

## Butties from the chippy outside Sevvie: templatic phonology in Liverpool English

Patrick Honeybone  
University of Edinburgh

Many languages feature phonologically constrained truncation processes. In German, for example, there is a well-established process of *i-formation* (Wiese 2001), which derives forms such as those in (1b) from those in (1a). General English features the phenomenon of *y-hypocoristic formation* (Lappe 2008), which creates ‘familiar’ forms from personal names, as shown in (2). The process in (1) is fully productive, whereas that in (2) is not: it is partially lexicalised, somewhat unpredictable, and can only affect names.

(1a)	(1b)		(2a)	(2b)
<i>Abitur</i>	<i>Abi</i>	‘high school diploma’	<i>Andrew</i>	<i>Andy</i>
<i>Depressiver</i>	<i>Depri</i>	‘a depressive person’	<i>Elizabeth</i>	<i>Lizzy</i>
<i>Klinsmann</i>	<i>Klinsi</i>	(name)	<i>Robert</i>	<i>Bobby</i>
<i>Spontaner</i>	<i>Sponti</i>	‘member of a spontaneous party fraction’	<i>Walter</i>	<i>Wally</i>
<i>Wilhelm</i>	<i>Willi</i>	(name)	<i>William</i>	<i>Billy</i>

In this talk, I discuss an analogous process which is found in the variety of English spoken in and around Liverpool (often called ‘Scouse’). This process is similar to, but interestingly different from, the phenomena shown in (1) and (2). It is productive, freely applicable to common nouns, and has a regular and somewhat remarkable phonology. It is sometimes referred to as *Scouse Diddification*, and it derives forms such as those in (3b) from those in (3a).

(3a)	(3b)	
<i>address</i>	<i>addy</i>	
<i>(bread and) butter</i>	<i>butty</i>	‘sandwich’
<i>chestnut</i>	<i>chezzy</i>	
<i>chipshop</i>	<i>chippie</i>	
<i>Sefton (Park)</i>	<i>Sevvie</i>	(place name)
<i>skint</i>	<i>skinny</i>	‘out of money’
<i>tomato sauce</i>	<i>tommy (sauce)</i>	
<i>Toxteth</i>	<i>Tocky</i>	(place name)

The processes in (1), (2) and (3) all involve the imposition of a phonological template on the base form to derive the truncated form. They are often described as cases of *prosodic morphology* because the template requires the derived forms to conform to a particular prosodic shape (in these cases, always a bisyllabic trochee), but this misses the fact that non-prosodic phonology can also be involved. One of the key research questions in this area is: *what is the possible form of the template in such processes?* I show here that the template in *Scouse Diddification* is constrained in a number of ways: subsegmentally, syllabically, prosodically and (arguably) orthographically. The data that I discuss derives from two sources: a corpus of written forms, collected from such sources as Spiegl (2000), and a questionnaire task which probed the intuitions of native speakers.

### References

- Lappe, Sabine (2008) *English Prosodic Morphology*. Dordrecht: Springer.  
Spiegl, Fritz (ed.) (2000) *Scouse International: the Liverpool Dialect in Five Languages*. Liverpool: Scouse Press.  
Wiese, Richard (2001) ‘Regular morphology vs. prosodic morphology? The case of truncations in German’. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 13, 131-177.