1 Dialects of English and their transportation

RAYMOND HICKEY

1 Introduction

The transportation of English outside the British Isles is closely connected to the history of colonial expansion which England embarked on at the beginning of the seventeenth century (Canny 1998b). Although the New World had been discovered at the end of the fifteenth century, England did not get involved in the colonial enterprise until a good century later, if one neglects the voyage of John Cabot to Newfoundland in 1497. What signals the beginning of English colonialism (Marshall 1996; Louis 1998) in the New World is the settlement of the east coast of the later United States, first with the unsuccessful attempt at Roanoke Island, North Carolina, in 1584 by Walter Ralegh and later with the settlement at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607. These were followed by the establishment of other colonies such as the Plymouth colony in 1620 in Massachusetts and the Maryland colony in 1634 (Algeo 2001a: 9). Parallel to forming a bridgehead on the mainland of America, the English established a presence in the Caribbean (Beckles 1998); the first and one of the most significant places was the small island of Barbados in the south–east which was occupied in 1627.

The settlers who left at the beginning of the seventeenth century came from different regions of the British Isles. A Scottish and an Irish element was present in this century (Cullen 1998) and these components are also dealt with in the chapters in the present volume on Scotland (Macafee) and Ireland (Hickey) respectively. The concern of the present chapter is mainly to examine the forms of English taken from England; however, many remarks on Scotland and Ireland are also to be found as it is not possible, or indeed desirable, to completely separate the three main source regions of extraterritorial varieties of English in the British Isles. The chapter will consider the further development of features which can be traced to input from Britain (and, in certain cases, from Ireland) at the various locations overseas. In this connection readers should also consult the introduction and the checklist of features in Appendix 1 of this volume.

* I would like to acknowledge many helpful comments which Michael Montgomery made on a draft version of this chapter. Needless to say, he is not to be associated with any shortcomings.
Before continuing, it is important to stress that the concern here is with varieties of English overseas which are not necessarily standard in the countries they occur in. While it is true that the standards of overseas varieties tend to differ from British English in pronunciation, in grammar they are much closer to their historical progenitor. For instance, there are very few features which are standard in American English and nonstandard in British English (most of these are past forms of verbs; see Butters 2001: 334f.).

1.1 The story of emigration

The study of transported dialects is concerned with emigration from the British Isles. This phenomenon should not be confused with the rise of the British empire (Lloyd 1984), although the two issues are closely related. But only in a small number of cases did emigration form part of the construction of the empire, e.g. where England sent administrative staff and military abroad or settlers with the specific goal of occupying and holding an overseas territory in the name of Britain. In many cases the emigrants were anything but concerned with strengthening the empire. For instance, in Scotland, the reorganisation of the northern parts of the country, known as the Highland Clearances and lasting well into the nineteenth century, was a major reason for emigration to Canada and Australia. Periods of exodus also occurred in the early stages of these clearances, i.e. there were waves of emigration, for instance that between 1763 and 1775 when thousands of highlanders left for British North America.

Furthermore, the question of substantial emigration does not concern such central imperial issues as the incorporation of India or parts of South-East Asia into the British sphere of influence (see chapters on Asian Englishes, this volume). Nor does it deal with such essential elements of the empire enterprise as the chartered companies, the most famous of which was undoubtedly the East India Company (Lawson 1993) which was founded in the seventeenth century and was active in Bengal in the eighteenth century (it also dominated English trade with China until it was disbanded after 1857). These organisations are of no concern in the present context because their activities did not have an effect on the development of extraterritorial varieties of English; they were more concerned with commercial gain than with promoting emigration, though there was some of this in connection with the goals of the company. Equally the military engagements of the empire – various wars, from the War of Independence in America (1775–83) to the (Second) Boer War in South Africa (1899–1902) – are not an issue here as their course or outcome rarely had any effect on the growth of English overseas, or only incidentally. In addition, one should mention that in many parts of the empire, particularly in those sections accrued from the second half of the nineteenth century to the period immediately after the First World War, no new forms of native English arose. In many instances the countries were not actually termed colonies, e.g. Egypt, over which Britain took control under Gladstone in 1882, was not labelled a colony. The mandated territories, which
arose after the defeat of Germany in the First World War and which were laid down in the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 and held under the general supervision of the League of Nations, were only superficially administered by Britain, e.g. Iraq, Trans-Jordan and Palestine which Britain gained from Turkey. Tanganyika, West Togoland and south Cameroon were taken over from Germany. There may have been a minor amount of subsequent internal migration due to the supervision of colonies of defeated powers by (former) colonies of Britain, e.g. with the administration of New Guinea by Australia or Western Samoa by New Zealand. In the course of the twentieth century these countries severed their ties with Britain and its colonies, usually through independence, for instance that of Western Samoa in 1962 and New Guinea in 1973.

2 Dialect areas providing input to colonies

2.1 The starting point

The point of departure for considering colonial English is represented by the dialects of England in the early modern and late modern periods respectively, specifically in the seventeenth century for the northern hemisphere and in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries for the southern hemisphere. At both these times the position of the dialects was determined by inherited geographical distributions which, in the case of the earlier century, stemmed from the dialect configuration of Middle English. In essence this had maintained itself into the early modern period (Lass 1987). There was a five-fold division of the country as follows: (i) Northern, (ii) West Midland, (iii) East Midland, (iv) Southern, (v) Kentish. These divisions in turn derived from the initial settlement patterns of the Old English period when tribes with distinctive varieties of Germanic arrived on English soil. Thus the special position of Kentish is largely a consequence of the fact that Jutes settled in the south-eastern corner of England.

Within the early modern period the closer one moves to the present day the more differentiated the view of dialect divisions in England becomes, largely because of a greater amount of attestation which allows one to refine the dialect picture of England (Trudgill 1990). For instance, it becomes clear that the East Anglia area of the Middle English East Midland region was separate from the centre of the country (Trudgill 2001a). The south–west, consisting of Devon, east and central Cornwall and probably Somerset and Dorset, appears as a dialectally distinct subregion of the south. An important factor in the refinement of the dialect divisions of England is certainly the development of large conurbations like Tyneside, Birmingham–Coventry, Bradford–Leeds, Merseyside and, naturally, the continuing expansion of London. Migration into these areas altered their dialect composition, for instance the Irish emigration to Merseyside and Tyneside (Beal 1993) in the nineteenth century affected forms of English spoken there. There are in fact instances of immigration into England which may have had an effect on varieties there in the early modern period. Trudgill (2001b: 183–5)
sees the contact with Dutch and French speakers in late sixteenth- and early seventeen-century Norwich as instrumental in the rise of third-person-singular forms without -s inflection. The Strangers, as they were referred to, were crucially most strongly present at the time when the internal competition in English between -th and -s forms was greatest.

Population movements within England, chiefly the exodus from the countryside to the towns, had consequences for English. The towns became increasingly independent of the surrounding countryside linguistically and the regional divisions were matched by an urban–rural split which applied across the entire country. The rise of urban centres and their specific forms of English meant that changes could travel from one such centre to another. An instance of this is provided by Norwich in East Anglia. Here h-dropping was an innovation which entered the area from the outside (Trudgill 1999: 137). It first affected the city of Norwich but is now spreading to the surrounding countryside.

For the present volume, the position of largely rural dialects in the early modern period is the chief concern. Certainly for emigration to the New World in its formative years, cities did not play the significant role which they were later to achieve, with the exception of London perhaps. By the time of the major emigration to the southern hemisphere, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, cities had become more important and the population movements from London and the Home Counties provided the linguistic guidelines for the development of anglophone varieties (not least because of their social status) in the major locations of the southern hemisphere, i.e. South Africa, Australia and New Zealand.

2.2 Types of speech examined

When tracing the transportation of English overseas, more conservative rural forms of English in the mainland are given particular attention. This, of course, flies in the face of present-day sociolinguistic practice but it is justified because one is trying to link up the oldest recorded forms of English today with the extraterritorial varieties which arose overseas. Furthermore, the significance of urban varieties of language has increased greatly since the nineteenth century with the rise of cities, both in size and social importance. Hence a period which antedates this development must of necessity background the significance of urban varieties. For methodological reasons scholars turn to sources such as the Survey of English Dialects which incorporates conservative rural usage of the late

1 One should mention, however, that the ports of departure for emigration to the New World were already known for their linguistic diversity. This is obvious from certain prescriptive comments by early modern writers. For instance, George Puttenham (1532–1600) was of the opinion that certain forms of English (even in the south) were to be avoided. In his Arte of English Poesie (1589) he mentions the ‘marches and frontiers’ (where contact with Welsh or Cornish would have occurred) and the ‘port townes’ because of the high degree of language mixing there (Görlich 1999: 110).
nineteenth century, given the average age – over 70 years – of the informants consulted when most of the data was collected in the 1950s (Lass 1987: 224). For the same reason older sources such as Joseph Wright’s English Dialect Grammar (1905) or Alexander J. Ellis’ On Early English Pronunciation (1868–9) are consulted preferentially.

In general, the standard of English pronunciation must be treated with caution as changes which have occurred here may be independent of dialect developments. For instance, there is a general lengthening before voiceless fricatives which applied in the south of England in the early modern period. This is usually reflected in Received Pronunciation (RP), as in path, pass, staff; all with a long /ɑː/. However, the lengthening, which also applied to the /ɒ/ vowel in this consonantal environment, was not finally accepted into RP (Upton and Widdowson 1996: 10f.), so one has cross [krɒs] and off [ɒf] with a short vowel nowadays. The long vowel is found, however, in extraterritorial varieties such as Dublin English. What probably happened here is that during supraregionalisation in the nineteenth century, the long vowel in such words was adopted into educated Dublin usage, and then the short vowel came to be preferred in RP leaving Dublin English with the older pronunciation.

Another reason for exercising caution when considering the standard is that in some cases, spelling pronunciations have become established. An instance of this is a word like yellow with a long final vowel in RP, the diphthong /əʊ/, historically derived from /o/ in this case (Upton and Widdowson 1996: 28f.). But dialects of English tend more commonly to show a final shwa or rhotacised shwa, i.e. [jelə] or [jelɔ], in this word and in others like fellow. Indeed in some cases, like (southern) Irish English there has been a lexical split following on the phonetic contrast of local and standard pronunciation, i.e. fellow [fεlə] ‘boyfriend’ and fellow [fεlo] ‘male individual’.

2.3 Dialects in the early modern period

It can be assumed that the distribution of features in present-day dialects is different than it was at the previous periods of emigration. For instance, the distribution of voiced fricatives in word-initial position (Upton and Widdowson 1996: 40f.), as in /v/armer, /ð/ink, /z/aid, /ʒ/illing, was much greater as remnants of this feature in Sussex show (outside the present-day core area in the south-west as documented in the Survey of English Dialects, see the discussion in Lass 1987: 220–2). In other anglophone countries a similar situation can be shown to hold: in Ireland a uvular [ʁ̃] is found in isolated areas of the east coast, from rural West Waterford up to urban centres like Dundalk and Drogheda in North Leinster (and clearly attested in the recordings of A Sound Atlas of Irish English by the present author, see Hickey 2004). The conclusion here is that this feature was previously characteristic of the entire east coast.
In both these instances the older distribution has in all probability been masked by the spread of varieties – most likely more standard varieties of English without these features – into the areas formerly showing them. With regard to dialect transportation this situation demands special attention. For example, there are remnants of uvular [ʁ] in Newfoundland (Clarke, this volume) which might appear to be an independent development at this overseas location. But a careful examination of east coast Irish English shows that this was in all probability a much more widespread feature of English there at the time – over two centuries ago – of the major Irish emigration to Newfoundland and hence was probably carried by some speakers to eastern Canada. Indeed the distribution in Newfoundland today may itself represent a reduction of the occurrence in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries when Irish emigration was in full swing (Hickey 2002b). Although this is an Irish feature, it illustrates a matter of principle, namely that features in overseas varieties may derive historically from those in the British Isles although the geographical distribution in the source area is highly restricted.

2.4 Dialect features in England

2.4.1 Irregular distribution across England. Dialectal forms typically apply only to certain regions, i.e. they show an irregular distribution across England as a whole. An illustration of this is provided by the pronominal form Thou which occurs in the north Midlands and the north and as thee (in the nominative) in the west Midlands and the south–west (Upton and Widdowson 1996: 66ff.). There are two issues here: (i) the uneven distribution which resulted from the expansion of you in the entire eastern region and (ii) the use of the former accusative as a nominative in the west Midlands and the south–west. Other instances of irregular pronoun distribution are the following: hern for hers is a largely midland and southern feature in England (Upton and Widdowson 1996: 70ff.) and one which is found in the Lower and Upper South of the United States (Montgomery 2001: 131). Such features as ‘er [əɹ] ‘she’ (a nominative, deriving from the oblique form ‘her’), attested in the West Midlands, do not seem to have been transported, nor has hoo ‘she’, ultimately deriving from Old English hēo and attested for the north West Midlands only (Ihalainen 1994: 218ff.; Upton and Widdowson 1996: 68ff.).

2.4.2 Change in status. By this is meant that an element did not just survive in a dialect but that the grammatical status it had in older forms of English has changed. The use of thee in the nominative case in the south–west just mentioned is an example of this. A change in status may be furthermore due to a change in organisational principle. An axis along which a formal distinction can be made is that of stressed versus unstressed pronouns. The south–west is known for distinguishing formally between stressed and unstressed pronouns. The latter category uses the subject forms (he, she, we, etc.) and the former the object forms (him, her, us, etc.) of standard English personal pronouns (Ihalainen 1994: 214).
2.4.3 Relative status of features. When viewing dialect features it becomes obvious that their status vis-à-vis both the standard and transported dialects varies considerably. Take lengthening of /a/ as an example. This is normally found (i) before voiceless fricatives, e.g. path [pɑːθ] and (ii) before clusters of an alveolar nasal and homorganic obstruent, e.g. demand [dəˈmɑːnd]. This is a specifically southern English development and, in line with the prevalence of southern features overseas, it is found for most varieties, but not for all. A particular northern feature is the lack of diphthongisation of Middle English /u:/ to /au/ as in house [hʌːs], town [tʌːn]. This does not occur in overseas varieties (though it is present in Ulster Scots in Ireland) and is regarded within England as a strongly local feature which is immediately abandoned by speakers who style shift towards the standard. However, the lack of /a/-lengthening does not carry anything like the salience of the undiphthongised /u:/.

2.4.4 The loss of distinctions. Lastly it should be mentioned that the movement from dialect to more mainstream varieties of English may entail the loss of phonetic distinctions contained in dialects. A clear instance of this is found with Norwich speakers for whom the use of standard English means that words with vowels deriving from Middle English /ɔ:/ and /ɔu/, e.g. groan /ɡroʊn/ and grown /ɡrɔːn/ respectively, become homophones because these vowels had merged in those varieties which fed into the later standard of British English.

3 Features not transported

Assuming that regional speakers who emigrated in the early modern period took their local pronunciations of English with them, then the question to be asked is how they came to lose such pronunciations in those cases where they did not survive. There are basically three answers to this question (in those scenarios which do not involve language contact or creolisation):

1. in a dialect mix situation, certain features were disfavoured by the offspring of earlier dialect speakers;
2. through later imposition of more standard varieties, older regional features were supplanted (supraregionalisation);
3. independent developments within a transported dialect led to the demise of a feature or features.

Option 3 is generally regarded as unlikely. Dialect features might alter in form or distribution in a variety – consider the spread of /ʌ/ in forms of northern Irish English to words which do not have this in mainstream English – but the likelihood of independent developments leading to just the form of more standard

2 Historically this would seem to have held for more general varieties of Irish English (outside the north); for instance, Sheridan (1781: 144) notes /x/ in bull, pull, bash, push, etc. in Dublin English of the late eighteenth century.
varieties is small indeed. Deciding on whether 1 or 2 was operative in the genesis of an overseas variety is sometimes difficult, but the time scale might be a help here. Option 1, dialect mixture, is likely to apply early on as different dialects were usually present for many varieties from the very beginning (Hickey 2003a). Option 2 would require an external stimulus, i.e. for a dialect to start replacing its salient features by more mainstream ones, there must be a reason. In Ireland, the spread of general education for the majority Catholic population and the rise of an independent middle class in the nineteenth century are powerful factors triggering supraregionalisation.

3.1 A case in point: the strut lexical set

In the north of England the vowel of the strut lexical set is traditionally [o] as in [but] for but. Despite the obvious numbers of northern emigrants at overseas locations, this pronunciation does not occur in any overseas varieties of English. This fact is quite remarkable, seeing as how emigration goes back to the seventeenth century. In North America, for instance, the early seventeenth century saw emigration to New England as well as the Caribbean and the eighteenth century experienced much emigration from Ulster and Scotland. The nonexistence of [o] in American English would suggest that this realisation in the strut lexical set no longer existed in the entire south of England by the time of this emigration. It should also be noted that with regard to the lowering and unrounding of [u], Scotland (and by extension Ulster) was more innovative than the north of England (Macafee, this volume) and apparently had shifted this vowel to [ʌ] before the major emigration to North America just alluded to.

The conclusion to be drawn from the shape of extraterritorial varieties is that emigrants from the north of England were never the dominant influence at an overseas location (Montgomery 2001: 138; Lass 1990) and hence their speech never became a model in the genesis of a new variety.3 However, one caveat is necessary here. It may have been the case that [u] was found overseas in the strut lexical class but was later replaced by [ʌ] due to standardising or koineising influences at a particular location. This is conjecture, of course, because there would seem to be no evidence pointing to this. But one could mention that the high back realisation of the vowel of the strut lexical class is salient (Hickey 2000) in those varieties which have it and hence more likely to be replaced by a more mainstream pronunciation. However, even if this were the case, one would expect remnants of an [ʊ]-pronunciation, for instance, in geographically or socially isolated groups. Alternatively, one might find an [ʊ]-pronunciation in style shifting downwards, as part of a vernacularisation process.

3 This would certainly seem to be true of highly salient northern features, such as the fronted reflex of Middle English /oː/, [ʊ(ə)] as in stone [stʊn] (Lass 1987: 227) or the lack of lengthening before final /-nd/ clusters, e.g. [grʊnd] ground (Wakelin 1984: 71). Such extreme variations in English pronunciation would have caused miscomprehension among dialect speakers and may have been avoided by northerners from the very beginning.
This is attested in Dublin English where [ɔ] is deliberately used for local flavour, above all in the pronunciation [dobлин], although the supraregional form of Irish English does not have [ɔ] in the strut lexical set.

Another question closely related to this issue is why northern English never asserted itself overseas. Probably the only type of community where it could have done so would have been a Newfoundland type of scenario, an isolated, closely knit community where it could have maintained itself free of any pressure from southern speakers of English to adopt their pronunciation. But it was not the fate of northern speakers to settle in eastern Canada but of the south-western English (Clarke, this volume). Wherever there were northern English speakers they did not manage to dominate an entire community dialectally, e.g. in South Africa where the higher social status of southern speakers meant that, all other things being equal, the speech of this latter group dominated (Lass, this volume). At other locations, e.g. the eastern United States in the eighteenth century, northern English was taken overseas indirectly, i.e. through Ulster (Michael Montgomery, personal communication).

There are other features of British dialects which did not establish themselves at overseas locations. One could mention here the /u:/ vowel in the mouth and the /iː/ vowel in the fleece lexical sets (both northern English features). The use of /x/ in words like daughter did not survive although both Scots and Ulster Scots had this sound and both were present among eighteenth-century emigrants to North America. For this entire area, with the exception of Newfoundland, one could also cite the voicing of fricatives in initial position, i.e. /f, s, ð, ś, z, ð, ȝ/ which would have been present in transported southern and south-western varieties of British English but which did not survive (Montgomery 2001: 139).

On a morphological level ‘the complete replacement of thee, thou and thy by you and your in the Colonial period [of American English, and in standard varieties – RH] on both sides of the Atlantic’ (Butters 2001: 333) could be quoted.

3.2 The reduction and loss of variants

Given the later shape of varieties it is interesting to note what features did not manage to survive. Furthermore, a distinction must be drawn between the loss of a structural principle and the decreasing frequency of a feature. To pursue this issue, one should take as one’s point of departure the features which are attested in the earliest documents. An obviously different picture emerges compared to that one gains if one only considers present-day extraterritorial varieties. For the purposes of discussion the following sections consider various features which by and large did not survive in forms of American English. The documents from which they were gleaned are the Salem witchcraft trials from the early 1690s as they are among the earliest continuous documents from settlers in North America (Alexander 1928; Kytö, this volume; Krapp 1925 provides more detailed material from the mid seventeenth century).
3.2.1 Lowering of /e/ to /a/ before /r/. The lowering of /e/ to /a/ before /r/ is a widely attested feature in English. In some cases there has been an orthographic adjustment so that the instances, like *barn* (< ME *bern*) or *dark* (< ME *derk*) are no longer obvious. Examples from the Salem trial documents are *marcy*, *sarch*, *sarvant*, pronunciations which are not widespread, though they are listed in *DARE* (Cassidy 1985–). In England such lowering is obvious from a variety of county names, such as *Derbyshire*, *Berkshire*, etc. In the cases of the common nouns, those instances which were not adjusted in spelling have been reversed, perhaps with the exception of *clerk*, in both mainland and extraterritorial varieties. In standard British English the distinction between the dialectal pronunciation and the later standardised one is exploited lexically in the word pair *parson*: *person*. Dialects of England retain this lowering in conservative pronunciations to the present day, e.g. in East Anglia, cf. *har* (= *her*), *garl* (= *girl*), etc. (Trudgill 2001a).

3.2.2 /f/ as a reflex of former /x/. There are a few established instances of this, e.g. *laughter*, cf. German *lachen* with /-x-/—But many more instances are to be found in historical documents such as those from the Salem trials which have *dafter* (*daanfier*) for *daughter* and *thof* for *though* (Kytö, this volume). Of all varieties outside mainland England, only Scots and Ulster Scots (in their most conservative forms) retain the velar fricative, e.g. in *enough* /ɪnʌf/. In general /x/ has been vocalised but there are dialectal instances of a shift to /f/ in (the north of) England which may result in doublets like *dough* and *duff* ‘steamed pudding’.

3.2.3 Variation among high front vowels. That this kind of variation was widespread in early forms of English is not immediately obvious as the spelling of English has tended to dictate the pronunciation of /e/ or /ɪ/ with the obvious exception of the word *English/England* itself. Here one can see the result of a raising of /e/ before a nasal, the most common environment for this to occur. A similar raising is still found in extraterritorial varieties, e.g. in south-west Ireland. Not all instances of raising before nasals need be related to each other, e.g. the common raising in the Lower South of the United States is almost certainly an innovation and not a remnant of a situation in earlier English.

The Salem trials show that the raising of /e/ to /ɪ/ was not just confined to a pre-nasal environment and that one has variation in both directions, e.g. *git*–*get*, *weches*–*witches*, *lettel*–*littel* (Kytö, this volume). Of the examples found in these documents only the variation between [gɪt] and [ɡɪt] for *get* is still found to this day.

It may be that with the demise of this variation, it comes to be confined to raising in pre-nasal position. This would appear to have been the case for Irish English and shows how salient features are reduced to phonetically predictable environments, thus losing their salience. Here one can recognise the path taken
for the demise of /e/ to /i/ raising in Irish English (Hickey 2000: 66f.). This raising is also found in Ship English in a pre-nasal environment (see below).

3.2.4 **Alternation of /u/ and /i/**. The variation among short vowels in the early modern period is clear in another area; this is where there is an alternation between a front and a back high short vowel, i.e. between /i/ and /u, a/. This is attested in the Salem trials in the word *bushop* for instance, where the inherently round /ʃ/ probably induced the use of a back round vowel. This attestation may indeed point to the realisation of vowels in the structure lexical class with a degree of height (if not also rounding) in the early seventeenth century. Such spelling alternatives are also found in Ship English (see below).

3.3 **Other dialect features which have been lost**

3.3.1 **Retraction and raising of /æ/ to /ɔ/**. The area of low vowels is one which has shown considerable fluctuation in the history of English. There has been fronting and retraction\(^4\) at various times, the latter often coinciding with raising and the former with unrounding. While the fronting is clearly to be seen in American English today,\(^5\) cf. *pot* as [pat], the retraction is attested in many remarks on English in the early modern period. In Ship English there are cases like *tollow* for *tallow*, *for* for *far* (Matthews 1935). This type of retraction and raising is also commented on in Sheridan’s *Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language* (1781: 144f) and its later disappearance from Irish English, and perhaps from other varieties which may have had this as well, could be due to ‘ebb and flow’, the reversal in direction of a change by subsequent generations (Hickey 2002a).

3.3.2 **Fronting of /u/ and phonemic vowel length**. A feature of Scottish origin is the fronting of /u/ to a mid high vowel [u] (see McClure 1994: 85). In the British Isles this is an areal feature covering Scotland and northern Ireland where it was taken with the large-scale emigration to Ulster in the seventeenth century (Hickey, this volume: chapter 3). Despite the significant Ulster emigration to the United States in the eighteenth century, there do not seem to be any traces of this overseas.

This situation also applies to another feature of Ulster English, the lack of phonemic vowel length for many speakers, particularly those in Ulster Scots

\(^4\) The matter being discussed here is different from the more recent retraction of /æ:/ which in varieties like RP leads to /æ:/, e.g. *cancel* /kæːnzl/. Some extraterritorial varieties have begun to adopt this retracted vowel (for Australian English, see Bradley 1991), though it is not part of the historical input there. In New Zealand, on the other hand, it probably is (Gordon and Trudgill, this volume).

\(^5\) This feature appears to be of some considerable vintage in the United States and was noted by no less an author than Noah Webster in his *Dissertations of the English Language* in the 1780s: ‘It is a custom very prevalent in the middle states, even among some well bred people, to pronounce *off*, *soft*, *drop*, *crop*, with the sound of *a*, *aff*, *saft*, *drap*, *crap*. This seems to be a foreign and local dialect . . .’ (quoted in Montgomery, this volume). See also Cooley (1992: 170) for similar comments.
areas (see map in appendix 3). This derives from a more differentiated version of predictable vowel length known as the Scottish Vowel-Length Rule which was available in transported varieties of Scots (Aitken 1981). For speakers with environmentally conditioned vowel length, words like fool and full are homophones, both [fu:l] phonetically. In overseas forms of English there does not seem to be any variety where vowel length is not phonemic. The demise of this feature among the many Ulster emigrants to the New World may in part be due to the amount of homophony it causes and hence its avoidance in dialect mix situations.

3.3.3 Vocalisation of velarised /l/. There is no doubt that in the history of English, and in other Germanic languages like Dutch, there has been a tendency for velarised /l/, [ɬ], to be lost through vocalisation to a back vowel. Apart from the situation in Old and Middle English, for the modern period there was a widespread tendency for such vocalisation. John Ray, in A Collection of English Words not Generally Used (1674), notes the vocalisation of velarised [ɬ] before /d/ in words like caud (cold) and aud (old) (Ihalainen 1994: 202). This is a step further in the same development of velarisation with final vocalisation which is attested before velars in standard forms such as talk, chalk, etc. in Modern English.

It is difficult to say where this vocalisation was transported to overseas locations. For instance, in Newfoundland, among the communities derived from south-western English settlers, remnants of this vocalisation are present in lexicalised forms, e.g. gayoo ‘gale’. At other overseas locations a velarised [ɬ] may have developed latterly, or perhaps resurfaced if it represents a historical continuation. This is true of Australian English (Borowsky 2001); on New Zealand English, see Gordon et al. (2004). Vocalisation of /l/ is common in several varieties of American English (Pederson 2001: 259).

3.3.4 Merger and shift with /w/ and /v/. A conundrum in the history of varieties of English is unravelling and accounting for a series of movements between /w/ and /v/ which include both merger and shift of the two phonemes in southern British English and remnants of this situation in minor varieties of English in various islands of the Caribbean and the Pacific, chiefly in the south (Trudgill et al. 2004). This phenomenon is also found on the Sea Islands of South Carolina and could conceivably derive from varieties of Caribbean English which were transported there (Hancock 1980).

The shift of /v/ to /w/, a merger of the two phonemes, was reported in the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, e.g. by Ellis (1889) and Wright (1905). It is also mentioned by Wakelin (1972) referring to material from the Survey of English Dialects. In literature Charles Dickens made extensive use of this feature in his representation of Cockney speech, e.g. with Sam Weller in The Pickwick Papers. Whatever the actual time scale for this merger, it is undeniable that it has not survived in any variety of British English today.
A question of some linguistic importance is whether the shift of /v/ to /w/ was in fact a merger with the existing phoneme /w/ or whether the result of the shift was phonetically separate, thus allowing the ‘unravelling’ of the putative merger at a later point. But when viewing the attestations and documentation for this shift (including Dickens) one is forced to the conclusion that for wide sections of southern British English there was a merger of both /v/ and /w/ to some single, different segment. This is what Trudgill et al. (2002) call ‘The Two-Way Transfer Pattern’. By this they mean that the shift apparently went both ways. It was of some considerable vintage: Wyld (1956: 292) cites instances from as early as the fifteenth century and quotes the examples of vyn ‘wine’, and vyves ‘wives’ on the one hand and wyce ‘vice’ and woyce ‘voice’ on the other. There does not appear to have been conditioning for this exchange, e.g. according to the height of the following vowel where the shift of /v/ to /w/ might not be attested before /iː/, for example.

Although Trudgill et al. (2004) tend to be sceptical about African substratum input to white Caribbean speech in this particular case, they unfortunately do not recognise that Irish input may well have contributed to this development. While it is true that Irish does not have phoneme /w/ (as their only quotation rightly maintains), its does have a bilabial allophone of both /v/ and /f/. In all positions where a palatal consonant does not precede or follow, [β] and [φ] are the realisations of /v/ and /f/ respectively, e.g. lámha /l̃ã.və/ [l̃ã.wə] ‘hands’, fuar /fuəɾ/ [f̃wəɾ] ‘cold’ (on western and south-eastern Irish, see de Bhaldraithe 1945: 30–3 and Breatnach 1947: 34–7 respectively). The Irish input of the seventeenth century could well have contributed to the situation on Barbados and Montserrat, two south-eastern Caribbean islands with significant numbers of early Irish settlers (Beckles 1998; Hickey, this volume: chapter 12). Texts from the seventeenth century, such as those collected in A Corpus of Irish English by the present author (Hickey 2003c), show the use of v for w, e.g. vill ‘will’, vench ‘wench’ where v probably indicated [β] with somewhat more friction before high vowels (also the situation in Irish).

Ben Jonson in his The Irish Masque (1613/1616) uses ph to indicate the voiceless bilabial fricative [φ] of Irish English at his time: phair ‘where’, phich ‘which’ (the [φ] of Irish was also used as an equivalent to the [æ] of English; this equivalence is also seen in alternative anglicisations of one Irish name, Wheelan and Phelan both from Ó Faoláin [ɔːː φ̃iː.ə.ñiː]). Jonson furthermore uses [u] to indicate [β], e.g. leaue [lε̃.β] ‘leave’, diuell [dφl] ‘devil’ in noninitial position where the bilabial would have had little or no friction.

The postulation by Trudgill et al. (2004) that the sound to which both /w/ and /v/ merged was a bilabial approximant [β] gains support from languages which do not have a /w/-/-v/ contrast to begin with. In German, for instance, the amount of friction in the realisation of /v/ is minimal, probably because there is no need to maximise the acoustic distance from a [w] segment. This observation is confirmed by both the use of [β] for /v/ in Bavarian German and the consistent
use of \[w\] for \(/v/\), e.g. *vintage* \([\text{w}\text{ɪntɪf}\]'), on the part of nonproficient German speakers of English.

Trudgill et al. (2004) conclude that there was a merger of \(/w/\) and \(/v/\), in some varieties, to a bilabial approximant \([\beta]\) (with little or no friction, i.e. not a bilabial fricative; their symbol includes the IPA diacritic for openness of articulation) and that this was restored by contact with dialect speakers without this merger:

This merger was carried, perhaps in the 17th century, to other parts of the world, mainly the early colonies such as those of the Caribbean, in some of which it still remains. In southeastern England, on the other hand, it was reversed, as a result of contact with middle-class accents and accents from further north and west in England which did not have the merger. (Trudgill et al. 2004)

### 3.3.5 Interchange of \(/ð/\) and \(/d/\).

The lexical distribution of \(/ð/\) and \(/d/\) is more or less fixed in present-day English but historically there is much fluctuation. This always occurs in the environment of \(/r/\) (Hickey 1987). This variation is well known from the early modern period and Shakespeare has many variant spellings, e.g. *murther*, *burthen*. The fluctuation would seem to be determined by the dentalisation of \(/d/\) before \(/r/\), i.e. \([dr]\), and then the switch to a homorganic fricative \([ð]\). This account is borne out by the dentalisation of \(/d/\) before \(/r/\) which is still found widely in the north of Ireland.

### 3.4 Morphosyntax

By and large overseas varieties tend not to have continued archaic features of English morphology, even if these may have been present with early settlers. For instance, there is a proclitic form for the first person singular, *ch ‘I’* (first noted by Alexander Gil in his *Logonomia Anglica* from 1621; Ihalainen 1994: 200) which is only attested in the archaic dialect of Forth and Bargy (Hickey 1988) but is confined to this one case in Ireland.

The second-person pronoun, *thou*, has not survived intact anywhere in extraterritorial varieties, apart from archaic usage in religious language. The only remnant of it is as a truncated form ‘ee or as *dee* in British-based Newfoundland English; Clarke, this volume), although the full form *thou* is attested with the earliest English settlers in America (Kytö, this volume).

The plural of the second person is quite a different matter. Although standard English does not distinguish number with second-person pronouns, most nonstandard varieties of English have some means of indicating plurality with these elements, e.g. *ye, y’all, you’uns, youse, unu*; see Hickey (2003b) for a detailed discussion. The first form, *ye* (found in Scotland and Ireland), is a continuation of the historical second-person–plural pronoun in the nominative (the form *you* is derived from an original accusative form). The formation *y’all* is generally taken to be an independent development which arose through the natural use of the
quantifier *all* as a marker of plurality (though see Montgomery 1992, 1989a for a possible (Ulster) Scots origin). This view gains added credence from the fact that *y’all* has appeared independently in South African Indian English (Mesthrie 1992: 61). The form *you’uns* would seem to be of Ulster Scots provenance⁶ while *youse* is definitely of Irish English origin and has spread to a number of varieties of English in the southern hemisphere, especially in colloquial modes of speech. Forms similar to *unu* are confined to English in the Caribbean, especially in creoles there and to Gullah in the United States (Turner 1971: 134). The West African language Ibo has been determined as the source of this form (Burchfield 1994a: 10).

Morphological idiosyncrasies may have died out in extraterritorial varieties since the settlement of the locations at which they developed. A case in point is future negation with an independent *not* rather than the clitic form of an auxiliary and *not*: *She’ll not go home* for *She won’t go home*. This is still found in Scottish English (Miller 1993: 114) and in Tyneside (Beal 1993: 199). But in other varieties, such as Dublin English, the lack of contraction with the auxiliary is no longer attested although it is quite common in representations of Dublin English from the beginning of the twentieth century, e.g. in the plays of Sean O’Casey.

It should be mentioned here that many extraterritorial varieties have developed morphosyntactical forms of their own; the most noticeable of these are the contractions of common verb forms which are characteristic of vernacular forms of American English, e.g. *wanna* < *want to*, *gonna* < *going to*, etc. Such contractions also exist in the dialects of England, especially with reduced forms of the negative, e.g. *inna* ‘is not’, *winna* ‘will not’ (West Midlands, Ihalainen 1994: 214). Such forms are also found in Scots which is quite innovative in terms of its morphology and has many specific verb forms, cf. *cannae* ‘cannot’, *isnae* ‘is not’; see Burchfield (1994a: 11) and McClure (1994: 73f.) for a fuller discussion.

Nonstandard morphology is by and large an indication of varieties which represent an unbroken continuation of historical input. For example, this can be seen in the nonstandard nature of Scots in morphology, but not so much in syntax, an indication of the fact that it is historically continuous, whereas Irish English, with its more standard morphology and nonstandard syntax, is a language shift variety.

Another issue in the morphology of extraterritorial varieties is the use of forms which occur in mainland English but with a different function or at an unexpected point in a grammatical paradigm. Varieties as far apart as African American English and Newfoundland English offer attestations of this phenomenon. In the former, the past participle *been* is used for remote past (Rickford 1975) and an uninflected *be* is found in the present in an aspectual sense (Myhill 1988). In Newfoundland English the verbs *have* and *do* are uninflected when they function as auxiliaries but inflected as lexical verbs (Clarke, this volume). These

⁶ Montgomery, this volume, thinks that the process which led to this form was taken to America by Ulster emigrants, but that the actual form arose at the overseas location.
instances may reflect historical input (both South-Western English and South-Eastern Irish English) to the respective locations, as Hickey (2002b) shows for Newfoundland English.

3.4.1 Verbal -s. A considerable body of literature has arisen in the past few years concerning the issue of inflectional -s in present-tense verb paradigms among the different varieties of English, both mainland and extraterritorial (see Clarke 1997 for a recent summary of research up to the time of her writing; see further Poplack and Tagliamonte, this volume). A number of parameters determine the appearance of verbal -s and much of the effort of scholars has gone into determining the precise nature of these parameters for individual varieties. Furthermore, the rules governing verbal -s tend to be variable rather than categorical, a fact which makes it difficult to be accurate in describing the conditions for its occurrence. Some scholars have proposed one constraint, named the Type of Subject Constraint by Poplack and Tagliamonte (1989), and others, such as Michael Montgomery (1989b), recognise two constraints, Type of Subject and Proximity to Subject. In essence the claim is that verbal -s is disfavoured by an immediately preceding personal pronoun but that other types of subject can (but must not always) trigger -s across the verbal paradigm for the present tense. In addition the distance between subject and verb form is taken to be relevant, at least in some cases. Varieties vary according to the person and number which typically show verbal -s; for instance, in southern Irish English there is a strong tendency for this to appear in the third person plural, irrespective of the type of subject, e.g. They owns the whole street now. The weight of the subject (pronoun, noun, noun phrase) and the distance between subject and verb in a sentence also influence the occurrence of verbal -s across varieties.

Verbal -s constraints have been examined by Poplack and Tagliamonte in detail and their findings support the view that these have been determined by the historical input to early African American English, a finding which is supported by their investigation of the diaspora on Samaná peninsula (in the Dominican Republic) and Nova Scotia (Poplack and Tagliamonte, this volume). The examination of verbal -s in connection with African American English is of special relevance as the alternative source of this marker would be creolisation.

However, the view that creolisation is in the main responsible for features of African American English tends to be dismissed in recent literature, in particular where the dialectal antecedents of African American English are examined carefully (Schneider, this volume). One such study is that by Montgomery and Fuller (1996). The authors maintain that the ‘judicious selection and careful analysis of letters written by slaves and ex-slaves can be used to fill in some gaps in the history of African American speech’. To this end they looked at this data and distinguished six (possibly seven) different usages of verbal -s in nineteenth-century African American English, as shown in table 1.1. Montgomery and Fuller confirm that there is ‘a strong similarity between white and black English in the 19th century South Atlantic states in the use of verbal -s marking for a concord
Table 1.1. *Usages of verbal -s in nineteenth-century African American English*

| S1 | The same -s marker as found in Standard American English. |
| S2 | This marked agreement with nominal subjects in the third person plural (traceable to Scotland from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries onwards; later from northern Ireland through Scots immigration). |
| S3 | Marked nonproximity with pronominal subjects separated from a verb by a co-ordinate clause. |
| S4 | The so-called ‘historic present’ which marked ‘dramatic action in the past tense’. |
| S5 | An aspectual morpheme marking habituality. |
| S6 | Stems from a contraction of the modal *shall* (or more accurately the Scottish form *sall*) following personal pronouns used in the first person. |
| S7 | ‘Hyper -s’. This refers to -s marking in a context other than S1–6 (e.g. *You sells books*). |

System traceable to Northern British and Irish English that was based on the grammatical class and proximity of the subject” (see Montgomery 1994, 1997 for detailed arguments in this connection). Apart from the subject concord function, the use of verbal -s for narrative immediacy and for habitual aspect are prominent features of many varieties, including varieties of English in the south of Ireland, as the following attestations from Waterford show: *I comes up the street and sees the front door open* (narrative present); *I gets fierce worried about his job sometimes* (habitual aspect).

### 3.5 Lexical features

The survival of lexical features in extraterritorial varieties is normally a straightforward matter as they are usually fairly easy to identify (see the United States Midland words which Montgomery lists in his contribution to this volume as well as the lexical items discussed by Schneider for the southern United States). In some instances there has been a shift in form and meaning as with *hangashore* in Newfoundland from Irish Gaelic *ainniseoir* ‘lazy person’, in this case an original Irish word with an unetymological /h-/ and a portion of folk etymology. In keeping with the slight influence of northern dialects of English on later extraterritorial varieties, not too many specifically northern lexical items are found overseas.7 Words like *bairn* ‘child’ (Upton and Widdowson 1996: 74) are found across a large section of the north of England but did not travel. Nor did *oxter* ‘armpit’ (Upton and Widdowson 1996: 82f.) which is found recessively in Ulster in the core Scots areas but not elsewhere.

Related to the continuation of lexical items is the possible retention of pronunciations specific to individual words, e.g. the lack of shortening of /u:/ before

---

7 For an assessment of the use of lexical material in determining dialect boundaries, see Kretzschmar (1996).
/k/. This is generally a northern feature and is found in order of diminishing occurrence in Irish English in the following words: *cook, book, look*. A lexical split can occur in such instances based on the phonetic contrast between the dialectal and the standard form, e.g. *bold* [baul] ‘with sneaking admiration’, as in *The bold* [baul] *Charlie has done it again*, vs. [bɔːld] ‘misbehaved; audacious’, again in Irish English.

4 The journey overseas: Ship English?

The journey from England to an overseas location took at least several weeks by ship, the shortest being to Newfoundland and eastern Canada, the longest being to Australia and New Zealand which took considerably longer despite the development of fast, narrow-bow clippers for this long journey in the early nineteenth century. This fact has led a number of linguists to consider the type of English spoken on the emigration ships, often on the assumption that the foundations for features of later varieties at the destination of the ships’ voyages could have been laid during the transoceanic journey. In addition, it is known that the crews of emigration ships were quite diverse; they were not only drawn from the hinterlands of the ports, but from further afield, given the opportunity for employment which the emigration industry offered.

The main study of what is known as Ship English is Matthews (1935). The issue has been addressed on several occasions since, notably in Bailey and Ross (1988). The data base for Matthews’ article is formed by ships’ logs which were deposited at the Navy Office and in the Public Record Office, most after 1660 and a few before that date. Matthews examined the vowel inventory of Modern English with a view to determining whether deviant values existed then which could have been transported to overseas territories. His findings include such features as substitution of /o, η/ for /i/ (e.g. *bushop* ‘bishop’, *druselling* ‘drizzling’), the raising of /ɛ/ to /ɨ/ before nasals (e.g. *enemy*, *wint*, *frinds*), the retraction and raising of /æ/ to /ɔ/ (e.g. *tollow* ‘tallow’, *for ‘far’, see above), the lowering of /ɛ/ to /a/ before /r/ (e.g. *marcy*, *sarvant*), the use of *th* for *d* as in *orther* ‘order’, *ruther* ‘rudder’ which as Matthews thinks suggests the use of /ð/ (see Hickey 1987 for a fuller discussion). All these pronunciations have parallels in dialects in England. What ultimately renders Matthews’ study unsatisfactory is the fact that there is no general discussion of links to established varieties of English or no finer differentiation of the dialect background of the logbook writers. The upshot of his study is to confirm that these features were prevalent at the time of transportation. The question still remains unanswered as to whether certain varieties began to form already on the ships. But given the nature of the documents – ships’ logbooks – it is probably not possible to determine this at such a distance in time.

5 Transferred features recessive or lost at source

Transported features may gain additional interest for linguists by such features dying out, or at least becoming highly recessive, at their source in the British Isles.
There are different reasons for this development. The features in question may have been moribund at the source to begin with, or characteristic of a small, non-prestigious group there. At the overseas location, the status of a group may have been different. Furthermore, speakers overseas may select certain features and allocate them identificational significance for their embryonic variety of extraterritorial English. Variant retention, the precondition for such later reallocation, is, according to Trudgill (1986: 125), the result of a lack of accommodation of subgroups within a community at an overseas location. In his opinion those features which are either of very low or of very high salience are not affected by accommodation (however, minority and marked variants are nonetheless among those which are lost; Trudgill 1986: 126).

A few examples are offered briefly here to illustrate features which appear to have a greater distribution overseas compared with their mainland source.

5.1 **Double modals**

In varieties which historically have had a Scots input, notably Appalachian English, sequences of two modals can be found, e.g. *She might could come tomorrow*. This would seem to be a feature found through much of the eastern half of the United States; see Mishoe and Montgomery (1994) for an examination of data from the Lower South. Fennell and Butters (1996: 273–5) see the Scottish and Ulster examples of double modals as the most reliably attested (citing Montgomery 1989b). Montgomery and Nagle (1994) stress the differences between the Scottish and American systems (the latter mediated by eighteenth-century Ulster settlers) but regard the transatlantic connection as most probable.

5.2 **Positive anymore**

This may occur in Midland United States as in *They go to Florida on their holidays anymore*. It may well derive from the speech of eighteenth-century Ulster Scots settlers whose predecessors in turn had picked this up from native speakers of Irish before emigration. Montgomery (this volume) agrees with the Irish provenance of the feature, and thinks that at least the germ of this usage was taken to America by Ulster emigrants. Note that this feature and the previous one contribute to a definition of a Midland area in the United States (Montgomery, this volume; Johnson 1994).

5.3 **Palatal glide insertion**

This feature is somewhat different from the previous one in that it is present in Irish English and in Caribbean English and recessively in conservative varieties

---

8 In present-day Irish English this is chiefly found in West Donegal but used to be common throughout the entire north previously. It is probably a transfer phenomenon from Irish (J. Milroy 1981: 4; Crozier 1984: 318), arising as a calque on the Irish adverb _riamh_ ‘anymore’ which can have various tense references: past, present or future (Ó Dónaill 1977: 997).
in the American South (Kurath and McDavid 1961). It is manifested as a palatal glide after velars and before /a/. The feature is still well attested in the north of Ireland (and recorded in *A Sound Atlas of Irish English*), cf. *car* [kjær], *gap* [gjæp] (Harris 1984). It might appear to be a straightforward case of transportation from Ireland to the Caribbean, given the Irish input there in the seventeenth century (Hickey, this volume: chapter 12). However, the matter is not that simple. The source of the feature in northern Ireland is probably English (from the English settlers in Ulster, and not the Scottish). Harris (1987), when considering this palatalisation, concludes that there is compelling evidence for this having arisen within mainland English (it has been attested in southern England) and rejects Irish or African substrate languages in the Caribbean as a source. In this case the demise of the feature in England has left a few extraterritorial locations retaining it. Two of these – Ireland and the Caribbean – are remnant areas without one of these being the source of the other, however.

6 Mergers in overseas varieties

One of the contentious issues in research into extraterritorial varieties is the status of mergers (see the discussion of /v/–/w/ in 3.3.4 above). There are many pronouncements on the matter which have received attention, e.g. ‘Mergers expand at the expense of distinctions’, a famous dictum of Labov (1972: 300). The question is whether this is true and whether it it always true, that is, are there situations, external or internal, where mergers are disfavoured?

Evidence from locations as far apart as Ireland and New Zealand show, however, that mergers are less likely if the degree of homophony which might arise is considerable. For instance, the decline of *h*-dropping in late nineteenth-century New Zealand English and the survival and the reinstatement (in Dublin English of the nineteenth century) of the distinction between dental and alveolar stops – in the *THIN* and *THIS* lexical sets – are evidence of the resistance to mergers when major homophony is likely to be the result. In this context one could point to the absence of the *SQUARE* – *NURSE* merger from Ulster English in American English.

Given the avoidance of major homophony as a proviso, one can nonetheless observe certain mergers in extraterritorial varieties of English. The following list offers a selection of the more common of these.

6.1 The which/witch merger

Historically, words like *which* [mɪtʃ] and *witch* [wɪtʃ] were distinguished consistently, the merger being of late modern origin. In phonological terms, this loss

---

9 Bermejo-Giner and Montgomery (1997) show in their investigation of emigrant letters that both *h*-dropping and *wh*-loss were more widespread for the beginning of the nineteenth century than scholars have assumed for the end of that century (Bermejo-Giner and Montgomery 1997: 179).
is the removal of /h/ from the initial cluster /hw/ in words of the which-type. This analysis is borne out by the fact there there are no varieties of English which have h-dropping and the retention of [w], i.e. /hw-/; see Hickey (1984) for more detailed arguments.

In conservative forms of English, such as Scottish and Irish English, a distinction in voice with these approximants is made, but there are noticeable exceptions to this rule of thumb, e.g. Newfoundland English which has only the voiced approximant, even for the Irish-based variety of English there which certainly had the distinction in its historical input.

6.2 The cot/caught merger

The vowels of these two words are not always distinguished, either in length and/or quality. An unrounding and fronting of /o/ to /a/ in American English could be due to Irish influence as traditional forms of Irish English, both north and south, have, and have had, a more open vowel in the lot and thought lexical sets than in South-Eastern British English (Hickey, 2002b). This is also true of Newfoundland English where unrounding was characteristic of both the English and Irish inputs (Clarke, this volume). A merger at the British sources has not generally taken place because vowel length is still distinctive, something which is not always true in this case for many varieties of North American English, hence the merger.

6.3 Mid back vowels before /r/

Again, for many conservative varieties there may be a distinction among mid back vowels before /r/, i.e. the words morning and mourning may not be homophones, e.g. one has [moːnɪŋ] versus [moʊnɪŋ]. All such varieties are rhotic and it is difficult to predict just what lexical items show which vowel though there is a preponderance of French loanwords with the higher vowel, e.g. force, port, fort.

6.4 Short vowels before /r/

The distinction between front and back short vowels before /r/ as in germ /dʒɜrm/ and burn /bərn/ has been generally lost in English, and not just in non-rhotic varieties. However, conservative varieties (in Scotland and Ireland) may retain the distinction, at least in their vernacular forms, perhaps even showing

10 In the dialect mix of the early years of a variety there may have been individuals with a blend of these features, as in the case of Malcolm Ritchie in early New Zealand English; see Gordon and Trudgill, this volume.

11 An amusing corollary of this is that certain advertising slogans or banners of international firms of the anglophone world, such as XXX £ u ‘XXX for you’, do not come off in varieties without this merger, e.g. Irish English (except fashionable Dublin English), where four and for are phonetically distinct, i.e. [fɔːr] and [fɔːr] respectively.
a further distinction between mid and high front vowels as in *fɪr* [fɪr] and *fern* [fɜrn]. In general this distinction is not found in varieties of English overseas.
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