

R. Tandra, Joseph, & Jacobs
"Systematic hyperforeignisms"

THE REALITY OF LINGUISTIC RULES

Edited by
Susan D. Lima
Robert L. Corrigan
Gregory K. Iverson

Offprint

Systematic Hyperforeignisms as Maximally External Evidence for Linguistic Rules

Richard D. Janda
University of Chicago

Brian D. Joseph and Neil G. Jacobs
Ohio State University

0. Preamble: Internal vs. external evidence and language-contact phenomena

Hyperforeignization — as, for example, in the frequent American English pronunciation of *lingerie* as “pseudo-French” [lɪŋʒəriː] rather than real French [lɛ̃ʒ(ə)ʁi] — provides what could be considered maximally external evidence for the reality of rules as valid linguistic generalizations, because such hyperforeignisms often show speakers displaying systematicity and productivity in the application of general patterns to novel non-native contexts. Facts of this sort expand the range of evidence for rules overall; in addition, they support the claim that many (if not most) rules are actually “local generalizations” which typically range over lexically quite limited sets of data, rather than vast, more globally defined linguistic domains (cf. Joseph and Janda 1988).

The characterization of hyperforeignization phenomena as external evidence can easily be justified on the basis of the usual distinction made between data of this sort and internal evidence. Zwicky (1975), for example, pointed out that, in order to motivate and justify the (significant) linguistic generalizations which they proposed, most structuralist and early generative studies (especially in generative phonology) relied almost exclusively on what can be called “internal” evidence. At issue here are, namely: (i) the distribution of individual linguistic elements; (ii) their mutual alternations; and (iii) any other relations which exist between and among them, including configurational arrangements (e.g., symmetry within inven-

torics). Phenomena of this sort are clearly internal in the sense that their linguistic nature can be established without any need to bring in ancillary theories of extralinguistic domains. Nevertheless, it was not long before generativists (again especially phonologists) and their critics questioned the theretofore privileged status of such internal data. In particular, if a distributional, alternational, or configurational generalization of a language is limited to a restricted pattern found only in a small, closed set of elements, how can one be sure that it is in fact recognized by speakers, rather than being just an accident or a historical residue?

It was largely in response to this challenge that, as also observed by Zwicky (1975), generative grammarians and their critics turned to so-called "external" evidence — the literally dozens of other data-sources in which language overlaps with non-linguistic domains: e.g., physiology, neurology, psychology, and sociology. The externality of the phenomena in question resides in the fact that, for them, there is indeed a need for ancillary accounts which demonstrate that a given datum actually has to do with language, too, and not just with an essentially non-linguistic part of some overlapping domain.¹ Despite the existence of this extra requirement, Zwicky (1975) could list 22 type types of external evidence that had already been topics of linguistic research, and numerous later generative works have made many additions since then. The resulting set of evidentiary phenomena ranges from language-acquisition, -loss, and -universals (cf., e.g., Jakobson 1941), via the investigation of the specialized phonology found in marginal lexical domains such as affective vocabulary (cf., e.g., Joseph 1984), all the way to the experimental investigation of tune/text matching in made-up songs (cf., e.g., Janda and Morgan 1988).

The special appeal of external evidence, of course, is that these sources allow linguists to validate (or invalidate) claims regarding the reality and significance of proposed generalizations by testing their predictions against open-ended or at least additional sources of data — subject, obviously, to the proviso that at least partial theories can be provided concerning the relevant non-linguistic domains and their interaction with language (e.g., accounts of game behavior *vis-à-vis* linguistic play; cf. Note 1). Once the nature and the relevance of such overlapping, partially non-linguistic phenomena have been sufficiently established, external evidence can be considered on a par with internal evidence. That is, neither sort of data need be relegated to second-class status, especially since linguistic facts are not found in nature pre-labeled as "external" or "internal" (cf. Lightfoot 1979: 17-19, 77-78).

The most frequently cited sources of external evidence are intralectal, in the sense that they make reference to phenomena drawn from only one language-variety. Representative examples are provided by the following areas of linguistic research (here illustrated primarily with citations of early — and hence not necessarily still accepted — generative investigations): (i) diachrony (e.g., Kiparsky 1968, although regular sound-change is not necessarily more revealing than morpholexical analogies — see Anttila 1974); (ii) longitudinal studies of child-language overgeneralizations (e.g., Kuczaj 1977); (iii) psycholinguistic experiments with children and adults (e.g., Berko [(Gleason)] 1958; Fodor and Bever 1965); or (iv) aphasia (e.g., Schnitzer 1974). In this paper, however, we draw on the intersection of two interlectal sources of external evidence: (i) hypercorrection and its role in sociolinguistic variation — as treated, e.g., by scholars from Labov (1966) to Janda and Auger (1992) — and (ii) borrowing and nativization as language-contact phenomena — as discussed early on by, e.g., Hyman (1970).

Hyman's (1970) study is worth briefly reviewing here because it embodied the first generative claim that borrowings from a second-language (L2) constitute a kind of external evidence capable of validating proposed phonological rules and representations in the grammar of a first language (L1). Hyman's main argument was based on the assumption that the phonetic forms of foreign words can be taken directly into the deep grammar of an L1 and fed in — more or less equivalently to underlying forms — as input to the usual L1 phonological rules. Specifically, Hyman argued that the external evidence provided by loanwords taken from other languages into Nupe demonstrates or at least supports the psychological reality of three controversial rules of Nupe phonology — namely, (i) palatalization; (ii) labialization; and (iii) absolute neutralization. These can be formalized here (in abbreviated form) roughly as follows: (i) $C \rightarrow C^y / -\epsilon, \dots$; (ii) $C \rightarrow C^w / -\omega, \dots$; and (iii) $/\epsilon, \omega/ \rightarrow [a]$.

For example, the Yoruba word for 'to give a gift', [tɔrɛ], has been borrowed into Nupe as [tʷarʷa], apparently undergoing first palatalization and labialization and then absolute neutralization. After all, getting straight from the Yoruba surface-form to the Nupe surface-form for the word at issue would seem to require, first, palatalizing a consonant before /ε/ and labializing a consonant before /ω/, and, second, changing /ε/ to [a]. Here, the implication of Hyman's proposal is that, whereas native Nupe words never actually provide direct phonetic realizations of the underlying vowels

which undergo the absolute-neutralization rule in question, these vowels are in fact directly heard in foreign words from Yoruba. Phonological assimilation of such borrowed items to the sound-system of Nupe is thus claimed to involve treating their foreign segments as underlying — and so to require that they be subjected to obligatory rules of native Nupe phonology, like absolute neutralization (but see Manaster-Ramer 1981:45-49).

Although this claim by Hyman (1970) has not been widely accepted, it is significant that one of the most devastating counterarguments raised against it also draws on external evidence having to do with language contact. Namely, it is simply invalid to take foreign segments — before they are borrowed and nativized — as evidence for native underlying forms, since this leads to absurd conclusions such as that French [s, z] derive from underlying (English-like) /θ, ð/ because many French speakers substitute [s, z] for /θ, ð/ when they speak English.² Thus, for both counterarguments and pro-arguments, most linguists continue to rely on the assumption that external evidence from nativization indeed bears on issues like the reality of linguistic rules. This is particularly true as regards disputes over the most appropriate way to divide rules of sound-structure into subtypes, since language-contact phenomena have been adduced in support of all of the following subdivisions: phonotactic vs. allophonic vs. morphophonemic rules (cf., e.g., Haugen 1950), phonetic processes vs. learned morpholexical generalizations (cf., e.g., Stampe 1973/1979), and lexical vs. post-lexical rules (cf., e.g., Rubach 1984).

Especially in light of this consensus, we next provide a set of definitions and examples needed in order to characterize hyperforeignization; we then go on to investigate its more systematic manifestations as a source of rule-related external evidence in phonology.

1. Bases for the study of hyperforeignization

We can begin our characterization of hyperforeignism-relevant contact-phenomena between a first and a second language (an L1 and an L2, respectively) with the concept of **nativization**, which we define as the adaptation (here, in phonology) of an L2 item in such a way that it more closely matches L1 patterns. Thus, e.g., Spanish *Nicaragua* [nikará(x)wa] is nativized in British English as [nikarəgyuə] — with, *inter alia*, [l], [ə], [æ], [g], and [y] (partly on the basis of spelling) — while German *Bach* [bax] is

usually nativized in both British and American English (i.e., anglicized) as [bæk], with a final [k]. Similarly, French *milieu* [milyó] is normally anglicized as [milyú], with the final vowel [u], while *Marseilles* [maɛsý] and *Versailles* [vɛsáy] were once commonly anglicized as [má:seɪlz] and [vɛsɛɪlz], respectively, in early 20th-century American English (again probably due to the spelling; cf. Pyles 1952: 253-254).³

Foreignism or — in a form more parallel to *nativization* — **(re-)foreignization**, on the other hand, is a process of adaptation whereby the L1 version of an L2 item represents an at least moderately successful (re-)approximation of an L2 pattern. Thus, e.g., Spanish *Nicaragua* is usually somewhat foreignized in American English by being pronounced as [nikəɪdʒwə], while German *Bach* is sometimes foreignized in English by being given the pronunciation [bax]. In parallel fashion, French *milieu* is occasionally reproduced in English with the foreignized pronunciation [milyó], while *Marseilles* is now normally foreignized as [má:seɪ] in most American English (and has been since World War II; cf. Pyles 1952:254).

Hyperforeignization, though, is the converse of nativization: in attempting to approximate a perceived L2-pattern, a speaker nevertheless overextends the latter in such a way as to yield a form which is not natively found in either L2 or L1. The result is a **hyperforeignism** or **pseudo-loanword** — which, parallel to a (wo)man without a country, is a **form without a language**. Thus, in our initial example, French *lingerie* [lɛʒ(ə)ʁi] is a loanword which in American English often receives the hyperforeignized, pseudo-French pronunciation [láʒəɪ]. In the latter, the nasal vowel and the third-syllable primary stress show that [láʒəɪ] is not a “real,” nativized English form (since an active attempt has been made here *not* to nativize — i.e., not to anglicize). But the non-schwa vowels in the English pronunciation (including the nasal one) are not the expected correspondents of their French counterparts in [lɛʒ(ə)ʁi], and this shows that [láʒəɪ] is not a foreignization, either, since it does not even indirectly approximate the borrowing of a real French pronunciation.

Rather, the common English pronunciation of French *lingerie* [lɛʒ(ə)ʁi] as [láʒəɪ] apparently stems from a mistaken belief regarding French pronunciation on the part of English-speakers. After all, even native anglophones are aware that French has many words with [ā] and/or stressed final [é], as in *André*, and it is presumably from such a basis that they overgeneralize to the case of words like *lingerie* — thereby contradicting or at least ignoring the very pronunciation that they are supposedly try-

ing to imitate. What is important for our present purpose, though, is precisely (i) that we are here dealing with an **over-generalization**; and (ii) that it results from acting on an **organized perception about a pattern that is thought to hold generally, and hence in particular instances is also assumed to be the case: i.e., a rule**. That is, even many monolingual English-speakers appear to have strong opinions about certain phonological regularities of French. To the extent that they are systematically guided by these beliefs when they hyperforeignize loanwords in English, we feel justified in describing such productive linguistic behavior as maximally external evidence for rules, especially when the results match the native patterns of neither French nor English.

Lest it be thought that all English hyperforeignization is perpetuated against borrowings from French, we can consider as a second example of the phenomenon a newscaster's recent pronunciation of Russian *dacha* [dʌtʃə] as pseudo-Russian/hyper-German [dʌxə] (heard on CNN during August, 1992). The presence of a velar fricative shows [dʌxə] not to be English, but, although Russian has a phoneme /x/, it does not have one in the word *dacha* (but instead in, e.g., *kolchoz* [kəlxós] 'collective farm'). Rather, [dʌxə] seems to result from a foreignization so hyper that it goes beyond the target L2 into a mistaken other L2, here via an English-speaker's imposition on Russian of a German pattern (probably based on familiarity with the German spelling of [x] as *ch* in abovementioned *Bach*, etc.). Such overshoot from one L2 into another is in fact quite typical; we believe that it reflects the same phenomenon as is revealed in the report of many polyglots that, however many languages they may eventually master, they have at any given moment one strongly predominant L2. In English hyperforeignisms, as we will see below, the predominant L2 generally seems to be French for segmental phonology and Spanish for suprasegmental phenomena, though German also occasionally exercises considerable influence (as in the case of above *dacha*)

Before considering further specific examples of pseudo-loanwords, however, we need to make clear what hyperforeignization is not. This phenomenon crucially involves beliefs as to which speech-patterns really are native and which really are foreign, and so the set of hyperforeignisms does not, first of all, include instances of L1-based spelling-pronunciations that result from simple misunderstandings of L2 orthography — even though this process can likewise yield forms that are appropriate for neither L1 nor L2. Thus, e.g., when the English loanword *croissant*, from real French

[kʁwásɑ̃], is occasionally pronounced as non-French/non-(usual-)English [krʌsənt], this represents neither a hyperforeignization nor a misguided nativization. On the contrary, it merely reflects the combination of a speaker's lack of exposure to a foreignized (French-like) pronunciation of a *croissant* with the belief that the latter may already be a native English word, pronounced like a straightforward blend of, e.g., *poison* and *nascient*.

Second, hyperforeignization obviously does not include cases where a novel nativization yields a form which did not previously exist in either L1 or L2. For example, there are speakers for whom the Texas English borrowing of Texas Spanish *nachos* [náčos] involves nativization with the output [nʌtʃəz], and this result is certainly not a Spanish word; at some earlier time, too, it was not (yet) English. But the overextended processes of laxing and reduction which turn [náčos] into [nʌtʃəz] are clearly English patterns rather than misperceived Spanish ones. In short, the L2 original here, far from being a model for hyperforeign overextension, merely provides the raw material for deformations that create a newly naturalized English form.

Third and finally, hyperforeignization is not merely facetiously foreign-like language-play. Thus, e.g., when the comedian Jonathan Winters pronounced *garbage* [gárbəʃ] as [gárbáʃ], as if it were a pseudo-loanword, he presumably knew (or at least believed) that there is indeed no such real French word as * [gárbáʃ], even though he probably was following the model of real French (and borrowed English) *garage* [garáʒ], *mirage* [miráʒ], and the like. Instead, the Winters example surely reflects a desire to create an oxymoronic juxtaposition of the word for 'trash' with a chic French ending *-age* [aʒ] (containing elegant [a] — on which more later) and final stress-pattern. Thus, humor of this sort is at best a kind of "hyperforeignization" in which — by pushing hyperforeignism to ludicrous extremes — a joker can poke fun at people who produce pseudo-loanwords in serious contexts.

While hyperforeignization is not any of the three last-mentioned things, it is in fact a (sub-)type of **hypercorrection**, being distinguished from the more familiar manifestations of that general phenomenon by the fact that it crucially involves unintended overextension of patterns of an L2 rather than an L1. Actually, it is possible to identify several distinct kinds of hypercorrection, whereby the major division is that between the quantitative and qualitative types (cf., e.g., Janda and Auger 1992). **Quantitative hypercorrection** is the overshoot by one social group of another group's frequency of formal usage for a prestige variant of a linguistic variable: e.g., in

the most formal styles of New York City (NYC) English (cf., e.g., Labov 1966), speakers from the lower middle class (LMC) use more [j]'s in syllable codas than do speakers from the upper middle class (UMC). **Qualitative hypercorrection**, on the other hand, occurs when a speaker from one social group misidentifies another group's distribution for a perceived linguistic pattern and so overextends it — e.g., into environments where both groups (natively) have the same pattern, as in occasional formal-style phenomena in NYC like LMC-pronunciations of [r]-less LMC/UMC *god* as [j]-ful [gawd] (as in *Gard*; again, cf., e.g., Labov 1966). With regard to these two types, hyperforeignization represents a variant of qualitative hypercorrection — one in which L1 speakers misidentify the perceived distribution of some non-native L2 pattern and so overextend it non-L2 environments. Thus, in order to foreignize *lingerie* by ensuring that it receives a maximally French(-ified) pronunciation, speakers of English are (or at least once were)⁴ tempted to give nasal [ã] and end-stressed [é(ɪ)] a distribution which includes the word in question, the result being [lãʒaréi]. Unfortunately, since *lingerie* lies outside the distributional domains of both [ã] and [é] in all styles and varieties of real French, the English form [ãʒaréi] is a borrowing which reflects an overextension that is not quantitatively but qualitatively hypercorrect — and so is indeed a hyperforeignism.

Given that hyperforeignization is in essence a borrowing of what "isn't there", the phenomenon points up the extreme inappropriateness of the metaphors which originally gave rise to linguistic concepts like "loanword" and "borrowing." Since expressions which are borrowed from a language are never really given back to it (especially not with compound interest), it has often been informally suggested that "stealing" would be a more accurate way of characterizing the phenomenon. Nevertheless, both "borrowing" and "stealing" imply that what is taken into an L1 from an L2 must necessarily cease to exist in L2, whereas "loanwords" ("thcfts") clearly need not disappear from their donor languages. Hyperforeignization, though, gives the *coup de grâce* to such proprietary metaphors, since one obviously cannot either borrow or steal what doesn't exist. Rather, hyperforeignisms demonstrate that biological analogies like "replication" or "cloning" are much more apt for lexical interchanges between languages. Indeed, there exists a terminology along these lines which goes all the way back to the work of Haugen (1950) and Weinreich (1953): in particular, the target of copying from one language into another can be considered as a **model**, and the result of such copying as a **replica**. And, just as mutations can poten-

tially occur in the course of biological replication or cloning, so one can misperceive or even, in a sense, hallucinate one's linguistic model, thereby creating either a deformed copy or a copy of nothing — a hyperforeignism.

Although we have previously devoted considerable attention here to the English pseudo-loanword [lãʒaréi] *lingerie* as a classic instance of hyperforeignization, it is actually an extremely isolated type of example, and this is in fact the case for many other hyperforeignisms, as well (cf., e.g., abovementioned English [dãxã] *dacha* as a hyper-German pseudo-Russianism). Nevertheless, alongside such sporadic hyperforeignizations, there also exist quite systematic hyperforeignizations — just as hypercorrection in general ranges from sporadic (idiosyncratic and unpredictable) to more systematic (regular and predictable). It is, after all, not surprising that, as a (sub)type of hypercorrection, hyperforeignization should cover the same spectrum from extremely irregular to extremely regular conditioning.

Thus, we can contrast the essentially hapax-legomenon nature of the pseudo-French vocalism in English *lingerie* with much more systematic examples like the pseudo-French final *r*-lessness (to which we return below in Section 2.1) often seen in such English borrowings as *derrière*, *péignoir*, *répertoire*, *Renoir*, and the like, since for some speakers this hyperforeignization seems to be nearly categorical. The opposition between rare vs. quite systematic hyperforeignisms is parallel to the way in which L1 hypercorrections range from the quite general, at one extreme, to isolated instances like the pronunciation of *coupon* as not [kúpãn] but [kyúpãn], at the other — whereby [kyúpãn] is an overextension of the pattern seen in virtually invariant *cute* [kyut] and beauty [byúri], plus prestigious but regional U.S. *tutor* [tyútrɪ], *duty* [dyúti], and *newt* [nyut]. Examples of general L1-hypercorrections are provided by situations like the variable but not infrequent addition of hypercorrect initial [h] in Cockney English, as illustrated by numerous cases like [h]ain't, [h]eels, [h]errands, [h]ever, etc. (cf. Wells 1982: 322).

The same continuum from rare to common holds for L2 hypercorrections, as well (cf., e.g., Janda 1979; Janda and Auger 1992). At the rare extreme are phenomena like double consonant-switches, as in an attested example involving a native speaker of Low German (LG) who, while trying to speak High German (HG), once pronounced *Rudel* — his own nickname — as hyper-HG *Rausef*. In this instance, the speaker not only carried out the change *d* → *t* (cf. LG *Dagg* vs. HG *Täg* 'day') but then also subjected its output to the further operation *t* → *f* (cf. LG *Holt* vs. HG *Holz* 'wood(s)'),

as well as making the vocalic alteration /u:/ → /aɪ/ (cf. LG *Buuk* vs. HG *Bauch* 'belly'). At the other, high-frequency extreme are examples like the case of one unusually self-conscious French-speaker who, in a task involving the reading of unpaired items on a list of words and short phrases, hypercorrectly added [h] before English vowel-initial words nearly 15% of the time, thus producing, e.g., *Holiday* [h]Imn, [h]Olio, *Oil* of [h]Olay, [h]unheard (of), etc.

Before discussing some of the systematic hyperforeignisms in English which provide a maximally external sort of evidence for the reality of certain linguistic rules (and so form the core of this paper), we would like to make one last point concerning the opposite, sometimes maximally idiosyncratic side of hypercorrection phenomena. Given that by far the majority of occasions and ways in which speakers hypercorrect tend to show an extremely sporadic distribution, it is worth keeping hypercorrection in mind as a possible default-explanation whenever one encounters individual linguistic phenomena that appear to be inconsistent and apparently random — as long as they can be correlated with particular speech-styles. That is, many uncommon alternant-forms which participate in patterns of L1 variation turn out to be localized so heavily in more formal styles that they, too, appear to reflect the same phenomenon as hypercorrection, although they are treated as such primarily — and sometimes only — by quantitative sociolinguists.

Labov (1989:13-18), for example, was able to make quite revealing use of this strategy in his work on the distribution of tense /æh/ (roughly [e^h]) in Philadelphia English. Although Labov had earlier found that /æh/ occurs in the affective adjectives *bad*, *glad*, and *mad*, whereas lax /æ/ is found in *sad*, at least one later researcher called this distribution into question by eliciting from Philadelphia speakers certain isolated examples of the contrary vowel-pattern for these adjectives. Nevertheless, Labov (1989) was able to mine a massive corpus of varied speech-data in such a way as to establish robust stylistic correlations for Philadelphia /æh/ and /æ/ — correlations showing that the alleged distributional counterexamples mentioned above are extremely likely to have been uttered as self-conscious hypercorrections provoked by a socially unnatural and linguistically unrealistic informant-session.

Thus, in the informal speech of Philadelphians, /æh/ indeed occurs virtually categorically in *bad*, *glad*, and *mad*, even though /æh/ is a well-known negative stereotype of the Philadelphia dialect — to the point where speech

samples containing it receive negative evaluations on a scale for rating job-suitability. But, as style becomes more formal, this consistency in the distribution of Philadelphia /æh/ within ...ad adjectives other than *sad* diminishes dramatically, just as self-consciousness increases. As a result, Labov (1989) found that, while spontaneous speech had a consistency of 99% (across 250 tokens), elicitation style (as in a linguistically directed interview) showed only 90-96% consistency (even across fewer tokens), and word-list style was at most 77% consistent. We must conclude, then, that hypercorrection is a potentially pervasive phenomena which must always be taken into account in situations where there is contact between speakers of different language-varieties. And so, even in the case of exotic-seeming hyperforeignisms which may involve interactions between genetically unrelated languages, we are never really far from the garden-variety hypercorrection that occurs so commonly back home, in our first, native language.

2. Segmental examples of hyperforeignization

2.1 Hyper-French suppression of final consonants — à la "français(e)"

One of the most pervasive and systematic of all hyperforeignizing processes in English involves the suppression of final consonants in borrowed foreign words, an overgeneralization which is quite clearly based on English-speakers' awareness that, in French, the relation of writing to speech is such that many or even most consonant-letters at the ends of words are not realized phonetically. E.g., virtually all adults who speak English know that the *t* which ends the French word *ballet* is "silent." It thus quite commonly happens that speakers of English, in an attempt to foreignize their speech with what turns out to be literally a certain *ils-ne-savent-quoi*, impose on (relatively) non-nativized French loanwords a pronunciation which obeys what they perceive to be a salient phonological rule of French: do not pronounce a final consonant. In many such instances, however, the speakers in question exceed the actual rules of French, thereby producing forms which are not English but not French, either, in that they lack a final consonant which native French-speakers in fact pronounce.

Probably the most common single example of this kind of hyperforeignism in English involves hyper-Gallicization of the French phrase *coup de grâce* [ku d(ə) gras], which (in our experience) the vast majority of Eng-

lish-speakers pronounce as [ku də ɡʁɑ], sometimes even spelling it *coup de gras*. Unfortunately, in line with the usual nature of hypercorrection as a swan-dive into an empty pool, it turns out that French *coup de gras* means 'stroke of grease or fat' — hardly what a *nouveau riche linguistique* normally intends to communicate by saying [ku də ɡʁɑ]. The reason why this particular type of hyper-Gallicism is both so frequent and so misguided is that, as already mentioned above, it arises from a fundamental confusion between spelling and speech. After all, it is only the final consonants of French orthography which tend to be silent. Since the written final *e* of French is not usually pronounced, words which end in ...*Ce* or ...*CCe* are actually realized with a phonetically word-final consonant: cf., e.g., *vite* [vit] 'fast' and *dette* [dɛt] 'debt'. In addition, even though it is the case in French that the vast majority of written final consonants are not pronounced, it is simply not true that all such consonant-letters are silent, especially in the case of final *s*: cf., e.g., 'the bone' *l'os* [lɔs] vs. [lez o] *les os* 'the bones'.

It is probable, then, that the near-complete systematicity with which many English-speakers hyper-Gallicize French borrowings via final-consonant suppression is a result of the ideal conditions for hyperforeignization which exist in French. That is, well-known alternating pairs like *française/français* [fʁɑ̃sɛz]/[fʁɑ̃sɛ] seem to motivate a French phonological rule of final-consonant deletion, but this process is obviously not surface-true and so requires either the positing of "protective" schwa which are later deleted (as in *française*; cf., e.g., Schane 1968) and/or a considerable degree of morphological conditioning (as in *l'os*; cf., e.g., Tranel 1981). Given this mixture of regularity and opacity in French, it actually is only to be expected that speakers of English should come up with an overly general version of final-consonant deletion when they attempt to foreignize borrowings from French.

Still, the pervasiveness of these hyper-Frenchified pseudo-loanwords remains quite astounding. Examples with deleted "final" *r* include the pronunciation of real French *peignoir* [pɛ̃nwaʁ] and *répertoire* [ʁɛpɛʁtwaʁ] as hyper-French [pɛ̃nwá] (produced by an *r*-ful actor on a "Colombo" episode aired in December, 1992) and [ʁɛpɛtwá], respectively — probably under the partial influence of (non-*r*-final) models like real French *François* [fʁɑ̃swá]. An additional and quite common case with omitted ...*r*(*e*) is provided by the pronunciation of real French *derrière* [dɛʁjɛʁ] as hyper-French [dɛ̃ʁj(ɛ)ɛ], perhaps modeled on real French *Perrier* [pɛʁjɛʁ]. Instances with

deleted "final" */s/* include real French (*La Marseillaise* [(...)*maksɛjɛz*] and (*Alliance Française* [(...)*fʁɑ̃sɛz*] hyper-Frenchified by English-speakers as [(...)*máksɛjɛj*] and [(...)*fʁáásɛj*], respectively, as if under the influence of above-mentioned real French *français* [fʁɑ̃sɛ]. The already mentioned case of *coup de grâce* [ku d(ə) ɡʁás] hyper-Gallicized as [kú də ɡrá], on the other hand, would seem to reflect the analogical influence of real French *coup d'état* [ku d etá] and possibly also *faux pas* [fo pá].

A final English example of the hyperforeign suppression of final */s/* in French loanwords is provided by hyper-Gallicizing of real French *fleur de lys* [fløʁ d(ə) lɪs] as [fləɪ də lɪ], perhaps on the model of real French *Paris* [paʁi]. The expression *fleur de lys* was in fact borrowed from Old French as Middle English *flour de lice*, so it is apparent that the last consonant in its final noun was originally pronounced in both languages. It is true that some (but not all) Modern French dictionaries allow the pronunciation [(...)*li*] for references to the *fleur de lys* as in heraldry, but real French *lis/lys* 'lily' is now invariant [lis], and we have as yet encountered no native French-speaker who has final [s] even for the heraldic device. An occasionally heard parallel case with a deleted "final" *ɪ* is that of real French *tête-à-tête* [tɛt a tɛt] hyper-Frenchified as [tɛɪ a tɛj], under the possible influence of real French words like *cachet* [kaʃɛ], which is borrowed as [kášɛj] because lax vowels like /ɛ/ cannot occur word-finally in English.

Striking proof of the resoluteness with which speakers of English have taken to heart the hyper-French rule suppressing final consonants in foreign borrowings is available in the form of instances where this process has been extended to loanwords from languages other than French. Thus, e.g., the name of former *Belorussia*, now *Belarus* — English [bɛləʁús] — was recently pronounced as hyper-French [bɛləɹjú] by Jim Lehrer of the "McNeill-Lehrer Report" (in March, 1992). Similarly, the name of the linguist (*Elizabeth*) *Traugott* [(...)*tráʊg(ð,ə,ɛ)*] is occasionally pronounced (even by some linguists) as [(...)*tráʊg(ð,ə,ɛ)*] (E. Traugott, personal communication), and announcements on classical music-stations often yield to temptation and pronounce the name of Puccini's Italian opera *Turandot* not as real Italian [túrəndɔt] but instead in a way that rhymes with the French name *Bardot* [baʁdɔ]. It is significant that this same readiness of English-speakers to impose hyper-French processes on non-French loanwords is found with many other sorts of hyperforeignization phenomena — for example, the one that we turn to next.

2.2 Creation of Franco-German palatal fricatives (palatalized or deaffricated)

Based on our observations, it seems that speakers of English tend to treat the palatal(-alveolar) fricatives /ʃ, ʒ/ as generic foreign (non-English) consonants — apparently à la Pseudo-German and Pseudo-French, respectively. That is, the frequency of palatal(-alveolar) /#ʃ(C)/ in such German (and Yiddish) loanwords as *schmalz* (and *schmuck*), and of /ʒ/ in such French loanwords as *genre* and *rouge*, has apparently led English-speakers to perceive /ʃ, ʒ/ as more (accurately) foreign than /f, ʒ/. We believe that it is this perception which explains the commonness of American English hyper-/ʃ, ʒ/ forms like real Swedish *smörgåsbord* [s] pronounced as hyper-German/pseudo-Swedish [ʃmɔːrgəsbɔːrd], or real French *parmesan* [pɑːmɛzɑ̃] pronounced as hyper-French [pɑːmɛʒɑ̃] — perhaps a Franco-Italian hybrid influenced by real Italian *parmigiano/a* [pɑːrmiˈʝano/a]?). However, these hyper-/ʃ, ʒ/ forms do not all arise via the hyperforeignization of words from European languages. Thus, e.g., a common American English pronunciation of *Beijing* is hyper-French/pseudo-Mandarin [bɛːʒiːŋ], where real Mandarin has a voiceless unaspirated affricate [...tʃ...], which usually strikes English ears as closer to English /tʃ/ than English /ʒ/. More spectacularly, Azerbaijani is now pronounced by some English-speakers with two generic-foreign /ʒz/s, as hyper-French/pseudo-Azeri [dʒɛːbɑːʒɑːn] — as opposed to an earlier (at least apparently Turkic) version with [...z... j...]).

Nevertheless, it can be predicted that hyperforeignization via palatal(-alveolar)ization should in the future become somewhat less common in American English, at least as regards /ʃ/. This is because a process whereby prenasantal (especially word-initial) /s/ in native American English words like *street* is realized as [ʃ] — and perhaps reinterpreted as /ʃ/ — can be observed in certain rather large speech-communities (e.g., in Philadelphia English and in African-American English across the U.S.). Indeed, we have recorded some speakers for whom the phonological distribution of this innovative initial /ʃ/ has expanded from words with initial *str-*, like *street*, to *r-*less forms like *stone* and even to *sk-*initial words like *skill*, particularly when the preceding word is pronounced with a final /s/ (as in *their [ʃ]skill*). If, as we believe likely, this sporadic American English change of initial /s/ to /ʃ/ before stops (especially in the vicinity of /s/) undergoes regional and social spread and goes on to lexical and phonological completion, then words like *schmalz* and *schmuck* will at some point most probably lose their present German/Yiddish aura.

2.3 Substitution of generic foreign [a] for English-sounding [æ] or even [ɑ]

Probably the most common vocalic hyperforeignization-process of American English is the strong tendency to substitute the generically elegant and foreign vowel /ɑ/ for English-sounding /æ/ — and even for English-sounding foreign [a]. This phenomenon has several probable sources. First, to varying degrees, English-speakers in the U.S. are aware of American/British English differences like [pæθ]/[pɑθ] *path* (cf., e.g., Pyles 1952 or Kenyon and Knott 1953). Second, they are also likely to have some sense of the crosslinguistic predominance which (outside of English) /ɑ/ shows over /æ/ as regards frequency of occurrence in consonant inventories (cf., e.g., Madieson 1984)). Third, most people in the U.S. probably know that /ɑ/ is present, and /æ/ absent, in standard varieties of certain “familiar” foreign languages — i.e., ones which are frequently spoken, studied, or heard by speakers of American English: e.g., Spanish, Italian, French, and German. Fourth and finally, it seems probable that most speakers of American English are likelier to equate foreign [a] with English /æ/ than they are with English [ɑ]. It is as a result of these factors, we believe, that — as Pyles (1959: 254) puts it — “every American who ever went to high school is aware that[...] in languages other than English[...] the letter *a* has the approximate value that it has in *father*”.

It bears emphasizing that speakers of American English display a far more fanatical dedication to /ɑ/ as a generic foreign vowel than do speakers of British English: recall the abovementioned contrast between the minimal nativization of Spanish *Nicaragua* [nikarɑː(y)wɑ] in American English [nikæːrgwə] vs. its major deformation as British English [nikæːgyuə]. Thus it is that, in the recent film “The Silence of the Lambs”, the British actor Anthony Hopkins — playing the American doctor “Hannibal the Cannibal” Lecter — steps slightly out of character when he mentions a meal eaten with “a nice chianti” and pronounces the last word in this phrase as British English [kiːɑnti] rather than usual American English [kiːɑn(t)i]. In this latter case, Italian speakers with whom we have consulted report that they perceive British English /æ/ as actually being phonetically closer to Italian /ɑ/ than is American English /ɑ/, and it is in this sense that we evaluate the pronunciation [kiːɑn(t)i] as a (generic) hyperforeignism.

Parallel examples are legion; one particularly striking instance arises because many American English dialects realize /ɑ/ as [ɒ] or [ɔ] before /l/, so that real Italian *Vivaldi* [vivɑldi] is sometimes hyperforeignized as

/s z

American English [vəvɔldɪ] — which sounds far less Italian (to Italian speakers) than does British English [vəvəldɪ]. Matters are even worse in languages which have a phonemic distinction between either /a/ and /ɑ/ or /æ/ and /ɑ/. For example, the real Québec French name *Anne* [an] is often hyperforeignized by speakers of American English as [ʌn] — which happens to be homophonous with the real Québec French word *âne* ‘donkey’ [ɑn]. Similarly, real Persian *Hanid* [hæmɪd] is often hyperforeignized by English-speakers from the U.S. as [hæmɪd] — which contains a totally non-Persian vowel, since the non-/æ/ *a*-vowel of the language is rounded /ɒ/, as in *Iran* [ɪrɒn]). Finally, real Egyptian Arabic *Sadat* [sɑdɑt] is usually hyperforeignized by speakers of American English as [sɑdɑt].

3. Suprasegmental examples of hyperforeignization

3.1 Hyper-Spanish penultimate stress in vowel-final pseudo-Japanese

As regards the suprasegmental of stress in foreign-language borrowings into English, one significant factor is that many speakers of American English are frequently and intensely exposed to numerous names and other loanwords from penultimate-stressed, largely vowel-final Spanish and Italian. It is this Italo-Spanish-based association of vowel-finality with penultimate stress which appears most responsible for the fact that, when English-speakers borrow words from Japanese — which, except for the mor(a)ic nasal, is exclusively vowel-final — they overlook the language’s variably situated pitch-accent (which can fall on the first, second, third, or no mora of a word) in favor of a pseudo-Japanese penultimate-stress pattern that is essentially hyper-Spanish. This accentual shift has major phonetic consequences, since in English the distinction between stressed and non-stressed syllables is directly relevant to major phonological processes that affect vocalic reduction, laxing, tensing, and diphthongization, as in *explain* [ɛksplɛɪn] vs. [ɛksplænɪʃən] *explanation*. It is thus clear that different stressings of one and the same word in English can show drastic phonetic differences from one another — especially in the case of loanwords, which are inherently somewhat variable in their degree of nativization vs. foreignization.

In addition, the pitch-accent of Japanese itself interacts with various phonetic processes of the language, such as the devoicing of any high vowel that is found between a voiceless consonant and another such consonant or

a pause. Cf. real Japanese *f(u)ton* (where devoicing is indicated by parenthesization, and pitch accent by underlining of a mora), which may even be realized in Japanese as the further-reduced form [Φt̚:] but is borrowed into English as [fútɒn]. Finally, it is relevant for the borrowing of names that the Japanese custom is to say a person’s family-name first and individual name second; contrast, for the name of the well-known filmmaker, real Japanese *Kurosawa Akira* vs. anglicized *Akira Kurosawa*. As a result, Japanese names borrowed into English with an accurately foreignizing (real Japanese) pronunciation and word-order are often unrecognizable to English-speakers (cf., e.g., the examples further below).

Fortunately, most Japanese-speakers have sufficient familiarity with the English pronunciation of words from their native language to become aware of the wide divergences which exist between foreignized (near-Japanese) and nativized (anglicized) versions of their names, and they quite often themselves do the work of hyper-Hispanizing names or other Japanese words when pronouncing them for native speakers of English. For example, it is our experience that, when asked by English-speakers to give the Japanese pronunciation of the final-accented word *sake* ‘rice wine’, even some Japanese linguists are initially tempted to anglicize it, imposing hyper-Spanish penultimate stress and so mentioning first the pseudo-Japanese pronunciation [sáke]. Why shouldn’t they be so tempted, when even English-speaking linguists routinely hyperforeignize the names of their Japanese colleagues, as in the hyper-Hispanically stressed examples that follow?

Thus, e.g., we find that the real Japanese name *Tsujimura Natsuko* [t̚sujimura nat̚(w)ko], where the respective pitch-accents fall on the first mora and the second mora of the words, appears with the expected hyper-Spanish penultimate stress in English and so is pronounced as pseudo-Japanese *Natsuko Tsujimura* [nɑtsukoy tsujəmúra]. Similarly, real Japanese *Kuno Susumu* [kuno susumuw], with two accentless words, is borrowed into English as hyper-Spanish/pseudo-Japanese *Susumu Kuno* [sʊsʊmu kúnɔy], while *Matsuda Kenjiro* [mat̚ʊda kenjɪro:], where the first word ~~is~~ is accentless and the second word has the pitch-accent on its initial mora ~~is accentless~~, is hyperforeignized in similar fashion as *Kenjiro Matsuda* [kɛnjɪroʊ mɑtsúra]. Pursuing matters somewhat further with the name *Matsuda*, we can observe that Japanese corporations are also aware of the abovementioned restressing tendency of American English hyperforeignizations and so counteract it when marketing their products in the

U.S. Thus it is that we have car names such as *Mazda* [mázdə] (which comes much closer to the previously given Japanese pronunciation of *Mazda* than would a direct transliteration, which yields above [mátstɹə]), as well as *Datsun*, which is based on the Japanese nonsense-word *Datosun* [dat:osun] (with pitch accent on its initial mora) but is respelled in order to avoid possible American English hyperforeignization as hyper-Spanish/pseudo-Japanese [dátóysən].

3.2 Hyper-Hebrew/Spanish final stress in consonant-final pseudo-Hebrew

As a second illustration of prosodic hyperforeignization, we can consider how knowledge of the predominant last-syllable stress in heavily consonant-final Hebrew leads many English-speakers to overgeneralize such ultimate stress to consonant-final words which in Hebrew bear penultimate stress. Perhaps the most remarkable thing about this final-restressing of Hebrew words is that it seems to derive from the same overfamiliarity with Spanish which we previously saw leading English-speakers to impose penultimate stress on the pitch-accent system of Japanese. The shared Hispanic element here — and the explanation for the apparent discrepancy involved — centers on the fact that, at the phonetic level,⁵ Spanish has a disjunctive stress-rule such that vowel-final words are accented on the penult, while consonant-final words (excluding verbs and plural nouns) bear a final accent. Thus, the fact that speakers of American English tend to treat all consonant-final words in Hebrew as final-stressed probably reflects not only a familiarity with the predominant accentual pattern of Hebrew but also the further influence of their knowledge of Spanish stress.

The most numerous cases of this sort involve restressed hyperforeign pronunciations imposed by English-speaking newscasters on the names of prominent Israeli political figures. Thus, e.g., *Yitzhak Rabin*, which in real Hebrew is pronounced [(y)it'xak(r)abin], is hyperforeignized in English as hyper-Hebrew [yits(h)ák(r)ábín]. Similarly, *Shimon Peres* is often borrowed into American English as hyper-Hebrew [šimó(y)n pèrés]; contrast actual Hebrew [šimon pères]. Also perhaps relevant here are the French (woman's!) name *Simone* and the Spanish surname *Pérez*, which is normally taken into English as [pərés] (itself hyper-Hispanicized with last-syllable stress because of its final consonant). Significantly — and likewise a reflection of (hyper-)Spanish influence on the English pronunciation of foreign borrowings — there has been little or no tendency to create hyper-

Hebrew final stress in forms which end in a vowel. Thus, the name *Moshe* is usually pronounced not [móšé] but [móyšé] (occasionally Yiddicized as [mɔʃšə]), and an *Uzi* (machine-gun) is virtually always referred to as an [úzi], not an *[úzɪ].

As an Israeli political figure becomes more prominent in American media-coverage, the hyper-Hebrew form of his or her name may give way to a form based on the spoken Israeli Hebrew norm. Thus, when *Mena(c)hem Begin* first became Israel's prime minister in 1977, he was relatively unknown to the general American public, and so, in early references to him by U.S. newscasters, his last name was usually pronounced [bégin], in a hyper-Hebrew way, as opposed to real Hebrew [bégin]. The subsequent change in the American media to a pronunciation with initial stress — [bégin] — most likely reflected adoption of the initial stress in the actual Hebrew model (i.e., a partial foreignization), rather than a simple process of English-oriented nativization. Such incomplete foreignization can in fact often be observed when the once-unfamiliar names of world leaders gradually become household words. This happened, for example, with the vowels in early references by the American media to *Mikhail Gorbachev*, whose name changed (over a period ranging from weeks to months) from [gárbəčəv] to more Russian-like [gárbəčəf].⁶ Here, too, as with the adoption of the Hebrew model for the name *Begin*, there occurred a nativization to the surface phonetics of American English; in the latter case, stressed Israeli Hebrew /c/ was diphthongized as English [éj], and unstressed-vowel reduction changed /i/ to [ə].

3.3 Hyper-French stress- and vowel-shift with pseudo-Yiddish names in -(e)l

The common pronunciation in American English of certain Yiddish names offers an interesting example of the use of hyperforeignism as a strategy for Americanization. The examples concern Yiddish family-names which end (in Yiddish) in syllabic /l: e.g., *Mánda(e)l*, *Férl(e)l*, *Bíkel*, etc. In Yiddish, syllabic /l may not be stressed. However, these names are often pronounced today in American English as [màndél], [fərtél], or [bəkél] (son *Theodor* — versus father *Shloyme* [bík]). The source of this hyperforeign pattern is probably French *-el(te)*; cf. innovated names such as the *Shandélls*. The Yiddish names with unstressed syllabic /l could have fit easily into the general stress pattern in English; cf. *handle*, *hurtle*, (Alaska governor Walter) *Hickel*, etc. In the anglicized borrowing *mándelbread* < Yiddish *mándlbrojt*

'a type of baked good' (similar to *biscotti*; = *mandl* 'almond' + *brojt* 'bread'), however, the stress is only on the initial syllable, in contrast to the family name *Mandél*. Adoption of the final-stress pattern may vary among individuals; cf. *Ted Köppel* [kópəl] (the journalist host of "Nightline" on ABC television) versus *Bernie Kopell* [kòpəl] (the actor who played "Doc" on the television series "The Loveboat"). Thus, the hyper-Frenchification of *Bikél*, *Feréel*, *Mandél* again represents adoption of hyperforeignism as an analogical strategy, rather than a simple phonological process. The change in question is not limited to Yiddish names, as shown by the treatment of an acronym like *JaNELL* [jænél], a now-renamed Department of Judaic and Near Eastern Languages Literatures.

4. Hyperforeignization as evidence for the reality of linguistic rules

Hyperforeignisms provide external evidence bearing on the existence and nature of linguistic rules in several ways. At least some instances of the phenomenon have a quite systematic nature — in the sense that it is possible to find numerous examples exhibiting the same pattern (as for the abovementioned hyper-French process whereby English-speakers are tempted to suppress virtually all word-final consonants in French loanwords). In addition, a given pattern of hyperforeignization can remain productive even when it is not absolutely regular (recall the abovementioned extension of hyper-French final-consonant deletion to the B(i)elorussian toponym *Belaru(s)*). Most importantly, hyperforeignisms presuppose both a strong awareness of what native-language generalizations are (thus giving speakers a base to move away from, when they foreignize) and a vague awareness — or at least perception — of linguistic patterns that are not native (thus giving speakers a target to aim for).

Finally, however, we believe that it is also important to emphasize that hyperforeignization processes are often morphemically or at least lexically limited in the scope of their operations, so that they provide evidence in support of the claim that the quantitatively if not qualitatively predominant type of grammatical pattern in languages consists of local rather than global generalizations (cf., e.g., Joseph and Janda (1988) on "constellations" and Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor (1988) on "constructions"). Thus, for example, a locally-based, constellational view of rules seems most appropriate for expressing such facts as the generalization that speakers of English show

no tendency to spread the recently common hyper-Spanish pronunciation of *Contra(s)*, with [oɹ], to all other foreign words, much less to native words like *contradict* [kántɹədíkt]/*[kòɹntɹədíkt].

The foregoing sections have furnished ample documentation both for what we have here called hyperforeignization and for its bearing on the reality of linguistic rules, thus updating and expanding the brief earlier discussions of the phenomenon that date back at least as far as Bloomfield (1933: 448-449) (and see below for an apparent hyperforeignism from ancient times). Nonetheless, we feel that, in a sense, this paper has described only the tip of the hyper-form iceberg, since there exist numerous additional phenomena which, while not strictly hyperforeignisms as defined above, appear to result from processes closely related to hyperforeignization. We therefore conclude by outlining a selection of these cases, although we really can do no more here than signal them as pointing the way to further evidence for rules in language.

First, we wish to emphasize that, while all of the previously discussed instances are phonological in nature, there undoubtedly also exist morphological hyperforeignisms. An example from English that suggests itself here is the pseudo-Spanish phrase *No problema!* 'No problem!' — an expression that can be heard rather commonly in the United States today, being found, e.g., as one of the lines that Arnold Schwarzenegger's character in the recent film "Terminator 2" learns and utters (in addition to the Anglo-Hispanic blend *Hasta la vista, baby!*). Second, while all of the examples cited above involve two contemporaneous language-varieties, it in principle ought to be possible to find hyperforeignisms where the "foreign" variety is an earlier stage of a speaker's own first language: i.e., cases where speakers deliberately, perhaps for special effect, create a non-etymological archaic form — a "hyperarchaism". An example of this type is provided by the first part of the movie "Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Sex but Were Afraid to Ask", a sketch (entitled "Do Aphrodisiacs Really Work?") where Woody Allen and Lynn Redgrave — respectively playing a medieval court-jester and his queen — speak a variety of English in which they overuse the now-archaic verbal suffix *-st*, once the usual marker of the familiar second-person singular. Third, speakers sometimes seem to show a general awareness that certain linguistic patterns are non-native, but in a vague, non-specific way — one not keyed to any particular foreign language-variety. For example, in a television commercial for the "Olive Garden" Italian restaurant which we recorded recently in Columbus, Ohio

(during March, 1992), the narrator speaks with a voice that, however non-Italian it may be, is also clearly not an American-English accent.

Fourth, we should emphasize that, though all the preceding examples of hyperforeignization (including hyperarchaism) come from English, this phenomenon is by no means restricted to that language. Given our more limited familiarity with contact between pairs of languages which do not include English, we do not find it surprising that the non-English hyperforeignisms which we have so far encountered are all of a rather sporadic nature. The best such case that we can cite here comes from Turkish, in which the word *rol* 'role', a loanword from French, would ordinarily be expected to have a non-palatal /r/ and so to show the same back-vowel harmony in suffixes as does, e.g., native Turkish *yol* 'road', which has the definite accusative *yol-u*. Instead, however, the word has a palatal /r/, and so suffixes following *rol* irregularly show front-vowel harmony: cf., e.g., definite accusative *rol-ü* (not **rol-u*).⁷ Fifth, the fact that all the above examples come from currently spoken language-varieties should not be taken to imply that hyperforeignization is only a modern phenomenon. For example, based on one interpretation of the facts, it also occurred in Ancient Rome, where speakers created occasional hyperforeignisms via hyperaspiration when borrowing into Latin from more prestigious Greek.

Sixth and finally, we wish to draw attention to the fact that many of the examples which we have collected and cited here as demonstrating hyperforeignization come from various outlets of American popular culture: movies, television-commercials and -programs, radio talk-shows, and the like. To a certain extent, hyperforeignisms reflect the existence, within a given speech-community, of some sense (whether right or wrong) as to the typical linguistic behavior displayed by one or more external groups — coupled, of course, with an active desire to put this impression into play in one's own linguistic behavior, based on an evaluation of one's relation to the strangers in question. In this way, hyperforeignization provides a fairly direct reflection of cultural and linguistic stereotypes, especially the caricatures that feed into — and are reinforced by — portrayals in the popular media. Hyperforeignisms are thus quite revealing of the prevalent attitudes that members of a society bear toward outsiders: the prestige accorded to the Greek language by Latin speakers in Rome, as demonstrated in the case of Latin hyperaspiration, or the somewhat provincial, "ugly American" sense that virtually any non-English pronunciation is as good as

another for the purpose of creating an Italian ambiance, as displayed in the above-mentioned commercial for the "Olive Garden" restaurant, and so on. In this sense, hyperforeignisms not only reveal something about ourselves with regard to the rule-governed nature of our linguistic competence; they also tell us something about ourselves as a society vis-à-vis others: about our linguistic performance in the broadest sense.⁸

Notes

1. For example, although Ferguson (1983) has pointed out that they almost never do so, works which cite the speech rules in language games as relevant evidence for phonological theory bear an obligation to show that such instances of linguistic play, which are expressly designed so as to obscure speech, are not fundamentally different from normal conversation, which is normally intended to be readily understandable.
2. Actually, a surprising number of French-speakers from France substitute [f] and [v] for English /θ/ and /ð/, respectively, while most Québécois substitute [t] and [d] (cf. Auger 1990). But this fact merely strengthens the argument (given in the main text) against claiming that nativization always involves treating foreign segments as underlying native forms which undergo native phonological rules. After all, the contrary view would allow us to draw the patently absurd conclusion that, even within, say, Parisian French, some speakers derive surface [s] and [z] from underlying /θ/ and /ð/ but [f] and [v] from /t/ and /v/, respectively, while others derive surface [s] and [z] from underlying /s/ and /z/ but [f] and [v] from /θ/ and /ð/, respectively.
3. Pyles (1959: 256) in fact points out that, until intense radio-coverage of World War II brought L2 versions of foreign place-names into most homes in the U.S., the usual American English pronunciation of, say, European cities was an extremely nativized (i.e., anglicized) one which today seems almost unbelievable. Nevertheless, their survival in U.S. town-names demonstrates that it was once common not only to initialize the stress of such words but also to pronounce the stressed vowel of *Prague* and *Athens* with [eɪ], of *Lyonis* and even *Milan* with [a i] (though [i] was also heard for the latter), of *Madrid* with [æ], and of *Péru* with [j].
4. We should note at this point that, as is also the case with hypercorrection across dialects of a single language, instances of hyperforeignization across language boundaries exist only when a speaker's overextension of a pattern from another language-variety is intended to approximate the speech of that variety. Thus, on the one hand, the pronunciation of *wash* as [wɔʃ] (*warsht*) may well have arisen via a hypercorrection based on (i) the near-homophony of, say, *war* [wɔ:] and *wash* [wɔ:ʃ] in certain r-less dialects of the interior southern U.S.; and (ii) the knowledge that r-tal dialects spoken further to the north pronounce words like *war* as [wɔ:ʃ]. On the other hand, though, people who today acquire *warsht* because that is what their family, friends, and neighbors say are not engaging in hypercorrection. In parallel fashion, the act of pronouncing *Angerie* as [ɛnʒɔ:ʃi] should not be considered hyperforeignization in the case of English-speakers who are unaware that that word is a French borrowing.

5. On a morpho(phono)logical approach, however, it is possible to reduce the two disjuncts of the Spanish stress-rule to a single principle (cf., e.g., Harris (1991) and references there). Namely, if all ...vcv#-final nouns and adjectives are considered to have a stem boundary between their last consonant and last vowel (= ...vc|v#), with that final vocalic segment constituting an often gender-related "word-marking" suffix, then it can be said that all Spanish nouns are regularly stressed on the vowel which immediately precedes the last consonant in their stem. This principle carries over in a straightforward and obvious way to consonant-final nouns, which can be analyzed as lacking a word marker (= ...vc|#). Spanish verb-stress is likewise assigned with reference to a stem-boundary, but whether the accented vowel precedes or follows the stem depends on the particular tense/finiteness category involved (on the resulting "columnarity," cf. Janda (1993) and earlier references there). In such morphological analyses of Spanish stress, the language has word-penultimate accent only as a default, with the more usual accentuation-principle being stem-final (or, in verbs even post-final).
6. Note, though, that this name rarely became fully Russiannized to [garbatčǝf], which shows final stress, the reduction of unstressed /ð/ to [a], and the final devoicing of /v/ to [f].
7. Kazazis (1992) discusses several folk-etymologies that are closely related to hypercorrection (more or less as its hypernativizing inverse) and likewise involve contact between Turkish and French (as well as, especially, between Greek and Turkish). We might also mention at this juncture that Sadock (1992:MS) has recently documented several examples where language-contact phenomena have resulted in disagreements as to how the names of various newly independent or liberated countries should be pronounced in English. At least one of these instances verges on hyperforeignism: e.g., the case of the Ivory Coast, whose official English name is *Republic of Côte d'Ivoire*. Still, since this choice reflects the wishes of the Ivoreans, who speak not English but French as a non-indigenous language, the name in question is perhaps best considered a "hyponativization".
8. For additional examples, useful comments, and various kinds of help that benefited this paper in other ways, we would like to thank the following people (and any others we've inadvertently not mentioned here): E. Alexander, J. Auger, L. Barratt, A. Bosch, A. Dahlstrom, S. Davis, J. Goldsmith, M. Hansen, P. Hopper, G. Iverson, M. Kac, K. Kazazis, J. Kellerman, I. Kenesei, W. Labov, S. Lima, M.-L. Licbe-Harkort, K. Matsuda, B. Need, K. Pasaran, J. Perry, S. Pinker, Cz. Pleh, J. Sadock, R. Skousen, R. Strier, H. Suzuki, N. Tsujimura, C. Wiltshire, and several present or former colleagues at the Ohio State University who filled out questionnaires for us.

References

- Anttala, R. 1974. "Formalization as degeneration in historical linguistics". In: Anderson, J.; and Jones, J. (eds), *Historical linguistics* 1, 1-32. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.
- Auger, J. "Two French accents in English — with special reference to linguistic awareness". In: Burmeister, H.; and Rounds, P. (eds), *Variability in second language acquisition: Proceedings of the 10th Meeting of the Second Language Research Forum*, pp. 133-150. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Berko [Gleason], J. 1958. "The child's learning of English morphology". *Word* 14: 150-177.

- Ferguson, C. 1983. "Simplified registers and linguistic theory". In: Obler, L.; and Menn, L. (eds), *Exceptional language and linguistics*, 49-66. New York: Academic Press (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich).
- Fillmore, C.; Kay, P.; and O'Connor, M. 1988. "Regularity and idiomatcity in grammatical constructions". *Language* 64.3: 501-538.
- Fodor, J.; and Bever, T. 1965. "The psychological reality of linguistic segments". *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 4: 414-420.
- Harris, J. 1991. "The exponence of gender in Spanish". *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.1: 27-62.
- Haugen, E. 1950. "The analysis of linguistic borrowing". *Language* 26: 210-231.
- Hyman, L. 1970. "The role of borrowing in the justification of phonological grammars". *Studies in African Linguistics* 1.1: 1-48.
- Jakobson, R. 1941. *Kindersprache, Aphasie und allgemeine Lautgesetze*. Uppsala: Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapet i Uppsala Förhandlingar [Uppsala Universitets Åarskrift 1941]. Translated by Keller, A. as *Child language, aphasia, and phonological universals*. The Hague: Mouton 1968.
- Janda, R. 1979. "Hypercorrection and hyper-correction in phonological change". In: Malsch, D.; Hoard, J.; and Sloat, C. (eds), *Proceedings of the 8th Annual Meeting of the Western Conference on Linguistics*, pp. 49-60. Edmonton: Linguistic Research [Current Inquiry into Language and Linguistics 26].
- Janda, R. 1993. "Metrical phonology and the 'columnar' morphology of Spanish verb-stress". In: Crochetière, A.; Boulanger, J.-C.; and Ouelton, C. (eds), *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Linguists*. Saint-Foy, Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Janda, R.; and Auger, J. 1992. "Quantitative evidence, qualitative hypercorrection, sociolinguistic variables — and French speakers' *eadhaches* with English *hiØ*". *Language & Communication [Special Issue on Hypercorrection and Hyperaccommodation]*; Yaeger-Dror, M. (ed.) 12.314:195-236.
- Janda, R.; and Morgan, T. 1988. "El acentó dislocadó-pues cantadó — castellanó: On explaining stress-shift in song-texts from Spanish (and certain other Romance languages)". In: Birdsong, D.; and Montreuil, J.-P. (eds), *Advances in Romance Linguistics*, 151-170. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications Holland [Publications in the Language Sciences 28].
- Joseph, B. 1984. "Balkan expressive and affective phonology — the case of Greek *is/dz*". In: Shangriladze, K.; and Townsend, E. (eds), *Papers for the 5th Congress of Southeast European Studies; Belgrade, September 1984*, 227-237. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc. (for the US National Committee of the AIESEE).
- Joseph, B.; and Janda, R. 1988. "The how and why of diachronic morphologization and demorphologization". In: Hammond, M.; and Noonan, M. (eds), *Theoretical morphology: Approaches in modern linguistics*, 193-210. San Diego: Academic Press (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich).
- Kazazis, Kostas. 1992. "Folk etymology: the hellenization of some Turkish loanwords in Greek". In: Murley, J.; Stone, R.; and Braithwaite, W. (eds), *Law and philosophy — The practice of theory: Essays in honor of George Anastaplo*, II, 1024-1032. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Kenyon, J.; and Knott, T. 1953. *A pronouncing dictionary of American English*. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company, Publishers.

II

Alternatives to Rules

Kiparsky, R. 1968. "Linguistic universals and linguistic change". In: Bach, E.; and Harms, R. (eds), *Universals in linguistic theory*, 338-367. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Kuczaj, S. 1977. "The acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms". *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 16.5: 589-600.

Labov, W. 1966. "Hypercorrection by the lower middle class as a factor in linguistic change". In Bright, W. (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference, 1964*, 84-102, 102-113 [Discussion]. The Hague: Mouton [*Janua Linguarum, Series Maior* 20].

Labov, W. 1989. "Exact description of the speech community: short *a* in Philadelphia". In: Fasold, R.; and Schiffrin, D. (eds), *Language change and variation*, pp. 1-57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company [*Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 52].

Lightfoot, D. 1979. *Principles of diachronic syntax*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press [*Cambridge Studies in Linguistics* 23].

Maddieson, I. 1984. *Patterns of sounds*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press.

Manaster-Ramer, Alexis. 1981. *How abstruse is phonology?* Dissertation, University of Chicago.

Pyles, T. 1952. *Words and ways of American English*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Rubach, J. 1984. "Rule typology and phonological interference". In: Eliasson, S. (ed.), *Theoretical issues in contrastive phonology*, 37-50. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.

Sadock, J. 1992-MS. "Politically correct geography". Unpublished paper, University of Chicago.

Schane, S. 1968. *French phonology and morphology*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press [*MIT Press Research Monograph Series* 45].

Schmitzer, M. 1974. "Aphasiological evidence for five linguistic hypotheses". *Language* 50: 300-315.

Stampc, D. 1973/1979. *A dissertation on natural phonology*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1973. Published in New York: Garland Publishing, Inc [*Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics*], 1979.

Tranel B. 1981. *Concreteness in phonology: Evidence from French*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York [Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York I].

Wells, J. 1982. *Accents of English 2: The British Isles*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press.

Zwicky, A. 1975. "The strategy of generative phonology". In: Dressler, W.; and Mares, F. (eds), *Phonologica 1972: Akten der zweiten Internationalen Phonologie-Tagung: Wien, 5.-8. September 1972*, 151-165, 165-168 [Discussion]. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.