Introduction

RAYMOND HICKNEY

1 The emergence of overseas varieties of English

It is probably true to say that mainly regional forms of English were taken to the colonies which England founded in the core 200-year period between the early seventeenth and the early nineteenth centuries. Those who served in the overseas settlements were very largely from the lower ranges of society, irrespective of whether one is talking of deportees in early Australia, indentured servants in the early anglophone Caribbean, emigrants and adventurers of various sorts in many other colonies, the sailors who worked on the ocean-going ships, or the 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.

The present book sees its justification in a number of aims which have been set by the editor and the contributors. The first is the attempt to bring into focus just what input varieties were probably operative in individual colonies. The second is to examine the extent to which dialect mixing and/or language contact have been responsible for the precise structure of overseas varieties in areas with multiple immigration patterns. The third aim is to attempt an evaluation of the different reasons for extraterritorial varieties having the form which they show. Dialect input is only one source of colonial English, as shown in the following list of factors determining its shape:

1. Dialect input and the survival of features from a mainland source or sources.
2. Independent developments within the overseas communities, including realignments of features in the dialect input.
3. Contact phenomena where English speakers co-existed with those of other languages.
4. An indirect influence through the educational system in those countries in which English arose without significant numbers of native-speaker settlers.

5. Creolisation in those situations where there was no linguistic continuity and where virtually the only input was a pidgin, based on English, from the preceding generation.

In the study of varieties of English, linguists have sometimes favoured one of the above explanatory factors to the exclusion of others. But even a cursory glance at the forms of English overseas shows that accounting for their structure means taking more than one factor into account and according them relative weight on the basis of considered linguistic arguments. This attitude characterises many of the contributions of the present volume which attempt to afford dialect input arguments greater weight in the discussion of the genesis of overseas varieties and so redress an imbalance which they perceive in the linguistic descriptions of the varieties they are involved in without, however, seeking to adopt an ideological standpoint in favour of dialect retention in extraterritorial forms of English.

1.1 What constitutes dialect input?

In an investigation of the nature of the present one a major concern is determining just what constitutes dialect input to extraterritorial varieties. A simple starting point would be to contrast unusual features in these varieties with those attested in present-day British dialects and simultaneously consider whether there is historical continuity between the area in Britain where a feature or features exist and the overseas site at which these seem to reappear. This task is not as easy as might be imagined. Even in an area like Newfoundland (Clarke, this volume) which was for a considerable time isolated from the rest of the anglophone world and which has only two dialect input sources – South-East Irish English and South-West British English – the matter is far from decided as there was interaction between the two mentioned areas in the British Isles (Hickey 2002a). Furthermore, one finds dialect spread across communities overseas. Indeed there may well have been internal migration in an overseas region, such as the Caribbean, which opens up the possibility of features diffusing there, for instance it is conceivable that features of Irish English spread outward from Barbados (and Montserrat) when speakers from here shifted to different parts of the Caribbean, travelling as far as the south-east coast of the United States (Montgomery 2001: 129).

Another approach in determining what features may have existed in English formerly and been transported overseas involves the examination of historical documents. Here one can avail oneself of the many more or less prescriptive commentaries on English from the early modern period – going back to the sixteenth century – and comb through them for mention of features not part of present-day standard British English but attested overseas. Such sources range from occasional comments in travel literature (such as those by Fynes Morison
for Ireland in his *Itinerary* of 1617–26; see Hughes 1903) to whole glossaries of provincialisms (cf. collections of words from the dialect of Forth and Bargy by Vallancey and Poole; see Dolan and Ó Muirithe 1996). Two other significant sources are (1) more or less genuine representations of rural speech in fictional literature and (2) more pointed caricature of accent such as the satirical treatments of Irish English in Restoration drama (Bliss 1979).

Of greater value are dedicated works on English pronunciation and grammar. For instance, for Ireland, Thomas Sheridan’s *Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language* (1781) is an important guide to pronunciation in Dublin in the late eighteenth century. Here he admonishes ‘the well-educated natives of Ireland’ for various traits of speech which he regards as nonstandard (Sheridan 1781: 146). By these means a glimpse of contemporary usage is gained. Similar prescriptive works exist for speech in Britain for the entire early modern period.

Among the other sources of data being utilised by linguists of late are emigrant letters. These are documents written usually by individuals without too much education and hence without overt conceptions of correct English. They often provide glimpses of what the speech of emigrants was like as the correspondents were in most cases individuals who had already left their country, settled overseas and were writing back to those still at home. Such emigrants’ letters have been examined by Michael Montgomery in his investigation of Ulster Scots influence on early American English (Montgomery 1995, 1997a) and similar collections of letters have been used when examining Irish English in the south of Ireland by Markku Filppula (Filppula 1999) and the present author (eighteenth-century letters illustrating southern Irish English of that period). In addition to this there is a study of regional British English as attested in emigrants’ letters; see Bermejo-Giner and Montgomery (1997).

In the nineteenth century there are a number of studies which were written as a consequence of the rise of linguistics as an academic discipline. Such works are frequently diachronic in nature and offer insights into conservative speech in Britain which may well have been taken overseas to the colonies. A notable instance of such a source is the comprehensive work on English pronunciation by Ellis (5 vols. 1868–9) and of course the invaluable dialect grammar and dictionary by Wright (1905).

### 1.2 The relative value of dialect features

When considering possible British/Irish sources for overseas varieties one must not be misled by similarities which are so common that they are of little value. There is a general principle that the more widespread a feature the less it is indicative of a connection between homeland and colony. An apt example of this is diphthong flattening (Wells 1982: 149f.), by which is meant that the movement of the tongue at the end of the rising diphthongs /ai/ and /au/ is much reduced, if not entirely absent, hence one has pronunciations like *wife* [waːf] and *house* [haːs]. This phenomenon is very common indeed; 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 instances are final cluster simplification, particularly postsonorant deletion, as in mend /mɛn/ and the alveolarisation of /ŋ/ in unstressed syllables, typically in the progressive form of verbs, e.g. talking /tɔːkn/ or the assimilation of sibilants to nasals as in wasn’t [wɒzn] → [wɒdn], 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.

The opposite case, so to speak, is represented by camouflaged forms which are dialectally significant but often difficult to recognise as they show a surface similarity to constructions found in more standard varieties of English but are used differently. Two examples can be taken to illustrate this. In African American English come with V-<ing, as in She come acting like she was real mad, looks like a normal case of the verb of motion but this is in fact a special use as a kind of auxiliary verb indicating indignation on the part of the speaker (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998: 173; Spears 1982). The second instance, from Irish English, is the use of never to mark the past as in She never called us which does not have the meaning ‘She did not call us on any occasion’ but refers to a particular occasion which is obvious if a specification of time is added (optionally): She never called us that evening (common in northern England and in Scotland as well).

Dialect features are characterised not only by presence or absence but by relative frequency. The consideration of frequency has led to many insights in recent years, especially on the level of syntax. For instance, in their study of relatives, Tottie and Rey (1997) and Tottie and Harvie (2000) 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 unsimilar to that of Middle Scots examined by Romaine (1982).

Furthermore, early attestations of overseas varieties can be illuminating in this context. Howe (1997: 267ff.) maintains that earlier African American English (as incorporated in the ex-slave recordings collected in Bailey et al. 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.

1.3 Internal ranking in dialects

Dialect features show internal ranking, that is, not all features are of equal significance for the status of the dialect. Some are group-exclusive, i.e. a community of speakers uses a variant which is not found in adjacent communities. Within a community dialect features can of course be unevenly distributed. In general, those associated with sections of the community far removed from the standard are taken as highly indicative of that community in that they contribute significantly to its unique profile.
Furthermore, an implicational relation may hold in a dialect too, that is, the presence of one feature may imply the presence of another much as with implicational universals in phonology such as voiced stops implying voiceless stops in any given language. For instance, if a speaker of Irish English has the habitual aspect as in *She does be home of a Saturday*, then he/she is certain to have the immediate and resultative perfectives as in *She’s after eating the cake* and *She has the book read*, respectively.

Features which show implicational relations are usually those which are markers in the sociolinguistic sense, i.e. they tend to disappear from speakers’ speech on style shifting upwards. As such they tend to play a role in perceptual dialectology (how speakers themselves see a dialect) and surface in linguistic stereotypes (Hickey 2000a).

1.4 Linguistic constraints on variability

The use of features in a dialect may be subject to constraints on variability. On the one hand there are independent constraints which are traceable to some extralinguistic factor, ultimately of social origin. But there are also 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 au t] or the nonoccurrence of diphthong lowering before voiceless segments in Canadian English (*tight* is [tait] and not [taɪt] although *tide* is [taɪd]). The instance of final cluster reduction just quoted provides a good example of this kind of variability (see Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (1998: 249–56) for a detailed discussion of this in American English). In the history of English one can see that sequences of bilabial nasal and voiced stop have not existed for centuries, i.e. *comb* is pronounced without the final /-b/ (Jespersen 1909: 216). 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-western forms of British English; see Upton and Widdowson 1996: 34f.). Deletion after velar nasals is not always the case word-internally, contrast *singer* [−ŋ] with longer [−ŋɡ−]. However, the cases which are linguistically interesting from the point of view of present-day varieties are those where an alveolar nasal is followed by a voiced stop. Here the stops are 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.

1.5 Dialect survival

There is a characteristic topography which goes with dialect survival overseas. 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 kind of situation as is the Ozark Mountains region. 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. 176ff.). 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; this volume). Features in such areas tend to be retained which are not necessarily characteristic of the country they are part of. For instance, rhoticism – the Southland ‘burr’ – in the Otago region of the South Island of New Zealand is not typical of the rest of the country. Such locations exist in the contemporary anglophone world and may have existed historically, but have since disappeared, e.g the baronies of Forth and Bargy in the extreme south-east of Ireland (Hickey 1988).

1.6 Dialect diaspora

Movement away from one area to a smaller, more remote one is what one can term ‘dialect diaspora’. 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,1 are not found here. The conclusion which can be drawn is that this phonetic feature is a recent phenomenon, postdating 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: 206–8).

There are other African American diasporas, notably on Samaná peninsula in the Dominican Republic and in Nova Scotia (Poplack 2000: 4–10; Poplack and Tagliamonte 2001: 10–38; 39–68). Data from these locations form a central object of investigation in the chapter by Poplack and Tagliamonte, this volume. The return to West Africa by African Americans in the newly founded state of Liberia in the nineteenth century (it was proclaimed a republic in 1847) has been investigated by John Singler along with the development of African American

1 The term ‘lexical set’ refers to a group of words which all contain a specific sound, irrespective of how this is pronounced in a certain variety. Hence the price lexical set refers to all words which show /ai/ in standard English which may of course be pronounced differently in various varieties of English. The lexical sets first proposed by Wells (1982) are listed in appendix 1 ‘Checklist of nonstandard features’ in the present volume.

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 and New York, and one which involved those who took a midwestern route up into St Louis, Chicago and 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.

1.7 Ebb and flow

When viewing dialect survival in the context of the current book, a number of caveats are called for. Perhaps the most important involves what the present author in another context has called ebb and flow (see Hickey 2002b). By this is meant that certain features which appear to be historical continuities in a remnant area may well not represent a straight line of development from the earliest days of the dialect. An instance (from Britain) which shows this clearly is velarised /l/ in syllable codas. This existed in Old English and was responsible for the breaking of vowels as in West Saxon called ‘old’ /æəld/. Syllable-final velarisation continued into Middle English and led to vocalisation of the lateral, something which is still obvious from the spelling of such words as talk or walk in present-day English which retain the /l/ in writing. But the velarisation of /l/ in popular London English, cf. milk [mɪlk], would appear to be a recent phenomenon which was not common in the nineteenth century. The explanation for this would seem to lie in the pendulum movement among speakers’ preference for a velarised /l/ in their speech. A swing of the pendulum in favour of this realisation can be seen in present-day Southern Irish English where pronunciations like field [ﬁːl] are becoming increasingly common (as attested amply in the recordings for A Sound Atlas of Irish English), although traditionally Irish English has been known for an alveolar /l/ in all syllable positions (Hickey 1986a).

There are various motivations for the phenomenon of ebb and flow. It may occur between generations of speakers and, if general across a broad section of the population, it may become established in the speech community. It may also be the result of dissociation between groups in a society where the preference of a feature by one group may lead to its being avoided by another (Hickey 2000b).

1.8 False leads

Another caveat concerns features which seem to have a single identifiable source. The clarity of such cases often masks other sources which might be considered.
A case in point is *a*-prefixing as in *They were out a-playing on the strand*. Some authors have pointed to parallels in Irish and Scottish Gaelic (Majewicz 1984) in which there is a structural parallel; consider the Irish rendering of the English sentence just given: *Bhí siad amuigh ag imirt ar an trá* [was they out at playing on the strand]. But this obvious parallel would appear to be coincidental. The structure *a*-V- *ing* is well attested in British English during the colonial period, deriving historically from *on V- *ing* with phonetic reduction of the preposition *on* much as in *asleep* from an earlier *on sleep*. This may well be the source for those varieties of American English which show this structure as Montgomery (2000), who is sceptical of the Celtic origin, rightly points out. In addition, such text collections as *A Corpus of Irish English* (Hickey 2003c) has only a very few attestations in the many historical texts for Irish English which it contains.

### 1.9 The likelihood of 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. The epenthetic vowel in question is a shwa in words with final /-lm/ clusters, i.e. with heavy codas consisting of more than one nonhomorganic sonorant, hence *film* is typically [fɪləm]. 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 only about 1 per cent, 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 1986b) 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, of course – would suggest its appearance in South African English is the result of an areal spread from the former language, given the close contact between Afrikaans and English in South Africa.

### 1.10 ‘Colonial lag’

Historically, commentators on varieties of English outside Britain tend to highlight their conservative nature. For the dialect of Forth and Bargy, mentioned above, there are remarks from as far back as 1577 by Richard Stanyhurst on the similarity between that variety and Chaucerian English which for Stanyhurst would have been a vague reference to an antique form of English (Miller and Power 1979). Latter-day writers refer to the language of the Elizabethan era or to that of Shakespeare and frequently claim that dialects tend to maintain this still (there are many such references to Irish English, for example, and to Appalachian English; Montgomery 1998, 2001: 107–9). Precisely what such labels mean is
frequently not 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’ (Görłach 1987).

But a closer look at allegedly conservative dialects reveals that they are not simply preserved versions of earlier forms of the language on the mainland but have themselves gone through processes of their own. Such processes can be inherited, i.e. overseas varieties continue processes initiated at their historical source (Branford 1994: 477). This is clearly the case with the raising of short front vowels in varieties of English in the southern hemisphere. Furthermore, varieties at new locations obviously undergo independent developments which may be triggered by language/dialect contact or result from internal motivation within the language or triggered by the new society using it. In addition, the specific nature of an overseas variety may rest substantially on dialect mixture, given settlers from different regions. In such cases the attention of linguists has rested on the nature of the mixture and the results it engendered; see the contribution by Gordon and Trudgill in the present volume.

1.11 Distributional patterning

Recent literature on varieties of English has concentrated on elements which were inherited by forms of the language which arose at new locations. Ongoing changes, such as the raising of short vowels just alluded to or the lowering and retraction of diphthongs, also to be found in the anglophone southern hemisphere, are just two examples of features inherited by varieties arising overseas. Another aspect of this complex is whether the realisations and rules are categorical or variable in their application. Furthermore, there may be hierarchies of constraints which are to be found with realisations and these may reflect the situation in the source dialect, indeed such hierarchies may be the clearest indication that a certain dialect is the source for another, as Poplack and Tagliamonte have shown conclusively in their work on this subject (see Poplack and Tagliamonte, this volume, and the contributions in Poplack 2000).

1.12 The neglect of distinctions

Finally, one can mention that the neglect of distinctions, present in more standard forms of English, can be characteristic of a particular variety. A clear example of what is intended here is provided by the use of the so-called ‘extended present’ of Irish English (Filppula 1997). By this is meant the use of a present form of a verb to encompass an action which stretches back into the past. In such cases, for instance in sentences with the temporal adverbial since, e.g. *He has been here since we moved to Dublin*, English requires the present perfect. However, Irish English only uses the present and so neglects the tense distinction found in standard English, e.g. *We’re living here for ten years now*. A significant source for this usage
in Ireland (it is also found in Scotland) may well be Irish where an equivalent to the present perfect of English does not exist.

1.13 Folk dialectology

The last topic to mention in this section is what has come to be known as *folk dialectology*. By this is meant examining how nonlinguists conceive of dialect distinctions and dialect areas. Preston (1993a: 338–44) gives an analysis of 138 south-eastern Michigan respondents’ outlines of the dialect area ‘southern’ in the United States. The broad view was generally correct but it covered a large area, much greater than what linguists would regard as ‘southern’. The respondents differed according to class affiliation and age. Both younger and lower-middle-class respondents regarded ‘southern’ as covering a larger area than did older and upper-middle-class respondents. Preston (1993a: 344–56) also conducted investigations into what nonlinguists viewed as areas of ‘correct’ speech and of ‘pleasant’ speech.

The value of such investigations lies in the information it gives us about speakers’ attitudes to varieties other than their own. This in turn can help in accounting for such sociolinguistic movements as accommodation (Trudgill 1986) and dissociation (Hickey 2000b) and ultimately assist linguists in explaining externally motivated language change.

2 The spread of English

The dissemination of English beyond the island of Britain has a history which is over 800 years old, beginning with Ireland in the late twelfth century. The early settlement of Ireland by the English has largely been a matter of internal concern for scholars engaged in Irish English but it is of interest here because it is the earliest example of language mixture involving transported English and the insights gained here are of relevance to the examination of later instances of English at overseas locations. The situation of imported English to Ireland in the late twelfth century (from west Wales) provides information about the planting of English into a multicultural context in which Norman French was the superstrate and Irish the substrate of the host country (Hickey 1997a; this volume: chapter 3).

For the establishment of forms of English outside Europe the early settlement of Ireland is also of considerable significance. In many instances the route for English across to the New World was out of Ireland rather than directly from England. This began with the deportation of politically undesirable Irish to Barbados in the early 1650s, continued with the departure of religious dissenters from Ulster to North America, chiefly Pennsylvania, throughout the eighteenth century and also involved the seasonal migration of Irish to Newfoundland on the eastern coast of Canada up until the first decades of the nineteenth century (Hickey 2002a). In numerical terms the major Irish exodus was in the middle of
the nineteenth century with large-scale emigration to the eastern United States. Each of these situations resulted in different kinds of linguistic influence in the host regions and are dealt with in the relevant contributions in this volume. Furthermore, the transit route taken by immigrants is of significance. For instance, many of the Irish travelling to the New World used Canada as a point of entry and passed through the Ottawa Valley on their way to the United States (Charbonneau 1997; O’Gallagher 1984).

Direct emigration from England has been a continuous feature from the seventeenth century onwards, chiefly to North America and the Caribbean in the early stages. The main port for both trade with and emigration to the New World was Bristol (McGrath 1978) 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 centuries 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 (Lass, this volume). Naturally 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. The latter derives from the mixed London/Home Counties dialects of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. For instance, all the three countries just mentioned show a raising of short vowels which is not typical 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 /æː/ 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 (see Kiesling, this volume).

2.1 The social setting overseas

The situation in which the settlers from the British Isles found themselves overseas varied considerably. 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: 137–68) 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: 280–355).
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 deprivation 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, who would naturally have had higher social status, meant that the influence of the Irish on incipient varieties of English there was correspondingly reduced (see Kiesling, this volume).

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. 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 Patterns of settlement

It is known from immigration patterns in other parts of the anglophone world, such as the eastern United States or Newfoundland (Mannion 1974), both in the eighteenth century and later in the United States in the nineteenth century, that immigrants from specific backgrounds clustered in certain areas. The most obvious reason for this is that those who went first, passed the message about where they had settled back to those in the area they came from. Others then followed on, going to the same area at the overseas location. In the case of the recruitment of emigrants the same would have applied: the recruiters in the homeland would have had contacts to specific points in the overseas locations. If one assumes that this was the case for countries like New Zealand in the nineteenth century as well, then one can assume local proportions for the major regions of Britain, depending on initial settlement patterns. An obvious case of this is the Otago and Southland regions of the South Island, where many Scottish settled (Trudgill, Gordon, Lewis and Maclagan 2000: 305), or the Hawkes Bay region where there was a high concentration of Irish (Hickey 2003b). Certain tensions between regional groups from the British Isles would have furthered this clustering, for instance the Protestant Scottish and the Catholic Irish congregated in different parts of New Zealand. Segregation along confessional lines is largely true of Newfoundland as well, certainly of the outlying areas away from the Avalon Peninsula and its centre St John’s (Clarke, this volume).
2.3 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. Neither the early settlement of Newfoundland by Irish and West Country immigrants nor the later settlement of Nova Scotia led 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: 20–2), 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; Lass 1987: 302). 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.

2.4 The formative years of a variety

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 greatest 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 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 input during the eighteenth century was considerable in the United States Midland (Montgomery this volume), but that of the much
larger number of southern Irish immigrants during the nineteenth century was significantly less, because distinct forms of American English in the regions into which the Irish emigrated (chiefly the north-east) had already attained their linguistic profile.

It should be noted that the founder principle only applies in situations where there is a continuity from initial input dialects to later forms of English at a given location. This excludes it from sites such as Ireland or KwaZulu-Natal where language shift occurred with the population imposing features of their native language on the target language English at these locations.

The question of speaker quantity in the formative years of a variety also needs to be considered. There are locations where very small numbers of speakers of a variety were present and where, despite the social standing of such speakers, no discernible influence can be recognised on later varieties. For instance, Irish missionaries were operative in various parts of Africa (Schmied 1991; see Mesthrie 1992: 21 on South Africa) throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but their numbers were too small to have left an imprint on English in the regions they were working in. Occasionally on an individual level, speakers from overseas locations may show, at least passively, knowledge of regional features of British English due to school teaching by such regional speakers (for instance, Singapore where there are schools run by Irish religious orders).

2.5 Dialects and standards

With the change in status from colony to independent state new standards arose, which in turn stand in a certain relationship to that 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, particularly after the Second World War, the influence of the supraregional variety of American English has increased considerably in areas contiguous with the United States, such as the Caribbean or Canada which has reoriented 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, labelled ‘Canadian Raising’ by Chambers (1973).

Other former colonies still ascribe a certain status to Received Pronunciation (RP). In the sense of Trudgill and Chambers (1998) their varieties are to a significant degree heteronomous to the British standard. This applies above all to the colonies anglicised fairly recently, such as those in the southern hemisphere.

The position in Ireland is quite unique in the anglophone context, and the only comparison it allows is with Scotland (Macafee, this volume). There is no codified
norm of Irish English, either north or south, and the types of English spoken in the two main areas of the island differ significantly from each other. Equally there is no emulation of RP, if one neglects a small section of the northern Protestant community. The ceiling in terms of standardness is determined by supraregional forms of English which are devoid of salient Irish features. For instance, in the south, the supraregional variety does not tolerate the morphologically transparent second-person-plural pronoun *youse* ← *you* + {S} but it does allow the inherited historical form *ye* with the same meaning. Moving downwards on a sociostylistic scale, one notices an increasing use of specifically dialectal features which are part of a style-shifting manoeuvre and which adds local flavouring to one’s speech, a vernacularisation strategy, so to speak. Examples of this would be using /e:/ for /i:/ in certain keywords whose stressed vowels derive from ME /ɛ:/ such as *leave*, *tea* or employing *do + be* to express habitual aspect as in *She does be tired in the evening*. Of course, the position of such features has nothing to do with their possible origin in dialect input to Ireland but with their status as markers of localness in the speech of the Irish. However, their existence can serve as a means of discovering what features of a dialect were formerly characteristic before supraregionalisation set in.

3 Scenarios for dialect development

3.1 Contact with other groups

It must be borne in mind that increasing contact does not necessarily entail increasing assimilation (whether linguistic or cultural) among groups. Andersen (1988) points out that it is not uncommon for communities that are becoming more open in terms of increasing contacts with the outside world to remain attitudinally (and linguistically) closed. Nor is it unusual for relatively closed communities to be attitudinally open, adopting the cultural and linguistic innovations that happen to come their way. Andersen maintains that a distinction can be drawn between *open* vs. *closed* communities and *endocentric* vs. *exocentric* ones (Andersen 1988: 74f.), with the former distinction referring to levels of contact with the outside world and the latter to the degree to which the community is focused on its own internal norms vs. outside norms. In addition, increasing levels of contact may actually serve to sharpen dividing lines among groups, as residents of formerly closed communities set up psychological (and, often, linguistic) barriers against the encroachment of the outside world. In the words of Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (this volume): ‘Community attitudes, in the final analysis, may play a far greater role in guiding the directionality of change in interdialect contact than levels of contact.’

3.1.1 Diffusion among dialects. Changes among dialects at new locations do not just concern the relationship to a possible standard. Many innovations are internal to nonstandard varieties and may involve interchange between sets of such
varieties. This applies both to changes from within, i.e. motivated by some aspect of the linguistic system, and those from outside with their roots in the attitudes in the community of speakers.

The spatial spread of innovations can take a number of distinct forms. It is necessary to distinguish at least three types (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998: 142–8). Contagious diffusion is the simplest of the three and refers to the spread of dialect forms which follows a straightforward time and distance relation. Cascade diffusion is one which is increasingly common, given the concentration of populations in urban centres, and consists of change proceeding strictly from larger cities to smaller ones. Contrahierarchial diffusion is seen occasionally where linguistic markers of a region diffuse over a wider area with these forms taking root and spreading, effectively reversing the usual direction of linguistic diffusion. All three types may be present in one area, as in Oklahoma which has cascade diffusion of the [ɔ] to [a] merger, contrahierarchial diffusion in the spread of *fixin’* to (see Schneider, this volume) and contagious diffusion for the merger of [ı] and [ɛ].

The diffusion of nonstandard features over a region is also attested in mainland Britain. For a recent discussion of the spread of glottalisation, see Milroy, Milroy and Hartley (1994).

3.1.2 Dissociation from other groups. In the discussion of varieties of English considerable attention has been given to the accommodation of social groups to one another (Trudgill 1986) and this is taken to have been, and still be, a powerful force in language change. The notion of dissociation is diametrically opposed to accommodation, i.e. the approximation of individuals to the speech of their interlocutors. In both accommodation and dissociation one is dealing with an alteration in the speech of a community in contact with another; the issue which separates them is that of direction (there would not appear to be a definite predisposition towards unidirectionality as there is with language-internal developmental clines such as grammaticalisation). Furthermore, the phenomenon of dissociation is generally attested socially, for instance in dress, food, leisure-time activities or area of residence, just to mention a few typical parameters of social variation. If one assumes that sociolinguistic behaviour correlates with nonlinguistic social behaviour then the existence of dissociation in other social spheres outside language gives support to the assumption of its existence on a linguistic level, i.e. support to the notion of a movement away from one’s interlocutors on the level of language.

Although the phenomenon is conceded by linguists (Giles 2001: 195f.), it has not been the object of an equal amount of study as accommodation. Synchronic cases where it can be observed have been recorded by the present author (Hickey 2000b), in particular with reference to current changes in the English of Dublin. More attention to this phenomenon in the study of transported dialects may lead to insights hitherto concealed by the neglect of this issue.
3.1.3 Dialect mixing. Apart from the scenario of convergence between creole and dialect or between contact language and dialect, there are obviously situations in which the input at an overseas location consisted of several dialects. Such contexts can safely be assumed to underlie the early settlement of the United States or Australia, for instance, because historical records point to the mixing of settlers from differing regions of the British Isles (see Kytö, this volume, on early North America) and furthermore documents also attest to the existence of divergent accents in the early period of settlement. The assumption would thus seem valid that a process of dialect mixing operated in such historical contexts, yielding a particular output depending on the nature of the input forms and their relative weight, in both a quantitative and social sense.

Below, some typical scenarios are sketched which can be taken to have applied in the development of English overseas. The input forms may have originally co-existed, i.e. may have been present among the first settlers, or may represent cases of later imposition of a supraregional variety which interacted with more local forms of language in a region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input forms (A + B)</th>
<th>Output form (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIALECT A</td>
<td>DIALECT B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) [a]</td>
<td>[æ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) general [-e:]</td>
<td>general [-i:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) allophones [ð, ɹ /d]</td>
<td>general [ð]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dialect with [a] may be that of a minority group in the colony and hence does not influence the output form, e.g. northern English settlers in South Africa.

This situation could be one where there is a supraregional variety influencing a local dialect as with the supplanting of [e:] pronunciations in Ireland with words of the meat lexical class.

This scenario involves a stigmatisation of input from one of the dialects, probably reflecting it status in the particular social environment. This may have held in New York City with the plosive realisation in words of the this lexical set being relegated to nonprestigious varieties. Irish immigrants in the nineteenth century may have been a partial source of this plosivisation though in New York it is generally confined to voiced obstruents.

In the present volume the precise nature of dialect mixing is to be examined, i.e. what elements of input accents are filtered out on demographic mixing and whether processes such as analogical levelling and allophonic regularisation can be observed to have taken place (see in particular the contribution by Gordon and Trudgill). Special attention is paid to any discernible reallocation whereby variants in dialectal input have been assigned sociolinguistic significance thus
moulding a resultant form in which social differentiation at the new overseas location is given linguistic expression.

3.1.4 New-dialect formation. The heading for the present section is derived from a label which has been increasingly used in recent years to refer to situations in which a mixture of dialects blend to yield a new output at an overseas location. Given that general formulation, one could regard the development of virtually any extraterritorial variety of English as one of new-dialect formation. However, the term is applied in particular to situations in which there is clear knowledge of the initial mixture of inputs. In the context of overseas forms of English, this effectively refers to the varieties found in the southern hemisphere which show a maximum time depth of about 200 years.

The most recent major variety of the anglophone southern hemisphere is New Zealand English which essentially arose in the second half of the nineteenth century. Due to fortuitous recordings made in the 1940s, a number of tone documents of speakers born well before 1900 are now available (Gordon and Trudgill, this volume) and these have allowed linguists to study the development of New Zealand English from the second generation onwards.

The input dialects of New Zealand are well known, the chief components being south-eastern English, Scottish and Irish English which at their peak in the 1870s had a distribution of approximately 20 : 22 : 50 for the Irish, Scottish and English sectors respectively (see Hickey 2003b for a detailed discussion). Because of the knowledge of this early stage of New Zealand English researchers have been able to investigate the seminal period in the development of this variety. In their analysis of its genesis, Elizabeth Gordon and Peter Trudgill have postulated that a number of general factors have been instrumental in determining which of the possible inputs from the three main ethnic groups in early anglophone New Zealand became dominant and eventually survived in the later variety. In the process of new-dialect formation Trudgill, Gordon and their associates (Trudgill, Gordon, Lewis and Maclagan 2000) postulate the following factors/processes.

1. 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).
2. Unmarked forms survive even if they are minority forms: /ə/ over /ɪ/ in unstressed syllables as in English trusted with [ə].
3. Avoidance of homophony in a contact situation is a significant factor.

If factors 2 and 3 do not apply, then Trudgill et al. argue that the numerically more significant variant will survive in the new-dialect formation process. The last point could be labelled ‘the quantitative argument in new-dialect formation’ and has been criticised from a number of angles, not least because it is purely mechanistic and does not take the relative social position of the speakers into account (Hickey 2003b). Furthermore, factor 3 does not appear to have operated during 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.

In their recent monograph on New Zealand English, Gordon et al. (2004)
stress that they believe in multiple causation and multiple factors and con-
clude that the reason New Zealand English resembles varieties from the south-
east of England is because (a) the first immigrants were from there in large
numbers, (b) the south-eastern varieties were reinforced by an influence from
Australia, also south-eastern in character, and (c) later immigrants came from
the south-east of England in very great numbers. In general they maintain that
the social standing of south-eastern English emigrants to 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.

3.1.5 Shared innovations or common developments. The discussion of southern
hemisphere English touches on an issue which has been the subject of consider-
able debate among linguists in recent years, namely whether certain features in
extraterritorial varieties represent shared innovations among varieties or devel-
opments of a common historical input. A clear case to illuminate this discussion
is presented by short front vowels in South African, Australian and New Zealand
English (Lass, this volume; Gordon and Trudgill, this volume). In all three major
varieties of southern hemisphere English these vowels are raised when compared
to varieties in North America (excluding the recent Northern Cities Shift, Labov
1994) and in Britain, e.g. *bad* [ɛ], *bed* [be ʌ.d], *bid* [bɪd] or [bæd] (South African
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
eye early nineteenth century English and quotes Wyld (1956) who comments on this
in RP. He 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
African (after 1795 and in the 1820s respectively). He also sees the raised and
somewhat rounded realisation of the bath vowel as a parallel with colloquial
forms of London speech (Branford 1994: 480). The common ground between
scholars like Branford and Lass on the one hand and Gordon and Trudgill on the
other is that the latter assume that the raising of short vowels was a propensity in
the historical input, but not yet realised, this having taken place in New Zealand.
This is tantamount to saying that the chain shift upwards of short vowels had
already begun but not advanced very far. In Britain in the twentieth century a
reversal of the raising of the trap vowel had set in by the middle of the century
(Bauer 1985, 1994: 120f.), halting any incipient general shift upwards. Because of
the split between south-eastern British English and southern hemisphere English
in the early nineteenth century the latter was free to continue a vowel shift on a
trajectory which British English did not pursue.
3.1.6 *Internal dialect patterning.* The larger of the former colonies – the 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 in both countries.

The economic situation of former colonies is also significant for dialect patterning at new locations. For instance, the fishing industry had 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 in the last century or so (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 focusing 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.

3.1.7 *Embryonic and focused 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 focused varieties can be illuminated by case studies from this area. In the present volume there are two such studies, one of English on the Falkland Islands (Sudbury) and one of the English of Tristan da Cunha (Schreier) which show how nascent varieties are possibly moving towards clearer profiles by the preference, reallocation or dropping of input variants. In this situation the construction of local identity can be assumed to occur. An issue among linguists in variety studies is whether this largely unconscious process, which involves a whole range of social variables of which language is only one, is an epiphenomenon of the choices speakers make for purely linguistic reasons or whether the achievement of this local identity is a goal which is unconsciously pursued by speakers.

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

3.2 Language shift

A situation which demands special attention in the context of transported dialects is that of language shift (Thomason 2001) where an entire community switches from an indigenous language or languages to English. The speed at which this takes place varies. What is linguistically significant is that the members of the community learn English in an environment of uncontrolled second language acquisition. This kind of context is the nearest to that of creolisation which one can see historically in the Caribbean among the West Africans taken to this region as slaves. The main difference is that in a situation of language shift there is still access to the indigenous language, whereas with creolisation this is not the case; this in fact is a defining feature of the latter situation.

Varieties of English which have arisen from language shift situations have not been the object of very much investigation. Obviously native Americans or Australian Aborigines who switch from their native languages to English are engaged in language shift; see Malcolm (2001) on Aboriginal English. The Lumbee Indians (Dannenberg and Wolfram 1998, 1999) are a special case as they are racially mixed and because it is unclear what language or languages were spoken originally (see Wolfram and Dannenberg 1999: 183f. for a summary of current views and pp. 192–207 for grammatical features).

There are, however, more established cases of language shift which have been the object of much study. The first is Ireland, of course, which in the 800 years of English settlement has seen a switch from Irish to English (as has happened in the Scottish Highlands with Scottish Gaelic). The second is KwaZulu–Natal in South Africa where the Indian labourers, transported there in the second half of the nineteenth century, have largely switched to English in the twentieth century. As predicted by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) both Irish and South African Indian English show phonological and grammatical interference from the native languages of those involved in the shift. This particular situation has recently been labelled ‘imposition’ (Guy 1990), where in the establishment of a second language variety by speakers in a shift context, features of their first language are ‘imposed’ on the target language. At least the following two basic distinctions in shift scenarios can be made:

1. A population movement (immigration) takes place with a switch to the language of the host country within a generation or two (Indian immigrants to KwaZulu–Natal).
2. The target language is brought to a country by settlers and there is a gradual shift by the indigenous population to this imported language over many centuries. The likelihood of interference is greatest here as imperfect bilingualism lasts longest (Irish speakers shifting to English in Ireland).

3.2.1 Retention versus transfer. KwaZulu-Natal represents a situation which is outside the brief of the present volume as there is no special dialect input into South African Indian English. In Ireland the matter is somewhat different as there has been considerable input from various regions in Britain in the course of Irish history. Broadly speaking, the south-west of England was the source of English in the first period (approx. 1200–1600) and the west and north-west provided the input in the second period (1600 onwards, particularly the first two-thirds of the seventeenth century) with input from Scotland to Ulster representing a special situation within this second period.

Recent work on Irish English (e.g. Harris 1984) has tended to favour what is labelled the ‘retentionist’ standpoint by which is meant that authors see the dialects of English as the source of the specific characteristics of Irish English rather than the Irish language. However, the case for contact needs to be argued carefully to determine what it might be responsible for in Irish English. On a very obvious level one has vocabulary transfer from Irish (though not much of this). There are also more subtle cases of syntactic influence and on a still more abstract level one may have the adoption of a principle of the substrate language Irish, though the actual manifestation is different. For instance, phonetic lenition has a function in the system of Irish in that it distinguishes grammatical categories (Hickey 2003a). The actual results of lenition in Irish do not occur in Irish English but the principle of weakening consonants intervocally has led to /t/ in positions of high sonority being lenited to a fricative (Hickey 1996).

3.2.2 The convergence account. The arguments about whether features of an extraterritorial variety are solely due to contact, dialect survival, or other factors are frequently presented in absolute terms. The linguistic reality may point to a convergence of factors. This is evident in areas as different in their sociolinguistic composition as Ireland and the southern United States.

A case in point is the so-called resultative perfective in Irish English (Hickey, this volume: chapter 3). To begin with one can note that in the Irish language a perfective is indicated in a clause by the participle occurring after the object; in the West Country dialect input to Ireland this OV word order may well have existed as an archaism, given that this order was originally typical of English in general. This means that perfective sentences such as I have the book read could be a calque on Irish Tá an leabhar léite agam, lit. ‘is the book read at-me’, or it could represent a type which was common among the English speakers who came to Ireland, particularly in the first period (1200–1600).

If one considers African American English one can note that /d/ is frequently replaced by /d/ (dental or alveolar) particularly in determiners (the, this, those,
etc.). Furthermore, *be* is used in an habitual sense and negative concord is common. The former feature is found in Northern Irish English (see Montgomery and Kirk 1996 for a discussion and revision of views put forward in Rickford 1986) and negative concord is frequent in many nonstandard varieties of British English. But it is known from the study of creoles elsewhere that dental fricatives are replaced by their stop equivalents; aspect is frequently promoted over tense in a creolisation situation (Hickey 1997b) so that the appearance of the habitual could have received its impetus from there. Equally, in creoles emphatic negation is frequently expressed by using more than one negator so that again this could have been the source. But what may be more likely is that input from both sources was active and contributed to the establishment of these and other features in African American English.

### 3.3 Internally motivated change

#### 3.3.1 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 show a manifestation of 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-Eastern Irish English, and, by extension, forms of English on Newfoundland deriving from this source, 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 variation is characteristic of overseas varieties of English, particularly in the northern hemisphere; for a discussion of Newfoundland English, see Clarke (1997). The distinction between lexical and auxiliary forms of the verb is not always crucial, however. In Appalachian English (Montgomery 1994, 1997b), and in the south in general, variation is found which goes back some considerable time (Ellis 1994) but here it is not determined by the status of the verb.

The second instance of such reanalysis concerns the irregular forms of *be* in the past (on this variation, see Tagliamonte 1998). Regarding the remnant communities they examined, Wolfram and Schilling-Estes state:

> In most U.S. varieties, past *be* is usually regularized to *was*, as in *We was home* or *You wasn’t there* (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998). However, in the remnant communities considered here, we find an alternate pattern in which past *be* is leveled to *was* in positive contexts (e.g. *We was there*) but to *weren’t* in negative (e.g. *I weren’t home*). This pattern represents a remorphologization of the two past *be* stems, such that *was* is now used as
a marker of affirmative rather than singular meaning, and the *were*-stem is now used as a marker of negativity rather than plurality. (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, this volume; see also Schilling-Estes and Wolfram 1994 and Wolfram and Thomas 2002: 69–77)

3.3.2 Refunctionalisation. At any one 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, and less so 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 (Hickey 1997b), 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 (see Hickey, this volume: chapter 12, for a detailed discussion).

3.4 Creolisation and transported dialects

Of recent date variationists have tended to assume that the influence of settler dialects on early forms of English in key areas associated with creolisation – above all the Caribbean and the southern United States – was greater than formerly assumed (Winford 1997–8). Winford reports on ‘the assumption that a relatively uniform basilectal creole variety was in general use among the African population of the south as a whole’ and then maintains that

The primary reason for this change [away from this assumption – RH] was the growing body of sociohistorical documentation which demonstrated that the early phases of settlement in the Caribbean colonies and elsewhere must have involved close contact between Africans and Europeans and a balance of their numbers, often in fact a majority of Europeans. . . Widespread creole formation would have occurred only later, when the growth of the plantations brought with it a massive increase in the African population, and the right kinds of social setting and conditions for this kind of change. . . Hence the closer approximations to English were in fact likely to have been present all along. (1997: 308f.)

In this context Winford notes that ‘restructured or creolized forms of English were introduced by (mostly Caribbean) slaves from the 17th century on, and also emerged as new creations on the coastal plantations, especially in the first half of
the 18th century’ (1997: 308). The assumption here is that the social scenario of the plantations with the concentration of the Africans and the attendant segregation of Africans from Europeans was what triggered the formation of creoles. This situation involved a break of linguistic continuity with the African background and a lack of superstrate language models for succeeding generations to have anything like normal language transmission in sufficient measure. This view adds particular significance to the perspective adopted in the present volume because it assumes that in the earliest stages of varieties, taken to have been creoles previously, there would have been influence from regional English through the whites with which the first blacks were in contact. In addition, one should mention that, at certain locations in the Caribbean, creolisation is assumed never to have taken place because the settlement situation was not conducive to it, e.g. on the Cayman Islands or perhaps on Barbados, the first anglophone settlement in the Caribbean.

3.5 Asian Englishes

To close this introduction to the theme of the current book mention should be made of varieties, which are largely, but by no means exclusively, second language forms of English, i.e. non-native (Williams 1987). Such varieties have been subsumed under the label ‘New Englishes’ according to the designation brought into currency by Pride (1982) and Platt, Weber and Ho (1984), although ‘Asian Englishes’ is a more neutral, geographical term used to refer to the group in Asia. Such forms of English – typically in South Asia and in South-East Asia – are distinguished by having arisen on the basis of few native speakers and of expansion through exposure to English, usually via the educational system (see Kachru 1994: 513–26 for a discussion of linguistic features and on the ‘creativity of bilinguals’, see pp. 528–33).

The subject of Asian Englishes is topical in the literature on varieties of English (Schneider 2003), not least because in recent years, for instance in Singapore, near-native or native varieties have arisen due to a conscious choice to use English as the primary medium of communication in this society with attendant exposure to English from the beginning of schooling. The nature of these Englishes, in both South Asia and South-East Asia, are the subject of three dedicated chapters in section IV of the present volume, ‘English in Asia’.
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