development and the acquisition of language*. New York-San Francisco-London: Academic Press, 111-144.

Rosch, Eleonor and Caroline B. Mervis. 1975. Family resemblances: Studies in the internal structure of categories. *Cognitive psychology* 7, 573-605.

Schmied, Josef. 1991. *English in Africa*. London-New York: Longman.

Schmid, Hans-Jörg, Dymitr Ibriszimow, Karina Kopatsch and Peter Gottschligg. in press. Conceptual blending in language, cognition, and culture. Towards a methodology for the linguistic study of syncretic concepts. In Afe Adogame, Magnus Echtler and Ulf Vierke (eds.). *Unpacking the new: Critical perspectives on cultural syncretization in Africa and beyond*. Münster: LIT.

Sey, Kofi. 1973. *Ghanaian English*. London: Macmillan.

Simo Bobda, Augustin. 1994. Lexical innovation processes in Cameroon English. *Word Englishes* 13(2), 245-260.

Taylor, John R. 2003. *Linguistic categorization. Prototypes in linguistic theory*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ungerer, Friedrich and Hans-Jörg Schmid. 2006. *An introduction to cognitive linguistics*. 2nd ed. London: Pearson Longman.

Wießner, Ines. 2005. *Der konzeptuelle Aufbau des Wortfeldes Haus für Hausa L1 und L2 Sprecher. Eine Untersuchung zu kontrastiver kognitiver Semantik in Nordnigeria*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Bayreuth University.

Notes

[1] Accessible recent compilations of evidence are the handbooks edited by Kortmann and Schneider (2004) and Kachru, Kachru and Nelson (2006).

[2] Obviously, this relates to the long-standing debate between the adaptationist and the alienist positions on the effects of colonial languages on indigenous languages and cultures. The alienationist view holds that English is an imperialist killer language (Phillipson 1992, Mühlhäusler 1996, Skutnabb-Kangas 2000) imposing a Western worldview on post-colonial societies, ultimately leading to the loss of the cultural identity of their members. The adaptationist view, on the other hand, claims that English has been and is constantly being transformed by the recipient societies to suit their local and regional needs and has already become part of their culture and heritage. The present study provides evidence supporting the adaptationist position but opens up a fresh, more differentiated view into the very nature of the adaptation, acculturation or appropriation processes going on.

[3] The terms *concept* and *cognitive category* will be used interchangeably in this chapter.

[4] That the association between ROOF and CEILING is also important for Western speakers of English is reflected in the fact that in the 4th edition of the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2005), the entry for *ceiling* includes a signpost to the entry *roof*.

[5] The column headed "weight" gives the proportion of informants who named a certain attribute. In this and all the following tables only those attributes are included that were named by at least 5% of the informants, unless an attribute is related to dimensions covered by more frequent attributes such as material.

[6] It should be observed that the focus of Igboanusi's dictionary is on Southern varieties of Nigerian English. It is possible that Northern, i.e. 'Hausa English', may differ in some respects.