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1 Introduction

A first glance at anglophone countries throughout the world reveals that some have English because settlers from Britain and Ireland came there during the colonial period, roughly from 1600 to 1900, and continued English as a native language at the new locations (Hickey ed., 2004; Trudgill this volume). In other countries, especially in Africa and Asia, English is spoken by indigenous populations as a second language (Sharma 2005, 2011), knowledge of which comes in the main from the educational system in these countries and from general exposure to English. The latter situation usually involves varying degrees of competence in English with some speakers having considerable competence in the language, others speaking it more as a foreign than a second language. However, where the first white population consisted of British/Irish settlers, English is present as a native language, so the question of competence is not an issue. Rather the manner in which forms of English at the new locations developed and reached the phonological and grammatical shapes they currently show is the central concern.

The division of English throughout the world into settler and non-settler forms does not always correspond neatly with individual countries as some show both types, e.g. South Africa, which has settler English with its white, English-descendant population and non-settler English in a number of other forms, including Afrikaans English, Black South African English and South African Indian English (see the contributions in de Klerk ed., 1996). The question of possible native-like competence for non-settler varieties is central to many recent discussions in the relevant literature, especially on English in Singapore (see the contributions in Lim, Pakir and Wee eds, 2010).

In the following sections certain aspects of new forms of English from the colonial period, i.e. those arising from non-settler English, will not be discussed in detail because these are dealt elsewhere in the current volume: for information on language contact, see Mesthrie; for creolisation, see Winford, for parallels between varieties, see Britain and for the relationship between older and more recently established varieties of English, see Filppula. The complex relationship of forms of English in Britain and the varieties taken to Ireland since the late twelfth century is not dealt with here, for reasons of space. Nonetheless, it should be said that some aspects of this relationship, especially those related to the historical shift from Irish to English, are germane to much of the discussion in this chapter. For a detailed treatment, see Hickey (2007), especially chapters 2, 4 and 6.
2 The transportation of English

Emigration from England has been a continuous feature from the seventeenth century onwards, chiefly to North America and the Caribbean in its early stages. The main port for both trade with and emigration to the New World was Bristol and the speech of many of those who left was that of the West Country and the South-West which was to play a significant role as input to many New World varieties.

Other regions of England have been the source for settlers in overseas colonies. The early seventeenth century saw emigration from East Anglia to New England and by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century the catchment area for emigrants to the colonies had largely shifted to the capital London and the Home Counties, e.g. the 1820s settlers to the Eastern Cape region of South Africa. The varieties of English spoken in the south-east were to affect the new varieties arising in the colonies. This is particularly true of the southern hemisphere – South Africa, Australia and New Zealand – which shows a common core of features which accounts for its relative linguistic unity. For instance, all the three countries just mentioned show a raising of short vowels which is not typical to the same extent of New World varieties, if one neglects more recent developments in the northern cities of the United States. In South Africa one finds that most of the features considered to be indicative of Australian English also occur (four of the six southern features listed in Mitchell and Delbridge 1965, Lanham 1996: 20). Indeed one of the differences is the tense front /æ/ in *cart* which may well be traceable to Irish influence in Australia, given its widespread occurrence in Ireland and the fact that there was no significant Irish contingent among the settlers in South Africa, though a considerable one in Australia.

2.1 The social setting overseas

The situation in which the settlers from the British Isles found themselves overseas varied considerably (Trudgill, this volume). There is a great contrast between the seasonal migration workers in Newfoundland and the political deportees from Ireland in early Australia. Equally, the nonconformist eighteenth century Ulster Scots (Miller 1985: 137-168) who moved into the east of the United States played a different role in American society than did the impoverished and weakened famine immigrants of the mid nineteenth century arriving in the large cities of the north-east of that country (Miller 1985: 280-555).

The sociolinguistic scenario at the new locations is a central consideration when attempting to evaluate British/Irish influence on overseas varieties. For example, there is a relative lack of influence of Irish English on the speech of the eastern United States despite the large number of rural Irish who flooded into the region in the second half of the nineteenth century. But this probably has to do with the desire to shake off the background of poverty and depravation which brought with it a willingness to integrate into the new society quickly. A similar explanation can be given for the slight influence of the Irish on the genesis of Australian English. Additionally, one finds in the United States that English there was well-established by the nineteenth century when the second wave of (southern) Irish emigration took place. In Australia, the presence of south-eastern British settlers in Australia, who would naturally have had higher social status, meant that the influence of the Irish on incipient varieties of English there was correspondingly reduced.

The settings at the overseas locations are relevant in another context as well. For the development of creoles (nativised pidgins) a planter society seems to be necessary
where the slaves would have lived in relative isolation from whites and hence created the environment in which creoles could arise (Winford, this volume). This would seem to have obtained in certain parts of the Caribbean, for instance on Jamaica, but not on Barbados (the original anglophone settlement in the area).

2.2 English at the new locations

The development of English at overseas locations depended, on the one hand, on the speakers emigrating and the kinds of English they transported. On the other hand, the nature of the conditions at the new locations played an essential role. The former colonies differ greatly in their size, climate, topography, economy and demography, and these are factors which determined the characteristics of new forms of English there.

Early settlement overseas was naturally on the coast of the area in question. In general these coastal regions show the most conservative type of English. This is as true of the south-east and east of Ireland as it is of the Atlantic coast of the United States and Canada. The further history of English at new locations is determined by migration routes taken. In the United States there was initially a general movement down along the Atlantic coast and somewhat inland with a fan-like spread into the interior beyond the Appalachians (Carver 1987: 176), with a later movement across from the east coast to the region of the Great Lakes (Carver 1987: 55). In Canada, given the geography of the country, the position was different. The early settlement of Newfoundland by Irish and West Country immigrants and that of Nova Scotia did not lead to a comparable diffusion into the interior; rather later immigration occurred through the ports in the St. Lawrence estuary and from there into south-central Canada. The topography of South Africa, on the other hand, allowed for a much more evenly distributed pattern of early settlement by British immigrants in the Western and Eastern Cape. These settlers carried more vernacular varieties of English (Lanham 1996: 20-22) whereas the later settlement of KwaZulu-Natal in the Durban area after 1848 was characterised by an increasing standardness of the imported varieties (de Klerk 1996: 10). For Australia, the area of initial settlement was the south-east of the country (present-day New South Wales), with the west around Perth and the north following later.

2.3 The formative years for settler varieties

For the development of later varieties at a location, especially a supraregional one which may adopt the function of a standard, the initial input is of great importance as it sets the direction which later forms at this location are to take. This fact is embodied in a term which has attained considerable currency in recent years, ‘the founder principle’ (Mufwene 1996). It essentially established a label for the long since observed fact that the formative years of a variety are the early ones. As opposed to this, varieties introduced at a later stage have a correspondingly slight influence. This principle can be clearly illustrated by considering the role of Irish input on English in the United States. The influence of the northern Irish (Ulster Scots) input during the eighteenth century was considerable in the United States Midland (Montgomery 2004) but that of the much larger number of southern Irish immigrants during the nineteenth century was significantly less. This is largely the case because distinct forms of American English in the north-east were already established although it is also true that the relative numbers of Ulster Scots in the eighteenth century were significant because the overall population of the then Thirteen Colonies was considerably smaller than in the nineteenth century.
2.4 The development of focussed varieties

With the change in status from colony to independent state new focussed varieties arose which in turn stand in a certain relationship to those in Britain. In fact the anglophone area can be divided according to its stance vis-à-vis standard varieties in Britain. The United States has its own conception of standard English which developed from supraregional forms of English outside the distinct dialect areas of the north-east and south. With the increasing economic power of the United States in the twentieth century the influence of general American English has increased considerably in areas contiguous with the United States, such as the Caribbean or Canada which has re-oriented itself towards a North American koiné rather than towards British norms of pronunciation (Clarke, Elms and Youssef 1995: 224). The case of Canada is interesting in that it has retained an aspect of dialect as its chief delimiting feature vis-à-vis supraregional United States English – a differential realisation of the rising diphthongs /ai, au/ of the PRICE and MOUTH lexical sets before voiceless and voiced segments: [praɪs] but [praɪz] and [maʊθ] but [maʊd]. This distribution has been labelled ‘Canadian Raising’ by Chambers (1973).

3 The genesis of overseas varieties

In the central 250-year period from the early seventeenth to the latter half of the nineteenth century largely regional forms of English were taken to the colonies which England founded. These varieties were mainly spoken by people from lower social ranks. This applied to deportees in early Australia, to indentured servants in the early anglophone Caribbean, to emigrants and adventurers of various sorts in many other colonies, to the sailors who worked on the ocean-going ships, as well as to bailiffs and other members of the colonial service industry. The only people from the educated middle classes and higher would have been senior officials in the administration, clerical and educational staff or army officers stationed overseas. Given this situation any treatment of colonial English is likely to be concerned with varieties which are not similar to, or even near, the current or recent historical standard of British English, even granting that the notion of ‘standard’ had a less clear profile in previous centuries than it does today, at least in its spoken form. Dialect input is, however, only one source for colonial English; others are indicated in the following list.

Table 1 Factors determining the shape of overseas varieties

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Dialect features from British/Irish sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Independent developments within the overseas communities, including realignments of features in the dialect input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Contact phenomena where English speakers co-existed with those of other languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Indirect influence through the educational system in those countries in which English arose without significant numbers of native speaker settlers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Creolisation in those rare situations where there was no linguistic continuity and where virtually the only input was an English-based pidgin from the preceding generation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sometimes in the relevant literature one or more of the above factors have been favoured to the exclusion of others. Considering all these factors and according them relative weight on the basis of considered linguistic arguments is, however, essential when attempting to account for the shape of later varieties at overseas locations.

3.1 Assessing dialect features

Similarities among varieties may be quite common and hence of little value when weighing up British/Irish sources for features. The more widespread a feature is the less it is indicative of a connection either between homeland and colony or between overseas varieties. An apt example is ‘diphthong flattening’ (Wells 1982: 149f.), the reduced tongue movement for the rising diphthongs /ai/ and /au/. This results in pronunciations like *wife* [waɾ] and *house* [haus]. This phenomenon is very common, it is found in South Africa and the southern United States, two regions which are definitely not linked historically, as well as in the north of England, e.g. *faan* [faːn] ‘fine’ (Ihalainen 1994: 213). Other common phenomena are (i) final cluster simplification (Schreier 2011), particularly post-sonorant deletion, as in *mend* /mɛn/, (ii) the alveolarisation of /ŋ/ in unstressed syllables, typically in the progressive form of verbs, e.g. *talking* /tækŋ/ or (iii) the assimilation of sibilants to nasals as in *wasn’t* [wɔznət] → [wɔdnət], found in south-east Ireland and parts of the southern United States (Troike 1986). It is the very general nature of such features which diminishes their diagnostic value when considering historical connections.

Dialect features are characterised not only by presence or absence but by relative frequency. The consideration of frequency has led to many insights, especially on the level of syntax. For instance, in their study of relatives, Tottie and Rey (1997) found that the lack of *wh*-relatives and the frequency of zero relatives points to the dialect background of African American English (Tottie and Rey 1997: 244) and shows a system not dissimilar to that of Middle Scots examined by Romaine (1982).

Early attestations of overseas varieties can be illuminating in this context. Howe (1997: 267f.) maintains that Earlier African American English (as incorporated in the ex-slave recordings collected in Bailey, Maynor and Cukor-Avila (eds, 1991) is more conservative than modern African American English and more akin to nonstandard southern white English, setting itself off from creole patterning in this respect.

3.2 Constraints on variability

There are linguistic constraints on variability such as the relatively rare occurrence of final cluster reduction before a vowel, e.g. *find* [fain] but *find out* [faind aut] or the non-occurrence of diphthong lowering before voiceless segments in Canadian English (*tight* is [tæt] and not [tart] although *tide* is [taɪd]). The final cluster reduction just quoted provides a good example of this kind of variability (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998: 249-256). In the history of English sequences of bilabial nasal + voiced stop have not existed for centuries, i.e. *comb* is pronounced without a final /-b/. If the nasal is followed by a voiceless stop then it is retained, e.g. *damp* with final /-p/. Stops following velar nasals have experienced a similar development: voiceless stops are retained, cf. *think*, but voiced ones are generally lost in word-final position, cf. *sing* [-ŋ] (the stop can, however, be retained in north-west forms of British English, Upton and Widdowson 1996: 34f.). Deletion after velar nasals is not always the case word-internally, contrast *singer* [-ŋ-] with *longer* [-ŋɡ-]. Where an alveolar nasal is followed
by a voiced stop the latter is realised in standard English, e.g. *cold, card, wind*, all with final */-d/*. In relaxed colloquial styles the final voiced stop can be deleted when followed by a further stop, e.g. *cold meat* [-lm-], but there are dialects where this deletion holds for careful styles, e.g. Dublin English. In these cases the stop deletion is a dialect feature and not just an aspect of fast speech.

### 3.3 Survival of features in relic areas

In general inaccessible, mountainous or isolated coastal regions keep the features which were characteristic of the input varieties. Appalachia and Newfoundland are two classic examples of this as are the Ozark Mountains. Indeed there may well be interconnections between such regions as Christian, Wolfram and Dube (1988: 2) postulate for Appalachia and the Ozarks (see map in Carver 1987: 119; he notes, for instance, the occurrence of *poke* ‘bag, small sack’ in the Appalachians and the Ozarks, see pp. 176f.). The Outer Banks of North Carolina provide an example of an isolated coastal region with dialect features not found in mainstream varieties of American English (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1997: 5-15). Features in such areas tend to be retained which are not necessarily characteristic of the country they are part of. For instance rhoticism – the now recessive Southland ‘burr’ – in the Otago region of the south island of New Zealand is not typical of the rest of the country.

### 3.4 Diaspora varieties

Diaspora varieties have arisen in the past few centuries with a population movement away from a main area to a smaller, more remote one. This situation is found in a few cases in the anglophone world and has been the subject of investigation by a number of linguists (notably Shana Poplack, Sali Tagliamonte and John Singler for diaspora forms of African American English). The linguistic interest of such areas derives from their separation from the core area and hence their lack of participation in later developments in this latter area. A case in point is offered by the Americana settlement in Brazil which consists of African Americans who left the southern United States in the wake of defeat after the American Civil War (Montgomery and Melo 1990: 195). Certain features which are regarded as prototypical of present-day southern United States speech, such as diphthong flattening in the *PRICE* lexical set, are not found here. The conclusion which can be drawn is that this phonetic feature is a recent phenomenon, post-dating the movement of African Americans to Brazil. Indeed researchers like Guy Bailey are of the opinion that diphthong flattening is a fairly recent phenomenon (Bailey and Ross 1992: 528; Montgomery and Melo 1990: 206-208).

There have been other African American diasporas, notable on Samaná peninsula in the Dominican Republic and in Nova Scotia (Poplack and Tagliamonte 2001: 10-38, 39-68). The return to West Africa by African Americans in the newly founded state of Liberia (1847) in the nineteenth century has been investigated by John Singler along with the development of African American English in the southern United States (Singler 1991) after this displacement. On the repatriated African Americans in Sierra Leone, see Ehret (1997: 174-6). For an examination of the language of an expatriate community of African Americans in Sierra Leone on the basis of letters, see Montgomery (1999).

Dialect features can also offer information about migration routes within a country. In the movement of African Americans from the south to the north in the United States there were two basic streams, one which involved African Americans
from North and South Carolina moving up along the coast to Washington DC, Philadelphia, New York and one which took a Midwestern route up into St Louis, Chicago, Detroit. It has been noted (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998: 115) that the latter group are less likely to show the shift of [ð] to [v], as in brother [-v-], smooth [-v-], than are their counterparts at Eastern Seaboard locations.

3.5 Likely sources

Competing sources for dialect features require that one considers more general aspects of language development in trying to reach a decision about which source is the most likely in a particular situation. An example of this is provided by vowel epenthesis in Irish English and Afrikaans English: as epenthetic vowel appears as schwa in words with final /-lm/ clusters, i.e. with heavy codas consisting of more than one non-homorganic sonorant, hence film is typically [filəm]. Branford (1994: 486) in his discussion of English in South Africa mentions the presence of the same feature in Irish English and suggests that it might be a source. But the number of Irish settlers in South Africa was in all only about 1%, so hardly significant in the genesis of varieties of English there. However, Afrikaans shows a similar epenthesis and studies of the geographical distribution of epenthesis (Hickey 1986) confirm that it is a low-level phonetic phenomenon with a typically areal spread, for instance it is found in Dutch and in the adjacent German dialects of the northern Rhineland. Its occurrence in Afrikaans – as a transported feature of Dutch – would suggest that its appearance in Afrikaans English is the result of transfer from Afrikaans.

3.6 Analysing ‘colonial lag’

Historically, commentators on varieties of English outside Britain have tended to highlight their conservative nature. As far back as 1577 Richard Stanyhurst commented on the similarity between the English of south-east Ireland and Chaucerian English which for Stanyhurst would have been a vague reference to an antique form of English. Latter-day writers refer to the language of the Elizabethan era or to that of Shakespeare and frequently maintain that dialects tend to maintain this still (see the references to Appalachian English discussed by Montgomery 2001: 107-109). Precisely what such labels mean is not usually specified; the power of the argument seems to derive from its very vagueness. Nonetheless, a certain antiquity is the point being made and the situation where colonies seem to fall behind developments in the mainland is often labelled ‘colonial lag’ (Görlach 1987). A number of genuine cases can be recognised beyond doubt. For instance, in present-day Dublin English the vowel in SOFT shows a long [ə:] before a voiceless fricative (the same applies to words like FROST and CLOTH): [səft], [frəst], [klɔt] (Hickey 2005). This is a feature adopted from nineteenth century British English but is one that is not present in the latter anymore, cf. [sɔft], [frɔst], [klbθ] in RP.

4 Linguistic issues in the analysis of settler Englishes

4.1 Shared innovations or feature continuity

Features which appear in settler English overseas can in principle be due to the input varieties to the regions or be independent developments which coincide with similar
developments in the homeland, but without any causal connection. The latter are termed 'shared innovations'. Those scholars who do, however, see a connection would interpret such developments as a continuity of existing trends in the input varieties.

As an illustration of the continuity scenario one can consider short front vowels in Southern Hemisphere English. In all three major varieties (South African, Australian and New Zealand English) these vowels are raised when compared to general varieties in Britain, e.g. bad [e], bed [be:d], bid [bi:d] (South African and New Zealand English). For South African English, Branford (1994: 474-80) deals in detail with the raised realisations of front short vowels. He also points out (1994: 477) that the raising of the TRAP vowel is probably an inherited feature of early nineteenth century English and quotes Wyld (1956) who comments on this in early twentieth-century RP. Branford also sees the raised vowel in the DRESS lexical set and the centralised realisation in the BIT set as having antecedents in British English at the time of the first wave of settlers to the Western and Eastern Cape regions of South Africa. The raising of short vowels can thus be viewed as a propensity in the early input. It was continued at the new Southern Hemisphere locations, most noticeably in New Zealand. In Britain in the twentieth century a lowering of the raised TRAP vowel had set in by the middle of the century (Bauer 1994: 120f.) halting any incipient general shift upwards.

Shared innovations can be found across the anglophone world. An example would be the independent development of the plural *y’all* in southern American English and in South African Indian English. For phonetic examples, see the discussion in 3.1 Assessing dialect features above.

4.2 Internal dialect patterning

The larger of the former colonies – United States, Canada, Australia and to a more limited extent South Africa – experienced internal migration after the transportation of English. Obviously, communication networks have been important for the spread of English at new locations. For later immigration to the United States and Canada the establishment of railway connections facilitated the push westwards of European immigrants.

The economic situation of former colonies is also significant for dialect patterning at new locations. For instance, the fishing industry has been, up until the twentieth century, responsible for the maintenance of remote conservative communities, again in Canada (Newfoundland) and in the United States (in areas like the Outer Banks in North Carolina). Migration within countries for economic reasons has in many cases led to a new distribution of dialects as with the movement of African Americans into the industrial centres in the north of the United States after the mid-nineteenth century (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998: 115).

Internal migration typically results in a shift from largely rural dialects to urban dialects as in the case just mentioned. It can also lead to anomalous distributions as with a dialect apex, a pocket area such as the Hoosier Apex of southern speech in lower Indiana and Illinois (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998: 110; Carver 1987: 174), in this case reflecting original settlement. Migration may well cause linguistic focussing if at a given location a dialect comes under pressure from outside and maintains its most noticeable features while the other less salient ones are lost. Indeed there may be a tendency to rule extension, the spreading of a formerly restricted feature to new parts of the variety in question. This may create the impression of a dialect becoming increasingly, rather than decreasingly, distinctive.
4.3 Embryonic and focussed varieties

The development of varieties in the Southern Hemisphere has provided linguists with situations in which the rise of new varieties can be studied more comprehensively than anywhere in the Northern Hemisphere. In particular the contrast between embryonic and focussed varieties can be illuminated by case studies from this area. English on the Falkland Islands (Sudbury 2004) and on English of Tristan da Cunha (Schreier 2004) show how nascent varieties are possibly moving towards clearer profiles by the preference, reallocation or dropping of input variants. An issue among linguists in variety studies is whether this process is an epiphenomenon of the choices speakers make or whether they unconsciously strive to achieve their own linguistic identity via a unique linguistic profile.

Not all cases of embryonic varieties lead to focussing, however. The external circumstances may militate against this. For instance, on the Bonin/Ogasawara Islands, in the western Pacific, English would seem to be on the decline after the return of the islands, which had been under United States controls since the Second World War, to Japan. Most of the younger generation are monolingual Japanese or use mainstream varieties of English (Long 1999: 278).

4.4 Reanalysis of variation

Irregular variation in a language, such as that found with the verb *be* or the inflection of present-tense verbs in English, can often be the subject of reanalysis in extraterritorial varieties. Two examples can be cited here to illustrate what is meant. The first concerns the inflection of auxiliary verbs. These, like all others, show -s only on the third person singular (in those varieties which do not have the so-called Northern Subject Rule, Ihalainen 1994). This inflection is unusual in that it is irregular across the present-tense paradigm and does not apply to other tenses. In certain forms of English, such as south-east Irish English, and by extension, forms of English on Newfoundland deriving from this source (Clarke 1997), the variation between inflection and none has been reanalysed as a function of the status of the verb in question. Auxiliary verbs do not show inflection, e.g. *He have used all the money up*, but lexical verbs do, e.g. *He has a new job at the factory*. The distinction between lexical and auxiliary forms of the verb is not always crucial, however. In Appalachian English (Montgomery 1997), and in the South in general, variation of some vintage is found (Ellis 1994) but not determined by verb status.

Another example concerns the irregular forms of *be* in the past (see Tagliamonte 1998). In many vernacular varieties past *be* is regularized to *was*, as in *We was home* or *You wasn’t there*. But in the remnant communities of the Outer Banks of North Carolina a different pattern is found in which past *be* is levelled to *was* in the positive, e.g. *We was home*, but to *weren’t* in the negative, e.g. *You weren’t there*. As Wolfram and Thomas (2002: 69) state: ‘The Mid-Atlantic coastal pattern represents a significant morphological restructuring, or remorphologization, of the two past *be* stems’.

4.5 Refunctionalisation

At any point in time a variety is likely to contain at least some elements which are afunctional (as a left-over from former historical stages, Lass 1990). A case which illustrates this is provided by English in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries where the use of *do* as an emphatic in present-tense declarative sentences (as in *I do like*
linguistics) was not yet definitely established, less in the west of England, which was a common source of settlers in Ireland, than in the east. Thus a syntactic structure was available in early modern Irish English which in itself was still in the process of becoming identified with a specific function. What would appear to have happened is that those Irish speakers who were in the process of transferring to English, through a process of untutored second language learning as adults, took the still afunctional *do* of declarative sentences and refunctionalised it as a means of expressing habitual aspect as seen in sentences like *They do be out fishing often* or *She does come over to our place after dark*. The fact that the trade-off with such refunctionalisation was minimal, in terms of disruption of syntax, probably facilitated the process.

4.6 Disappearance of features

There are some features from varieties in Britain and Ireland which never surface at overseas locations. A case in point is the short high back vowel [u] in the STRUT lexical set. It is well known that northern forms of British English (but not Scottish English) only have one vowel in the STRUT and FOOT lexical sets (Beal 2004), the split into [ʌ] and [u] having occurred in the south of England, first in the mid-seventeenth century.

There are no overseas varieties without the STRUT – FOOT split. This means that the speech of northern English settlers, especially to Southern Hemisphere locations, left no trace on forms of English there. One reason for this could be the high salience of the generalised [u] of northern England. For non-northerners, this vowel is only found in a small set of lexicalised examples, after labials, e.g. *bush, pull, foot*, before /l/, sometimes preceded by [ʃ], e.g. *could, should* and in cases of a shortened long [u:], e.g. *took, book*. The unconditional use of [u] would have been a clear dialect marker in early settler societies and the children of speakers with this feature would have been likely to avoid it in locations, such as South Africa or New Zealand, where a southern English pronunciation model, in which only lexicalised [u] occurred, was dominant.

5 Models for the development of new varieties

The development of different settler Englishes has spawned models of how this probably took place. Peter Trudgill’s New Dialect Formation model and Edgar Schneider’s Dynamic Model merit particular mention in this context.

5.1 New dialect formation

‘New Dialect Formation’ refers to situations in which dialects blend to yield a new output (Trudgill 1986, 2004; Schneider this volume). Some anglophone locations have yielded more insights in this sphere than others, New Zealand being the object of special interest (Britain 2008) because it is the latest major variety of English to become established and because a fortuitous find of earlier recordings (incorporated into the ONZE project, Gordon et al. 2004, Gordon, Maclagan and Hay 2009) has provided data from the second generation of settlers in this country, a situation which is not available for any other anglophone country with a settler population. However, the work on New Dialect Formation overseas has been supplemented by investigations of
dialect contact in England, particularly by David Britain in his work on English in the Fens on the North Sea coast (Britain 2005, Britain and Trudgill 2005).

The input dialects of New Zealand are well-known, the chief components being south-east English, Scottish and Irish English which at their peak in the 1870s had a distribution of approximately 50 : 22 : 20 for the English, Scottish and Irish sectors respectively (see Hickey 2003 for a detailed discussion). Trudgill and his colleagues have postulated that a number of general factors have determined which of the possible inputs from the three main groups became dominant and eventually survived in later New Zealand English. In the process of new dialect formation Trudgill and his associates assume the following

Table 2  
Factors and processes in New Dialect Formation (Trudgill et al. 2000)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speakers select most variants of their preceding generation, if there is no identifiable peer group variety (as was the case with second generation New Zealand English speakers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unmarked forms survive even if they are minority forms: /a/ over /i/ in unstressed syllables as in English trusted with [a].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Avoidance of homophony in a contact situation is a significant factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importantly, if factors (2) and (3) do not apply then Trudgill et al. argue that the numerically most significant variant will survive. This process is assumed to work as follows for single (related) features: if feature $X_1$ is found with more of the (combined) population than feature $X_2$, then $X_1$ will survive and $X_2$ will disappear; hypothetical percentage relationships would be 60:40; 75:25; 90:10. Examples of features would be (i) [ʌ] in the STRUT lexical set for $X_1$ and [u] for $X_2$, (ii) h-dropping for $X_1$ and h-maintenance for $X_2$.

Factors (2) and (3) are really caveats applying where (1) does not hold. But they do not always work. (3) did not apply to the loss of syllable-final /r/ which led to considerable homophony in New Zealand English of the kind known already from RP in England. With factor (2) the difficulty frequently arises of finding objective criteria for determining when a form is unmarked; the arguments here can very quickly become circular.

Trudgill’s quantitative approach has been criticised as mechanistic and insensitive to the relative social position of the speakers. Other views on New Dialect Formation do see sociolinguistic factors as relevant, especially in the later stages (Hickey 2003). The arguments for and against these positions are outlined in the discussions in volume 37.2 of Language in Society.

If the quantitative argument were correct then minority variants should in general not survive. But there are clear instances where this has happened. For instance, Australian English has maintained negative epistemic must, as in He mustn’t be Scottish, although this was a minority Irish feature in early varieties: not more than 30% of the founder population could have had it. Factor (2) does not hold entirely either. Again in (vernacular) Australian English, an apico-alveolar fricative realisation of /t/ is found in positions of high sonority, e.g. word-finally and pre-pausally as in cat [kæt], put [put]. This fricative is marked compared to [t], i.e. it is rare cross-linguistically, but happens to be present in Irish English.

Yet another difficulty with the quantitative argument is that it assumes a uniform dialect mixture in order for the percentage explanation for feature survival to work. But
there was obvious clustering of dialect groups in early New Zealand. Apart from the Scottish presence in Otago/Southland, the Irish were predominant in rural areas, such as Westland on the South Island, but the English had the highest concentrations in the cities (New Zealand History Online). The ONZE project which formed the basis for Trudgill et al.’s analysis did not provide complete coverage of the country as Gordon, Maclagan and Hay (2009: 84) readily acknowledge.

There are many reasons why New Zealand English resembles varieties from the South-East of England. First, the English outnumbered the Scottish and Irish each by a factor of more than 2 to 1. Second, the South-East varieties were reinforced by input via Australia, also South-Eastern in character. Third, New Zealand was a British crown colony so that the children of settler generations (above all in towns and cities) would have gravitated towards the model of English pronunciation corresponding most closely to the prestige forms of British English. This means that the social standing of South-East English settlers in New Zealand must be taken into account in determining which dialect input was favoured in the genesis of the specifically New Zealand variety of English. This can be shown by the presence of *h*-dropping – a vernacular South-Eastern English feature – in late nineteenth-century New Zealand. In her investigation of early New Zealand English, Elizabeth Gordon has shown that there was a re-instatement of word-initial *h*- due to pressure from schools which sought to ‘correct’ this fault in pronunciation (Gordon 2012: 320).

5.2 Schneider’s Dynamic Model

A quite different approach to overseas forms of English has been presented by Edgar Schneider (Schneider 2003, 2007; this volume), labelled ‘The Dynamic Model’. This model recognises different stages in the rise of independent varieties of English overseas during the colonial period and stresses the switch from an exonormative orientation to an endonormative one in which norms internal to the country in question become the determining factor for the general usage of English.

Table 3  *The evolutionary cycle of post-colonial Englishes (Schneider 2007: 56)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Foundation</th>
<th>Cross dialectal contact; limited exposure to local languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: Exonormative stabilisation</td>
<td>Acceptance of original norm; expanding contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Nativisation</td>
<td>Sociolinguistic cleavage between innovative speakers and conservative speakers (upholding external norms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Endonormative stabilisation</td>
<td>Acceptance of local norm (as identity carrier); positive attitude to it (residual conservatism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5: Differentiation</td>
<td>Network construction (increasingly dense group-internal interactions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exonormative norms usually derive from a British pronunciation model but in one or two cases, such as the Philippines, an American model may be decisive. Furthermore, the orientation towards one of the two major models may change over time as with Jamaica where American pronunciation is gaining ground due to increased exposure to this.
Schneider’s model stresses the tension between forces of conservatism and innovation at the overseas locations and thus implicitly rejects a uniform view of the developing variety found with Trudgill and his associates. He also points to the identity function of the new variety from Phase 4 onwards. A central focus of his model is the transition from an exonormative (generally British) pronunciation and/or grammar to an endonormative one which arises via a general distancing from the colonial source.

5.3 Assessment of Trudgill and Schneider

There are certainly common factors in both Trudgill’s and Schneider’s models. Consider the following formulation of the three basic phases in the rise of settler Englishes (these phases incidentally also apply to language shift scenarios, Hickey 2007: Chapter 4).

Phase 1: Proliferation of features on an individual level
Phase 2: Feature reduction and spread throughout entire community
Phase 3: Stabilisation with focussing

First, dialect speakers come together in the first/second generation and Phase 1 applies. This is attested for New Zealand (Gordon et al. 2004) and also for Australia (Burridge 2010). It is also clear that there is a transition from Phase 1 to Phase 2. The reason for feature reduction is seen by Trudgill in the numerical relationship of all possible inputs to the later stabilised variety with majority variants winning out. Sociolinguistic interpretations of the transition from Phase 1 to Phase 2 see external factors as also playing a role. In the case of New Zealand, the fact that it had an English administration and educational system would have favoured South-Eastern British English over both Scottish and Irish English. In the Dynamic Model, Schneider sees a switch from an exonormative orientation to an endonormative one as characteristic of the transition from Phase 2 to 3. Dialect combinations in Phase 1 as well as the transition to Phase 2 are not a primary concern in his model.

From this brief assessment it can be seen that both models illuminate aspects in the rise of new varieties. In essence, Trudgill is concerned primarily with what happens to diverse inputs at new overseas locations whereas Schneider focusses on the overall relationship of embryonic varieties to the established varieties, here those of England and in a few cases of America. It is the weaning away from this external source while establishing linguistic independence, often parallel to political developments, which gives birth to endonormative varieties.

6. Conclusion

The shapes which contemporary settler Englishes show are the result of complex historical processes. The dialect inputs play a decisive role initially (Mufwene 1996), but later, dialect contact at the overseas locations takes over as the driving force. Koinéisation, the preference for one dialect, may occur as can dialect levelling between diverse inputs. Supraregionalisation, a process whereby salient vernacular features are eradicated from a general public variety may also take place (Hickey 2013). Whether one or more of these processes occur depends on both language internal and external, social factors which ultimately determine language attitudes and behaviour in the new societies.
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