

standing of intonation patterns and their emotional functions than we now possess in our phonetic literature. I commend this problem to the younger generation of phoneticians, who must be to the broadcasters of speech of their generation what the scholars and the University presses were to the broadcasters of print — guides, philosophers and friends, rather than unsympathetic and superior critics.

I have finally to report to the Congress that since our last meeting we have published a booklet on the *Pronunciation of Foreign Place Names* (1). In the introduction to this booklet members will find discussed in detail the phonetic aspect of an interesting language problem. We have two booklets in preparation, one on foreign names (authors, musicians, etc.) and one on English family names, both containing the results of entirely fresh researches. A typical example of the British attitude to pronunciation of foreign names is contained in a review of the first of these booklets which appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* — „If the Announcer must talk French, let him talk French as French is usually spoken by an English gentleman”.

23. Dr. J. A. W. BENNETT (Oxford) : *Broadcasting in the British Dominions.*

It is impossible to generalize about the position of broadcasting in the British Dominions. What is true, say, of Canada, where we have to reckon with the influence of American stations, is not true of South Africa, with its comparatively small English-speaking community in which controlled broadcasting has been established for little more than a year. And it is too early to speak dogmatically about what are only tendencies. None the less, certain generalizations can be made, and deserve a place, if only as a footnote, in the history of English as a world language.

In the Dominions, as elsewhere, one obvious, though indirect, result of the development of the radio has been to stimulate speech-consciousness. Criticism of broadcast speech, in particular of announcers' speech, is often misguided ; it is not so widespread as in England ; but, in the Dominions at least, it must be taken as a stage in the growth of culture. The broadcasting services are a focus, as well as a target, for criticism. The widespread demand made by local educational authorities in Canada for the improvement of broadcast speech suggests that this growth

(1) *Broadcast English VI. B. B. C. Broadcasting House London W. 1.*

of speech-consciousness may have positive results. An incidental outcome is the publication of lists of recommended pronunciations. These may provide valuable records both of the varieties of pronunciation of English within the Dominions — a subject which has hitherto received little or no attention — and of the current pronunciation of local place-names, which often cause doubt and confusion. In the matter of native place-names especially, much good work can be done by the broadcasting authorities. Some of these names have already been mangled hopelessly by Europeans, but there is a chance of saving most of them in an approximate pronunciation. A list of Canadian place-names is in preparation. A few Maori place-names are included in the New Zealand list of authorized pronunciations, but I note that in at least two cases the pronunciations recorded there are different from those given in the B. B. C. Handlist of Foreign Place-names ; and pronunciations of names of places outside New Zealand often differ in the English and New Zealand lists. This is a case in which uniformity seems desirable and could be attained without undue controversy. This might be borne in mind when the other Dominions reach the stage of compiling such lists.

Criticism of broadcast speech in the Dominions takes two forms :

(1) There are criticisms of announcers' pronunciations of particular words. This type of criticism varies in quality : in Canada it is usually better informed than in New Zealand. Australians seem more apathetic, though *centenary* and *centennial* recently caused some heartburning. The evidence suggests that uninformed criticism does slowly decrease, and with it, we may hope, false ideas of „right” and „wrong” pronunciations.

(2) There are more general criticisms of the „accent” of the announcers. In all the Dominions these criticisms tend to be based on the assumption that any speech which does not conform to that used by the listener is wrong or affected. Educated English speech often falls, on this view, into the latter category. The best way of damning an Englishman in the Dominions is to say that he has an „Oxford accent”. This unfortunate phrase is used even more vaguely abroad than at home : the speech-habits that colonials mean to censure when they use it are more often those of the public schools, and of „Brighter London”, to use Professor Lloyd James's phrase, than those found within the University. Occasionally an English visitor to the Dominions may „talk fine” self-consciously, or an announcer may attempt to copy his B. B. C. prototype, with ludicrous results. But I suspect that protests against English speech are often really a symptom of colonial prejudice : having

heard few varieties of spoken English, the Colonial is apt to protest against any form which is unfamiliar (1).

It follows that most people in the Dominions, even many of those who have travelled, are unaware that their own speech has any national or local peculiarities. They think that they use the King's English, though their variety of it may contain as many blurred pronunciations as the affected speech which they despise. A consequence is that they do not always take kindly to an English-trained announcer.

Canada deserves separate treatment. Educated Canadian speech corresponds more closely to „General”, that is Western, American speech than to Southern English. This correspondence is illustrated in the Canadian handlist, which includes such pronunciations as *veɪkət*, *dəʊl*, *ɪntərestɪŋ*, *prɒsəs*, *təməɪtə*. And an American announcer will be more acceptable to Canadian ears than an educated Englishman using Southern English. Further, American stations cover most of the populated areas of Canada; and though they have been partly eliminated as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has grown, the Corporation itself regularly exchanges programmes with the American networks: at least 13 per cent of official Canadian programmes during the past year came from America.

So far I have been speaking of stations under government control. But in none of the Dominions do these stations enjoy a monopoly of the air. And the programmes offered by commercial stations give opportunities for the use of types of speech quite different from those normally heard in official broadcasts. The speech of announcers on commercial stations differs noticeably from that of official announcers. The commercial announcer is forced to be a salesman, even a comedian; nothing must suggest that he is superior to his audience of potential customers. He usually makes sure of being on the safe side by adopting the speech habits of those to whom he is selling — the farmer or manual worker, and their families. The same is true of private stations like that of the Trade Hall in Sydney — which, catering for a proletarian audience, employs an announcer with a marked Australian accent.

There are thus conflicting tendencies in Broadcast Speech in the Dominions. Whereas in government stations there is at least some attempt to regularise and clarify pronunciation, the

(1) English dialect speakers are scorned in the Dominions for the same reason; when emigration was in full flow some years ago the speech of the average emigrant — e. g. from the Midlands — was despised as that of a „homey”. A Scotch accent is more acceptable in some parts of the Dominions; but usually only where there was a strong Scottish element in the original community.

commercial stations usually disregard these attempts. And in at least two of the dominions the majority of the stations are commercial stations. In New Zealand the situation is anomalous: there the commercial stations are under government control, yet are not subject to the supervision of the Director of the national Broadcasting Service, and pay no attention to his recommendations.

Further: these commercial stations concentrate largely on entertainment, and entertainment of a particular kind. In Canada this takes the form of electrically transcribed serial dramas, sponsored commercially, and usually of American origin. „They are, naturally, written and spoken in the American idiom, and often with uneducated American accent; they abound in slang of all kinds, and in the slurred elliptical speech of the characters portrayed. They are widely listened to by children, and it cannot be considered that their influence on speech is good” (1).

In Australia and New Zealand, too, commercial stations (and even the official ones: 75 per cent of New Zealand official programmes are from records) make use of a large number of American records. In conjunction with the talkies this may help to increase the prestige of American English in those Dominions in the future.

It is only in the last two years that any of the national broadcasting services have become aware of their responsibilities in the matter of pronunciation, and there is still plenty of room for progress. The Canadian Corporation issues a useful handbook for its announcers, and promises more. In New Zealand a retired professor of English was appointed to inspect official stations and „improve” pronunciation: and he has published lists of his rulings. These lists reveal three things:

1. The differences between what we may call „Received New Zealand English” and Standard English are greater than is always allowed. In particular, spelling pronunciations flourish — e. g., *haʊswaɪfəri*, *mɑːgə'dʒɔː*, which are approved in the list, and *ɔndʒɪt*, which ought to be, since it is always pronounced thus in New Zealand. Probably the use of the breathed consonant *ʌ* in words like *which*, *while*, should be included here; all official announcers use it, and are encouraged to do so; the fact that there was a considerable Scottish element in the original community may have assisted its growth. Place-names are also affected by spelling-pronunciation, though this is not always shown by the list.

(1) Extract from a report by Mr. W. H. Brodie, who very kindly supplied me with information about the C. B. C.

And Latin phrases, even in law courts, are almost invariably given the „modern” pronunciation. Pronunciations apparently peculiar to the Dominion must also be noted : ən'ri:θətɪst, bæsɪk, 'pɛ:smən, su:pɪdʒæk.

2. Trouble has often been caused by words over which one would have expected no hesitation — suggesting that the standards of announcers are generally lower than in England. This again reminds us that Standard English is more often read than heard in the Dominions.

3. There is clearly need for some elementary training in phonetics, which would be made compulsory for all announcers. As it is, the devices used to express pronunciations are vague, inconsistent, and confusing.

In general, the New Zealand lists err by being too rigid, and by classing as „errors” some widely-used variants, which would certainly be approved by the B. B. C. And there are some curious inconsistencies : *bm* is not favoured as the pronunciation of *been* on the assumption that it is no longer in general English use : *æ* is not allowed in such words as *dance*, *path*, though it is much more prevalent in New Zealand than in England ; yet the short vowel is insisted on in almost all *trans-* compounds.

Th moral seems to be that these lists should not be too rigid, and should not be drawn up by one man, however competent. The Canadian handlist seems more realistic when it admits variants such as *gɑ:lə*, *geɪlə* ; *bm*, *brn*, *klɜ:k*, *klɔ:k*.

Most of the Dominion stations are regional, and there is therefore no likelihood of any excessive uniformity being imposed. The controversy in Canada as to whether British-English or American English should be used on the air seems really to be a regional controversy : the majority of complaints evidently come from British Columbia, in the West, where a large number of English people — army officers, for example — go to retire : their complaints are perhaps more common because they have leisure in which to complain. Otherwise, the existence of regional differences is generally ignored, and even denied by the broadcasting authorities themselves — though the phonetician will have no difficulty in observing differences between the speech, say, of Sydney and West Australia, and, in New Zealand, Auckland and Christchurch. I was interested to find that my Australian informant assumed that the characteristic and distinctive „Australian” speech was that of the outback farmer, which he would distinguish from the „thin” speech of the cities (1). This is one of the few instances I have met with

(1) Though we must remember that for comic or dramatic purposes the farmer might be quite arbitrarily credited with an equipment of

of the recognition of regional differences. Canadian speech seems to be remarkably homogeneous, and differences seem to be confined to the less educated people. But the predominance of State primary and secondary schools usually makes speech much less a criterion of class in the Dominions than in England.

24. Prof. E. W. SELMER (Oslo) : *Sprechnormierung im Rundfunk*.

Meine Damen und Herren !

In der ersten Einladung zu diesem Kongress, der schon 1937 erging, teilten unsre lebenswürdigen Gastgeber uns mit, dass „among the problems on which they want to call special attention, they wish to give a prominent place to those connected with broadcasting”. Schon auf dem Londoner Kongress hatte Professor LLOYD JAMES die Wichtigkeit dieses Teilgebietes der phonetischen Wissenschaft betont, und wir sind deshalb unseren Gastgebern zu Dank verpflichtet, dass sie, um wieder den Prospekt anzuführen : „should like to give the treatment of this subject and also the technical broadcasting every possible extension”.

Man muss meines Erachtens scharf unterscheiden zwischen *Sprachnormierung* und *Sprechnormierung*. Die erstere Regelung betrifft in erster Reihe *la langue*, die letztere dagegen *la parole*. *Sprachnormierung* muss politisch beeinflusst sein und riecht etwas verdächtig, und zwar nach politischen Minderheiten, Leitartikeln u. s. w. Die glücklichste Weise, dieses heikle Problem zu lösen, und zwar in dem günstigen Falle wo es keine eigentlichen Minderheiten gibt, sondern wo zwei, beziehungsweise drei Sprachen innerhalb desselben politischen Staatsgebiets sich die Wage halten, — ist selbstverständlich die Errichtung von zwei, bzw. drei Hauptsendern, wie dies bekanntlich in einigen Ländern der Fall ist. In anderen Ländern ist man noch nicht so weit, wird wahrscheinlich auch nie so weit kommen, eben weil sich die Sprachgruppen weder politisch noch ziffernmässig die Wage halten. Ganz eigentümlich sind die Verhältnisse in meinem Vaterland, Norwegen, wo „Riksmål” und „Landsmål” beide als Sendesprachen verwendet werden. Es fehlt mir leider die Zeit, auf eine ausführlichere Schilderung dieser beiden Sprachformen einzugehen, die jedenfalls den anwesenden Linguisten bekannt sein dürften. Das Riksmål, oder

„drawls”. There is a similar tendency to attribute to the English-speaking native (e. g., the Maori) a pidgin English which corresponds to no real speech. The broadcasting services can wield a wide influence in preventing distorted representations of the dialects that grow up where a native race lives side by side with the English.