

Contents

Acknowledgements — VII

List of illustrations — XIII

Figures — XIII

Tables — XV

List of abbreviations — XVII

1 Introduction — 1

2 The genesis of contact languages: An account of different hypotheses — 7

- 2.1 What is contact linguistics? — 7
- 2.2 The universalist hypothesis — 9
- 2.3 The substratist hypothesis — 12
 - 2.3.1 Lefebvre's and Siegel's models — 12
 - 2.3.2 Bao's systemic substratist model — 15
- 2.4 The contact-grammaticalization hypothesis — 20
 - 2.4.1 Language-internal grammaticalization — 20
 - 2.4.1.1 The Invited Inferencing Theory of Semantic Change — 25
 - 2.4.2 Contact-grammaticalization — 28
 - 2.4.3 Ordinary contact-induced grammaticalization — 29
 - 2.4.4 Replica grammaticalization — 34
 - 2.4.5 Replica grammaticalization as recapitulation — 36
 - 2.4.6 Pattern and matter replication — 41
- 2.5 The superstratist hypothesis — 45
 - 2.5.1 Mufwene's feature pool model — 46
 - 2.5.2 Retentionism — 48
- 2.6 Summary and conclusion — 49

3 Modality: Necessity and obligation in English — 53

- 3.1 Modality: A definition — 53
- 3.2 Traditional classifications of modality — 54
- 3.3 Modal semantic maps: van der Auwera and Plungian (1998) — 59
- 3.4 Source of modality: Depraetere and Verhulst (2008) — 62
- 3.5 The modal classification in the present study — 65
- 3.6 The history of modals of necessity in English — 68

- 3.6.1 *Must* — 69
- 3.6.2 *HAVE to* — 72
- 3.6.3 *HAVE got to* — 77
- 3.6.4 *NEED to* — 79
- 3.6.5 *BETTER* — 84
- 3.7 Summary and conclusion — 88

4 New Englishes and modality: Different history, different scenarios — 90

- 4.1 Defining New Englishes — 90
- 4.2 Kachru's (1985) and Schneider's (2007) models — 91
- 4.3 English in Singapore: History, evolution, and present-day situation — 95
- 4.4 English in India: History, evolution, and present-day situation — 99
- 4.5 English in Hong Kong: History, evolution, and present-day situation — 101
- 4.6 Modality in New Englishes — 104
- 4.6.1 Synchronic investigations — 105
- 4.6.2 Diachronic investigations — 113
- 4.6.3 Resolving the diachronic void: apparent-time approaches — 115
- 4.7 Summary and conclusion — 118

5 Theoretical and methodological implications — 120

- 5.1 Introduction — 120
- 5.2 The corpora: Composition and type of data — 121
- 5.3 Methods of analysis: Dependent and independent variables — 129
- 5.3.1 Statistical analyses conducted in the study — 134
- 5.4 An integration of corpus analyses: The sociolinguistic surveys — 135
- 5.4.1 The importance of observational techniques in sociolinguistics — 141
- 5.5 Summary and conclusion — 143

6 Corpus data meet survey data: Overview of the results — 146

- 6.1 Introduction — 146
- 6.2 Corpus data — 147
- 6.2.1 Synchronic analysis (BrE, SgE, IndE, and HKE) — 147
- 6.2.2 Diachronic analysis (SgE) — 161
- 6.2.3 The *BETTER* construction — 173
- 6.3 Survey data — 180
- 6.3.1 The surveys — 180
- 6.3.2 Attitudes towards SgE — 181

6.3.3	Modal elicitation in SgE and BrE —	189
6.3.4	Acceptability of different modal constructions —	191
6.4	Summary and conclusion —	198
7	Discussion of the results: A pan-stratist approach —	200
7.1	Introduction —	200
7.2	<i>Must</i> —	201
7.2.1	The role of the SUB-FORCE —	210
7.3	HAVE <i>to</i> and NEED <i>to</i> —	213
7.4	HAVE <i>got to</i> , <i>got to</i> , and <i>gotta</i> —	215
7.5	BETTER —	218
7.6	A systemic pan-stratist model —	222
8	Conclusion —	224
Appendices — 233		
	Appendix A —	233
	Appendix B —	245
	Appendix C —	251
List of the analysed or cited corpora — 255		
References — 257		
Index — 279		