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General introduction

Bernd Kortmann and Edgar W. Schneider

The all-important design feature of this Handbook is its focus on structure and on the solid description and documentation of data. The two volumes, accompanied by the CD-ROM, provide comprehensive up-to-date accounts of the salient phonological and grammatical properties of the varieties of English around the world. Reliable structural information in a somewhat standardized format and presented in an accessible way is a necessary prerequisite for any kind of study of language varieties, independent of the theoretical framework used for analysis. It is especially important for comparative studies of the phonological and morphosyntactic patterns across varieties of English, and the inclusion of this kind of data in typological studies (e.g. in the spirit of Kortmann 2004).

Of course, all of this structural information can be and has to be put in perspective by the conditions of uses of these varieties, i.e. their sociohistorical backgrounds, their current sociolinguistic settings (not infrequently in multilingual societies), and their associated political dimensions (like issues of norm-setting, language policies and pedagogical applications). Ultimately, all of the varieties under discussion in these Handbooks, certainly so the ones spoken outside of England, but in a sense, looking way back in time, even the English dialects themselves, are products of colonization processes, predominantly the European colonial expansion in the modern age. A number of highly interesting questions, linguistically and culturally, might be asked in this context, including the central issue of why all of this has happened and whether there is an underlying scheme that has continued to drive and motivate the evolution of new varieties of English (Schneider 2003). These linguistic and sociohistorical background issues will be briefly addressed in the introductions of the four regional parts and in some of the individual chapters, but it should be made clear that it is the issue of structural description and comparison which is at the heart of this project. Accordingly, in this General Introduction we focus upon the organization of the Handbook and the information to be culled from it.

This Handbook is geared towards documenting and mapping the structural variation among (spontaneously spoken) non-standard varieties of English. Standard English is of course that variety, or set of closely related varieties, which enjoys the highest social prestige. It serves as a reference system and target norm in formal situations, in the language used by people taking on a public persona (including, for example, anchorpersons in the news media), and as a model in the teaching of English worldwide. Here, however, it is treated as is commonplace in modern
Bernd Kortmann and Edgar W. Schneider

descriptive linguistics, i.e. as a variety on a par with all other (regional, social, ethnic, or contact) varieties of English. Clearly, in terms of its structural properties it is not inherently superior to any of the non-standard varieties. Besides, the very notion of “Standard English” itself obviously refers to an abstraction. On the written level, it is under discussion to what extent a “common core” or a putatively homogeneous variety called “International English” actually exists: there is some degree of uniformity across the major national varieties, but once one looks into details of expression and preferences, there are also considerable differences. On the spoken level, there are reference accents like, for example, Received Pronunciation for British English, but their definition also builds upon abstractions from real individuals’ performance. Thus, in this Handbook especially the grammar of (written) Standard English figures as no more than an implicit standard of comparison, in the sense that all chapters focus upon those phenomena in a given variety which are (more or less strikingly) different from this standard (these being perceived as not, note again, in any sense deficient or inferior to it). In light of the wealth of publications and comprehensive grammars on Standard English, there are no survey chapters on, for example, Standard British or American English in this Handbook. For the reference accents of British and American English chapters have been included.

1. Coverage

The Handbook covers some 60 (sets of) varieties, including main national standard varieties, distinctive regional, ethnic, and social varieties, major contact varieties (pidgins and creoles), as well as major English as a Second Language varieties in the British Isles (edited by Bernd Kortmann and Clive Upton), the Americas and the Caribbean (edited by Edgar W. Schneider), the Pacific and Australasia (edited by Kate Burridge and Bernd Kortmann), and Africa, South and Southeast Asia (edited by Raj Mesthrie).

The inclusion of second-language varieties (e.g. English in India, Singapore, Ghana, Nigeria) and, especially, English-based pidgins and creoles, which add up to more than half of all varieties covered in this Handbook, may come as a surprise to some readers. Normally these varieties are addressed from different perspectives (such as, for example, language policy, language pedagogy, linguistic attitudes, language and identity (construction), substrate vs. superstrate influence), each standing in its own research tradition. Here they are primarily discussed from the point of view of their structural properties. This will make possible comparisons with structural properties of, for example, other varieties of English spoken in the same region, or second-language or contact varieties in other parts of the English-speaking world. At the same time the availability of solid structural descriptions may open new perspectives for a fruitful interaction.
between the different research traditions within which second-language and contact varieties are studied.

The boundaries of what is considered and accepted as “varieties of English” and thus included in the Handbooks has been drawn fairly widely, to include English-based pidgins and creoles which at first sight look quite different from what many English-speaking people may have been exposed to. Pidgins are make-shift contact varieties used in communication between people who share no other tongue. Creoles, according to the classic definition, emerge when pidgins become a new generation’s native language. Pidgins are usually described as structurally reduced, while creoles are structurally complex and fulfill all communicative requirements by human speakers, but in practice the distinction between both language types is anything but clearcut, as some of the contributions in the Handbook illustrate. Traditionally, creoles have been regarded as distinct languages of their own, but linguists agree that the line between what constitutes a separate language as against a dialect of a language is usually drawn on political and social grounds rather than because of structural properties. In accepting English-oriented pidgins and creoles in the present context, we adopt a trend of recent research to consider them as contact varieties closely related to, possibly to be categorized as varieties of, their respective superstrate languages (e.g. Mufwene 2001). Creoles, and also some pidgins, in many regions vary along a continuum from acrolectal forms, relatively close to English and used by the higher sociolinguistic strata in formal contexts, to basilects, “deep” varieties maximally different from English. Most of our contributions focus upon the mesolects, the middle ranges which in most creole-speaking societies are used most widely.

For other varieties, too, it may be asked why or why not they have been selected for inclusion in this Handbook. Among the considerations that led to the present selection, the following figured most prominently: amount and quality of existing data and research documentation for the individual varieties, intensity of ongoing research activities, availability of authors, and space constraints (leading, for example, to the exclusion of strictly local accents and dialects). More information on the selection of varieties will be given in the regional introductions by the editors.

2. Organization of the Handbook

The overall organization of the Handbook is very simple: one volume each for phonology and grammar (i.e. morphology and syntax), with each of the volumes falling into four parts according to region or rather continent(s). The major world regions relevant for the discussion of varieties of English are the following: the British Isles, the Americas, the Caribbean, Africa, (South and Southeast) Asia, Australasia and the Pacific (or Oceania). These world regions have been lumped together into the four parts spelt out in section 1, according to criteria such as
number of relevant varieties, their (present and/or past) relatedness, availability of documentation and of researchers into the specific issues under discussion, and the expertise of the individual volume editors.

Following the general introduction, each volume opens with a list of general reference works, all of them exclusively book publications, relevant across the world regions covered in the Handbook and for individual world regions. Within the two volumes, each of the four regional parts opens with an introduction by the responsible editor(s) which puts in perspective the varieties spoken in the relevant world region(s) and provides a brief guide to the chapters written on them. These regional introductions include accounts of the histories, the cultural and sociolinguistic situations, and the most important data sources for the relevant locations, ethnic groups and varieties. Further issues addressed may include a survey of current research, but also the discussion of such notoriously problematic notions as dialect boundaries, dialect areas, or traditional as opposed to modern dialects, and the problem of treating pidgins and creoles as varieties of English.

Following the regional parts, each of the volumes concludes with a fifth part in which the reader will find two types of synopses: four regional synopses and a general synopsis. In the former, the editors will summarize the most striking properties of the sets of varieties of English spoken in the individual world regions and, within them, of selected cross-sections of varieties (e.g. contact varieties). Each volume will close with a general synopsis (authored by Edgar W. Schneider for the phonology volume, and Bernd Kortmann and Benedikt Szmrecsanyi for the morphology and syntax volume) on the most noteworthy findings and tendencies on phonological and morphosyntactic variation in English from a global perspective.

What will emerge from the synopses is that many of the features described for individual varieties or sets of varieties in this Handbook are not unique to these (sets of) varieties. This is true both for morphology and syntax and for phonology. As a matter of fact, quite a number of morphosyntactic features described as salient properties of individual varieties may strike the reader as typical of other varieties, too, possibly even of the grammar of spoken English in general. In a similar vein, it turns out that certain phonological processes (like the monophthongization of certain diphthongs, the fronting, backing or merging of some vowels, and some consonantal substitutions or suprasegmental processes) can be documented in quite a number of fairly disparate language varieties – not surprisingly, perhaps, given shared underlying principles like constraints of articulatory space or tendencies towards simplification and the reduction of contrasts.

It seems possible to distinguish three broad groups of non-standard features according to their distribution across varieties of English:

Group I: by far widest distribution on a global scale

Group II: found relatively frequently in one or more parts of the English speaking world
Group III: restricted to relatively few non-standard varieties of English (possibly only one variety)

As it turns out, only very few of the formal variants belong to Group III. The distributions of selected individual features, both morphosyntactic and phonological, across varieties world-wide will be visualized by the interactive world maps on the accompanying CD-ROM (see also section 4 below). On these maps, each of the selected features, for almost all of the varieties under discussion, is categorized as occurring regularly (marked as “A” and colour-coded in red), occasionally or only in certain specified environments (marked as “B” and represented by a pink circle) or practically not at all (“C”, grey). These innovative maps, which are accompanied by statistical distribution data on the spread of selected variants, will provide the reader with an immediate visual representation of regional distribution and diffusion patterns. It should be noted that, not surprisingly, it has turned out to be impossible to obtain accurate documentation on the presence or absence of each and every feature in each one of the varieties, so category “C” also includes those cases, for example, where no positive evidence as to the presence of a given feature has been provided, though the positive non-existence of anything seems impossible to prove. Also, any such categorization by necessity enforces problematic distinctions at times, so that finely-graded distinctions and conditions cannot be represented appropriately. For a summary presentation and discussion of the major results of these comparisons the reader is referred to the regional and the global synopses.

3. Nature and structure of the contributions

The chapters are descriptive survey articles providing state-of-the-art reports on major issues in current research, with a common core in order to make the Handbook an interesting and useful tool especially from a comparative, i.e. cross-dialectal and cross-linguistic, point of view. All chapters aim primarily at a qualitative rather than quantitative perspective, i.e. whether or not a given feature occurs is more important than its frequency. Of course, for varieties where research has focused upon documenting frequency relationships between variants of variables, some information on relevant quantitative tendencies has been provided. Depending upon the research coverage in a given world region (which varies widely from one continent to another), some contributions build upon existing sociolinguistic, dialectological, or structural research, and a small number of other chapters makes systematic use of available computerized corpora. In some cases and for some regions the chapters in this Handbook provide the first-ever systematic qualitative survey of the phonological and grammatical properties of English as spoken there.
For almost all varieties of English covered there are companion chapters in
the phonology and morphosyntax volumes. In these cases it is in the phonology
chapter that the reader will find a concise introductory section on the historical and
cultural background as well as the current sociolinguistic situation of the relevant
variety or set of varieties spoken at this location.

In order to ensure a certain degree of comparability, the authors were given a
set of core issues that they were asked to address (provided something interesting
can be said about them in the respective variety). For the phonology chapters, this
set included the following items:

– phonological systems
– phonetic realization(s) and (phonotactic) distributions of a selection of pho-
nemes (to be selected according to salience in the variety in question)
– specific phonological processes at work in the relevant variety
– lexical distribution
– prosodic features (stress, rhythm)
– intonation patterns
– observations/generalizations on the basis of lexical sets à la Wells (1982) and
Foulkes/Docherty (1999), a standard reading passage and/or samples of free
conversation (cf. also section 5 on the content of the CD-ROM below).

It is worth noting that for some of the contributions, notably the chapters on pidgins
and creoles, the lexical sets were not sufficient or suitable to describe the variabil-
ity found. In such cases authors were encouraged to expand the set of target words,
or replace one of the items. The reading passage was also adjusted or substituted
by some authors, for instance because it was felt to be culturally inappropriate.

This is the corresponding set for the morphology and syntax chapters:

– tense – aspect – modality systems
– auxiliaries
– negation
– relativization
– complementation
– other subordination phenomena (notably adverbial subordination)
– agreement
– noun phrase structure
– pronominal systems
– word order (and information structure: especially focus/topicalizing construc-
tions)
– selected salient features of the morphological paradigms of, for example, auxil-
iaries and pronouns.

Lexical variation was not our primary concern, given that it fails to lend itself to
the systematic generalization and comparability we are aiming for in this Hand-
book. However, authors were offered the opportunity to comment on highly salient features of the vocabulary of any given variety (briefly and within the overall space constraints) if this was considered rewarding. The reader may find such information on distinctive properties of the respective vocabularies in the morphology and syntax chapters.

In the interest of combining guidance for readers, efficiency, space constraints, but also the goal of comprehensiveness, bibliographic references are systematically divided between three different types of reference lists. As was stated above, this introduction is accompanied by a list of “General References” which compiles a relatively large number of books which, taken together, are central to the field of world-wide varieties of English – “classic” publications, collective volumes, particularly important publications, and so on. It is understood that in the individual contributions all authors may refer to titles from this list without these being repeated in their respective source lists. Each of the individual chapters ends with a list of “Selected References” comprising, on average, only 15–20 references – including the most pertinent ones on the respective variety (or closely related varieties) beyond any others possibly included in the General References list, and possibly others cited in the respective article. In other words, the Selected References do not repeat any of the General References given at the very beginning of both Handbook volumes. Thirdly, a “Comprehensive Bibliography”, with further publications specifically on the phonology and morphosyntax of each of the varieties covered in the Handbook, for which no space limitations were imposed, is available on the CD-ROM. The idea behind this limitation of the number of references allowed to go with each article was to free the texts of too much technical apparatus and thus to increase their reader-friendliness for a target audience of non-specialists while at the same time combining basic guidance to the most important literature (in the General References list) with the possibility of providing comprehensive coverage of the writings available on any given region (in the Bibliographies on the CD-ROM). It must be noted, however, that at times this rule imposed limitations upon possible source credits allowed in the discussions, because to make the books self-contained authors were allowed to refer to titles from the General and the Select References lists only. In other words, it is possible that articles touch upon material drawn from publications listed in the CD-ROM bibliographies without explicit credit, although every effort has been made to avoid this.

4. The CD-ROM

The two volumes of the Handbook are accompanied by a CD-ROM providing illustrative, additional and incidental material. Most importantly, given that in their natural setting language varieties are spoken and heard rather than described in
writing but that such oral material is hardly ever available, the CD contains audio samples, new sound material for each variety that, depending upon availability, may comprise (partly) phonemically transcribed samples of free conversation, a standard reading passage, and recordings of the spoken “lexical sets” which define and illustrate vocalic variation (Wells 1982). Another highly innovative feature of the CD is the vivid and in parts interactive graphic illustration of the variability discussed in the books. The user is provided with representations of regional vowel charts and with interactive maps showing the geographical distribution of individual phonological and grammatical features and, on a global scale, their degree of pervasiveness across the varieties of English. The CD-ROM also includes the “Comprehensive Bibliographies” for the individual chapters mentioned above. For individual varieties, users will find phonetic analyses of sounds and intonation patterns as well as further incidental material considered relevant by the author.
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The British Isles

Bernd Kortmann and Clive Upton (eds.)
Introduction: varieties of English in the British Isles

Bernd Kortmann and Clive Upton

1. A note on geopolitical terminology

‘The British Isles’ is a geographical term which refers to the two large islands that contain the mainlands of Scotland, Northern Ireland, the Irish Republic, Wales, and England, together with a large number of other, smaller islands that are part of the territories of these countries: one island (the Isle of Man) and one archipelago (the Channel Islands) have a significant degree of autonomy within the state which encompasses the bulk of the British Isles, the United Kingdom. ‘The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland’ (the UK) is a state that encompasses Scotland, Wales, England, Man, and the Channel Islands, together with the northernmost part of the island of Ireland. If Northern Ireland is omitted entirely from a description, the designation of the area described is properly ‘Great Britain’. ‘Ireland’ properly designates the whole of the island of Ireland (though popularly it is used to refer to the state of Ireland, that is the Republic of Ireland, which occupies the central, southern, and north-western parts).

2. The coverage of British Isles accents and dialects

Major accent and dialect distinctions in the British Isles section of this Handbook are represented in chapters covering Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Northern England, and Southern England. Other chapters cover the distinctive accents and dialects of somewhat less extensive areas: Orkney and Shetland, the Channel Islands, the eastern England region of East Anglia, and the very major conurbation and administrative area of the English West Midlands. Variation within each of these areas is, of course, discussed in the relevant chapters: in particular, Northern and Southern Irish are distinguished, as is the speech of southwest and southeast England, where major differences apply. It is expected that the reader might concentrate on particular chapters or smaller sections to gain in-depth knowledge of a particular variety or group of closely-related varieties or, especially by referring to the sound charts, to obtain an overview of wider overall variation or of variation relating to specific linguistic variables.

Whilst Received Pronunciation (RP) is specifically presented as a supra-regional accent model frequently used in the teaching of English worldwide and for purposes of wide communication, its description plays only a very minor part
in the analysis of the regional varieties, each of which is described in its own terms rather than in any sense as divergent from an externally-imposed norm. For reasons spelt out in the General Introduction to this Handbook, Standard English grammar is not explicitly discussed as a separate entity.

3. The concept of the ‘dialect area’

The linguistic varieties of the UK and Ireland presented in this Handbook are discussed along geographical lines. This arrangement by region is convenient in terms of structure, and is helpful to the user who wishes to understand regional differences, or who needs to concentrate on the variety or group of varieties found in one particular region. But it is also potentially misleading, since the impression might be gained that UK and Irish varieties are tidily to be separated from each other, with one being spoken by a fixed, geographically identifiable group of people quite distinct from another group using another quite different set of speech-forms.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Far from there being regional cut-off points for ways of speaking, i.e. boundaries where, for example, one accent ceases to be heard and another takes its place, accents and dialects blend subtly and imperceptibly into one another. Rather than the hearer detecting the presence or absence of features as they move about a country or region, particularly at a local level it is a matter of ‘more or less’, of features being heard with greater or lesser frequency as features most characteristic of one region are left behind, to be replaced with greater intensity by others associated with a region being approached.

Nor should we think that all speakers in one place use the same set of features with the same level of intensity, if they use them at all. It is to be expected that some speakers, those who sound most local to a particular place, will fairly consistently exhibit a set of features which most closely conform to a characteristic local way of speaking, and it is these which form a central part of the local accent and dialect descriptions given in the chapters that follow. However, very many speakers will not be consistent in their use of these features, being variably more or less regional in different situations or under different social promptings (e.g. the social status of addressee, and degree of familiarity between them), even within the same discourse (e.g. depending on the topic). It is important to note immediately that such variation is not random: speakers do not drift between, towards, or away from markedly regional pronunciations on a whim. Rather, it has been shown in numerous studies that such movement patterns correlate with such social phenomena as age, gender, socio-economic status, ethnicity and local affiliations of both speaker and hearer, and can result in short-term, but also long-term, language change.
The acceptance of the absence of tight boundaries for phonological and grammatical features, and the acknowledgement of speakers in any one place being socially heterogeneous and, moreover, inconsistent in their speech lead to the inevitable conclusion that the concept of the ‘dialect area’ as a fixed, tidy entity is ultimately a myth. In terms of pronunciation, what we are faced with, in place of a certain number of accents, is in reality a continuum: accents shade one into another as individual speakers espouse features drawn from a range of accents to which they have access and that are indicative not just of their regional connections but also of their social needs and aspirations. The same is true for grammatical usage, and for lexical choice.

4. The distinction between ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ dialects

Another often-used notion in dialectology we would like to question is the separation of dialects into two distinct categories, the ‘Traditional’ and the ‘Modern’. This artificially tidy categorisation is not only questionable given the fact of constant language change. It is even more debatable in the light of the fact that, as will be explained below, much of our knowledge of recent distributions of dialect features over wide sweeps of territory in the British Isles continues to be based on surveys now considered to have focused on the ‘traditional’, in the sense that their target was the essentially rural speech of comparatively static communities. (No community is ever wholly static or isolated, of course: there will always be incomers and external contacts, however few these might be in particular communities at certain times.) Nevertheless, the bipartite distinction does have some undoubted merit as an idealisation: it reminds us that urbanisation and geographical and social mobility have resulted in some accelerated and often quite dramatic changes in speech in recent years, as is made clear in the following chapters. Perhaps it reminds us, too, that language should be seen in its continuous historical (diachronic) as well as its ‘snapshot-in-time’ (synchronic) dimension, that there was a ‘then’ to contrast with the ‘now’. However, we would be wrong to suppose that there is a straightforward, clear-cut distinction between the way English was spoken in the rural communities of half a century ago and as it is in the towns and cities of today, or that change is happening to language now as it has not happened before. Across time there are periods of comparatively rapid and of slower alteration in speech, but language is constantly changing. (And, indeed, the mechanisms of language change occupy the research attention of very many dialectologists today, just as ascertaining the facts of its progress absorbed the efforts of dialect researchers of previous generations.) Furthermore, since human society is in essence the same as it was in the past, a greater understanding of the facts of and reasons for that change today informs our understanding of developments both in the past and into the future.
5. Historical and cultural elements in the formation of British accents

Varieties of English around the world are all derived from one ancestral root-stock (variously called Anglo-Saxon or Old English). In part at least, the distinctive sounds and grammatical properties of each are tied to developments in the history of the language, these sometimes dating back many centuries. It is in the UK and Ireland, and in England in particular, however, that this matter of pedigree is most significant. This fact is unsurprising. English is, after all, at bottom the product of England and southern Scotland, born of a fusion of West Germanic dialects brought from mainland Europe to the islands of Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries AD, and perhaps even earlier. Fusing over the centuries with elements of Celtic, Norse, and French, and subject to sundry other influences as a result of the islands’ complex history of trade and conquest, the language in its homeland has had time and motive both to preserve ancient forms and to fragment to a degree unknown elsewhere in the English-speaking world.

Thus, constant echoes of earlier phonology and grammar are to be heard in the British regional varieties discussed in this Handbook. They are very clearly evident where contrasts appear between regional accents and the convenient touchstone accent of RP, which is itself an evolving accent but one which, as a model for pronunciation of British English, does not go back before the nineteenth century. The STRUT/PUT merger of the English North and North Midlands, i.e. the vowel in words like \textit{strut} and \textit{hut} being the same as in \textit{put}, is Anglo-Saxon, for example. So are long monophthongs where RP and some other accents have diphthongs. So too, among many other features, are the ‘Velar Nasal Plus’ feature (as in the pronunciation /\textipa{s\textscale{2}i\textscale{1}n}/ of \textit{sing} or /\textipa{s\textscale{2}i\textscale{1}n\textscale{0}\textscale{3}\textscale{0}/ of \textit{singer} [Wells 1982: 365]) of the English north-west Midlands, and the rhoticity (i.e. the pronunciation of /\textipa{r}/ following a vowel, as in \textit{star} or \textit{start}) characteristic of Scotland, Ireland, south-west England, parts of Lancashire and the Northeast, as too of North America of course. Corresponding grammatical features from earlier periods of English include multiple negation (or negative concord), as in \textit{She couldn’t say nothing about them}, and personal pronoun forms like \textit{thou} and \textit{thee}.

The length of time over which English has been evolving in the small area that is the British Isles accounts in large part for the complex variation in its present-day dialects. To this must be added the region’s ethnic and political mix, both now and in the past. There are, of course, two sovereign states represented, the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland. The United Kingdom in turn comprises the nations of England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, and matters of national as well as of narrower regional identity come into play when espousal of features of language are concerned. In the present, Wales especially, and Scotland and Ireland to lesser extents, see the interaction of English with Celtic languages. In the past, this interaction with Celtic has been most influential in the north and west of the region, as has that with Norse in Ireland, in northern Scotland and the Orkney...
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and Shetland Isles, and in northwest and eastern England. The economic and political dominance exerted on Britain by London and the southeast of England has also inevitably shaped accents: not itself a regional accent, RP nevertheless has an essentially southeastern phonemic structure and phonetic bias; such processes as the Great Vowel Shift have acted to shape modern phonology more consistently and more completely in the south of England than elsewhere. All of this cultural and historical complexity, as it affects language, is rehearsed in the various chapters that follow, and each in consequence has its own unique perspective.

6. Dialect surveys

Although they are neither very recent nor focused upon the accents of major centres of population, a small group of major regional dialect surveys are heavily drawn upon in the writing of the following chapters, as they must inevitably be by anyone commenting on variation in the speech of the British Isles. Foremost among these, for England, is the Survey of English Dialects (SED). This essentially rural survey from the mid-twentieth century continues to be drawn upon for information because of its detailed coverage, its reliability (given the constraints under which it operated) and the accessibility of its information: it is fair to say that no reliable statements can be made about the widespread distribution of linguistic features within England without reference to its findings, since there exists no more recent country-wide comprehensive evidence. The SED is paralleled by its contemporary in Scotland, the Linguistic Survey of Scotland, in Wales by the Survey of Anglo-Welsh Dialects, and in Ireland by the Tape-recorded Survey of Hiberno-English Speech. The last two surveys were in some large measure directly inspired by the SED, under whose founder, Harold Orton, some of their founder-workers had trained.

Recently, however, whilst there have been some comparatively large-scale efforts at data-gathering (see especially the Survey of British Dialect Grammar [Cheshire/Edwards/Whittle 1993], the Freiburg English Dialect Corpus [Kortmann 2003, Kortmann and Wagner 2005], and the Sound Atlas of Irish English [Hickey 2005 and this volume]), the reader will notice that, with the notable exception of the latter, even these have not been on the scale of earlier surveys. This has not, however, been accidental or the result of academic indolence on the part of the linguistic community. Rather, recent concentration on social variation in speech, in order to better understand the mechanisms of language change, has resulted in focus being on small(er) areas and fewer locations in which diverse populations can be studied in close detail: the wide sweeps of variation that were the object of earlier research do not speak to the considerations of motivation for language use, and for language variation, which are a preoccupation of today’s dialectologists. (In this regard, there have been a number of recent seminal works which have been drawn upon in the
present volume, such as Foulkes and Docherty’s *Urban Voices* [1999] and Milroy and Milroy’s *Real English* [1993].) Beyond the larger survey materials, therefore, the authors have drawn upon a wide range of materials which result from their own and others’ intensive study of the localised speech of their respective areas.

7. **The chapters on phonology**

Melchers’ focus is on distinctions between the phonology of Orkney (“Orcadian”) and Shetland, and also between their divergence from and correspondence to the accents of mainland Scotland. Amongst those accents, Stuart-Smith identifies a continuum corresponding to a phonological range available to very many in Scotland, whose speech ranges seamlessly between Scottish Standard English and Scots: as regards the latter, on grounds of population density and the existence of detailed research data, she concentrates on the Urban Scots of the ‘Central Belt’ around Edinburgh and (especially) Glasgow. In a chapter which, concerning its northern data, relates very closely to that of Scotland, Hickey describes a complex of accents in which a north-south split provides a basic structure. He identifies a supraregional Southern accent and three regional southern varieties, distinguishing these from Northern varieties. He includes discussion of the complex terminology associated with northern variation, and three urban accents, those of Dublin, Belfast, and Derry. As Hickey’s chapter treats the admixture of English, Irish and Scots influences on the Irish English accents, so Penhallurick’s is concerned with the interface of English and Welsh in the phonology of Wales. Welsh sounds in English, the effects of long-established cultural links with the English Midlands and Southwest, and the existence of English as a Foreign Language for Welsh speakers are shown to be factors in the creation of the Principality’s distinctive English accents.

Directly across the border from Wales, Clark’s West Midlands is the second largest conurbation of England and the UK, home to the two distinct if closely-related accents of Birmingham and the Black Country. Concentration in this chapter is on the Black Country on the one hand and on the wider West Midland conurbation on the other, with the various accents discussed as both distinctive and as collectively a Northern English variety. In a discussion of the Northern accents of England proper, Beal identifies pan-northern accent features, whilst pointing also to more locally distinctive characteristics, most especially though not exclusively those of the Northeast (‘Geordie’) and Liverpool (‘Scouse’). Altendorf and Watt, in their chapter on the phonology of southern England, divide their area firmly into east and west (the non-rhotic and rhotic areas respectively), and describe the distinctive characteristics of the accents of these areas quite separately. Whilst they regard East Anglia as part of the South they do not venture specifically into this region: features of the East Anglian accents, and their relation to those of surrounding areas to the south, west, and north, are the subject of Trudgill’s chapter.
Concluding the chapters which deal with the accents associated with specific geographical regions, Ramisch concentrates on the Channel Islands, where interaction with Channel Island (Norman) French and mainland immigrant English have both had an impact on distinctively local English pronunciation.

Descriptions of two non-regional accents round off the discussion of accents of the British Isles. The first is that of British Creole, an ethnic variety which, in Patrick’s words, ‘is the product of dialect contact between West Indian migrants … and vernacular varieties of urban English’. The second is Received Pronunciation (authored by Upton), an accent that is in essence unmarked for place and so attracts none of the (sometimes adverse) social judgements which regional accents attract, and that is, in consequence, frequently used in broadcasting and as a language-teaching model.

8. The chapters on morphology and syntax

With the exception of the West Midlands and the Channel Islands, all regional and ethnic (British Creole) varieties in the British Isles discussed in the phonology volume of this Handbook have a companion chapter in the morphosyntax volume. In all morphosyntax chapters the features described are distinctive of the relevant varieties, but in the vast majority of cases not to be understood as unique to these varieties (cf. also the General Introduction to this Handbook). Another property the majority of these chapters share is that they provide qualitative, only exceptionally quantitative, accounts based on large digitized and/or computerized corpora of spontaneous non-standard present-day speech.

The first two chapters complement each other. The one by Melchers on Orkney and Shetland is geared towards highlighting morphosyntactic features which are distinctive of the Northern Isles especially due to their Scandinavian substratum. The Scandinavian features are particularly pronounced at the Broad Scots end of the dialect continuum. Especially for the Central Lowlands (Edinburgh and East Lothian), this is also the focus of Miller’s chapter on Scottish English. Southern Irish English, but also varieties of Ulster and Ulster Scots stand at the centre of Filppula’s chapter on Irish English. Especially the morphosyntax of Irish English varieties shows an interesting mix of features which, due to one or a combination of the following four factors, have affected the development of Irish English: retention of features from earlier periods of English, dialect contact with other varieties spoken in the British Isles, substratal influence from the indigenous Celtic language (Irish), and universal features we associate with varieties resulting from rapid, large-scale second-language acquisition. The second and third of these features also figure prominently in Penhallurick’s account of the morphosyntax of Welsh English: the influences of Welsh, and of the regional dialects spoken in the neighbouring counties of England.
Beal provides a survey of features found in the grammars of varieties spoken in the North of England, the vast majority of which are restricted to particular regions or cities. This variation in the morphology and syntax reflects the diverse histories of the different parts and urban centres of the North: in the far north, the shared history with Scotland and the continuing migration from central Scotland to Tyneside; the large-scale medieval Scandinavian settlements in an area stretching from the Northwest (Cumbria) south-east down to East Anglia, the so-called “Scandinavian belt” (including, for example, all of Yorkshire); in the large cities like Liverpool, Newcastle, and Manchester, high Irish immigration since the 19th century.

Three chapters are concerned with the morphology and syntax of non-standard varieties spoken in the southern parts of England. Trudgill deals with East Anglia, Wagner with the Southwest (traditionally known as the West Country), and Anderwald with the Southeast (London and the neighbouring counties, the so-called Home Counties). East Anglia and the Southwest have been well-established dialect areas since medieval times, especially the Southwest still boasting not only a unique mix of morphosyntactic features but also individual morphosyntactic properties which are truly unique to this area. The Southeast, by contrast, is a relatively young and, at least with regard to grammar, surprisingly underresearched area in modern dialect research. Here most morphosyntactic features seem to be representative of non-standard speech in present-day England in general. Anderwald’s survey is based, among other things, on quantitative analyses of the British National Corpus (BNC), the Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language (COLT) and the Freiburg English Dialect Corpus (FRED), and provides a solid basis for studies wanting to explore the extent to which the Southeast may be responsible for the (partly ongoing) spread of the relevant morphosyntactic features in the British Isles.

The chapter on the Southeast is also useful background reading against which to judge Sebba’s observations on British Creole, since the conversational data Sebba has analyzed are all taken from British-born Caribbean adolescents living in London. This contact variety displays a fascinating degree of syntactic variability which cannot be explained by a continuum model, as known from pidgin and creole studies, alone. What additionally needs to be factored in is, for example, the existence of (especially Jamaican) creole- and standard-like variants for many linguistic forms, and the fact that (for a variety of reasons) speakers often mix Creole and English English forms.
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English spoken in Orkney and Shetland: phonology

Gunnel Melchers

1. General background

Orkney and Shetland, known as “the Northern Isles”, are indeed the most northerly units of land in the British Isles. The lighthouse of Muckle Flugga, at a latitude of 61º, is the northernmost point of Shetland as well as of the whole of Britain, and Orkney is as far north as Bristol Bay in Alaska. Lerwick, the capital of Shetland, is equidistant from Aberdeen in Scotland, Bergen in Norway, and Tórshavn in the Faroe Islands.

The Shetland archipelago has a total area of 1,468 sq. km (to be compared with Orkney’s 976 sq. km) and consists of well over 100 islands, 15 of which are inhabited. In Shetland as well as Orkney the largest island is simply known as Mainland. Otherwise the names of the islands in both archipelagos can all be traced back to Norn, the Scandinavian variety once spoken in the area, e.g. Whalsay and Foula in Shetland, Westray and Egilsay in Orkney.

There are many similarities between Orkney and Shetland with regard to topography, history, population structure, culture and language but also some characteristic differences. Arable land, for example, amounts to a mere 3% of the total area in Shetland, whereas it is almost 40% in Orkney. It used to be said that the typical Shetlander is a fisherman who occasionally does a bit of farming, while the Orkneyman is a farmer who occasionally devotes himself to fishing. Other differences have to do with the fact that Orkney is much closer to the Scottish mainland (the southernmost point of South Ronaldsay is only about a mile north of Caithness). This is, among other things, reflected in language in that the Orkney dialect is less distinct from mainland Scots/Scottish English.

In spite of their peripheral location, Orkney and Shetland should not be seen as isolated communities, neither in the past nor today. The islands have always been at the crossroads of shipping and trade, and have been subjected to different kinds of immigration and impulses from various peoples: the Norse settlers first arriving in the 9th century, the Scots gradually taking over from the early Middle Ages onwards, and the Dutch and German tradesmen in the Hansa period. The Northern Isles today are modern British societies, with excellent educational establishments and a highly developed infrastructure. While traditional local industries live on, such as the production of cheese and whisky in Orkney, yarn and knitwear in Shetland, the last few decades have seen major changes in population growth, oc-
cupation and life styles as a result of the activities related to North Sea oil. The real boom took place in the 1970s in connection with the construction work, but the population level is fairly stable and there is less unemployment than in Scotland as a whole. Shetland now has a population of about 23,000 (to be compared with 17,000 in the mid-sixties) and Orkney about 20,000.

Considering social stratification, Shetland and Orkney make the impression of being more egalitarian than most other regions in Britain. Erving Goffman, the renowned American social anthropologist, who did fieldwork for his Ph.D. thesis as a “participant observer” on Unst, Shetland’s northernmost island, was impressed by the general classlessness of the society. More than half of the working population work in services; the second largest category is self-employed, which could stand for running a spinning mill as well as home-based knitting. It is not uncommon for an individual to be employed in widely different spheres, as in the case of a Fair Islander who until recently (1) ran the local post office, (2) was a member of the crew of “The Good Shepherd” connecting Fair Isle with Shetland Mainland, (3) was the local butcher, (4) taught traditional fiddle music at the school, and (5) looked after hundreds of sheep. With regard to gender as a sociolinguistic factor, results from recent linguistic work suggest that it is not significant either. Orten (1991: 65) reports similar observations from Orkney.

In the 10th century Orkney and Shetland were invaded and settled by Vikings, probably coming from South West Norway, as described in the Orkneyinga Saga, Landnámabok and Historia Norvegiae. It is claimed that they defeated the Picts, who are believed to have been the indigenous inhabitants of the area but have left few traces. It is no coincidence that the name of the Icelandic saga documenting the early history of the Northern Isles is derived from Orkney – that is where the heart of the Viking earldom lay and other Scandinavian settlements such as Shetland and Caithness were seen from an Orkney perspective.

Orkney and Shetland remained all-Scandinavian, with a native language variety known as Norn, the first Germanic language to be spoken on the islands, until well into the 14th century, when the Scots began to come in, making the Scottish element in the joint earldom the dominant cultural influence extending northwards into the islands. In 1379 a Scotsman was appointed Earl of Orkney, which included the sovereignty of Shetland, and about a century later the islands became part of Scotland. A serious plea for reunion with Norway was put forward as late as 1905, in connection with the Sweden-Norway separation, but the islands have remained under Scottish and British rule. It should be pointed out, however, that the links with Scandinavia, especially Norway, were never broken, as so remarkably demonstrated through the support given to the Norwegian resistance movement during World War II (“the Shetland Bus”). The Scandinavian heritage is an integral part of Orkney and Shetland identity.
2. The linguistic background

Norn was the dominant language in Orkney and Shetland for at least 500 years, but a natural consequence of the political changes beginning in the late Middle Ages was a gradual shift from Norn to Scots. Owing to the scarcity of written sources we have neither a complete documentation of the structure of the Norn language nor of the rate and character of the process of change. There is an ongoing, heated debate considering the actual demise of Norn (Barnes vs. Rendboe), where a group of “Nornomaniacs” (cf. Waugh 1996) argue that it lived on at least until the end of the 19th century in Shetland. What real evidence there is, however, suggests that in both Orkney and Shetland it died out no later than the second half of the 18th century.

Today, the traditional dialects as spoken in the Northern Isles must be described as varieties of Scots, yet with a substantial component of Scandinavian, manifested above all in the lexicon but also in phonology and, to a lesser extent, in grammar. These varieties are often referred to as “Insular Scots”, recognized as one of the four main dialect divisions of Lowland Scots (cf. Grant and Murison 1931–1976; Johnston 1997).

Orkney and Shetland can be characterized as bidialectal speech communities with access to a choice of two discrete, definable forms of speech: one a form of standard, basically Standard Scottish English, and the other what Wells (1982) calls traditional-dialect. Orcadians and Shetlanders are generally aware of commanding two distinct varieties and they have names for these, e.g. “English” vs. “Shetland” or “Orcadian”. Admittedly, age-related differences have been observed: on the one hand young people are losing some of the traditional-dialect indexicals, on the other they often state explicitly that they do not wish to adapt to outsiders and tend to be scathing about islanders who do. It would, however, be difficult to find truly monolingual speakers of the traditional dialect today.

As some of the recordings will reveal, the “either-or” scenario is probably not quite categorical, especially not with regard to phonology. In fact, there may well be something of a continuum, where certain traditional-dialect features are stable, such as the palatalization of dental plosives, whereas others vary with the speaker, the situation, and the topic, such as th-stopping. The following account of Orkney and Shetland phonology is not restricted to one end of the continuum and includes some observations on the considerable regional variation found in the Northern Isles. The presentation should be viewed as a complement to the full-length description of Scots/Scottish English in this volume (cf. the contributions by Stuart-Smith, this volume, and Miller, other volume); in other words, it focuses on features where Orkney and Shetland accents differ from other accents in Scotland.
3. Research and data

There exists as yet no definitive description of the present-day phonology of the Northern Isles. A number of young scholars, however, are currently researching topics such as the Shetland vowel system, aspects of quantity in Orkney and Shetland speech, and dialect levelling in young speakers. The final results from this research, which tends to focus on realizations of Standard (Scottish) English rather than traditional dialect, are unfortunately not yet available at the time of writing this text.

The only existing full-length work on Orkney dialect as spoken in the 20th century is Marwick’s *The Orkney Norn* (1929). Confusingly, Marwick uses the term Norn both for the all-Scandinavian language once spoken on the islands and for contemporary Orkney dialect. His work is mainly a dictionary of the dialect but with a brief introduction to grammar and phonology and with phonetic transcriptions of all headwords. As the title suggests, it has a marked Scandinavian and historical bias, particularly apparent in the phonology, which takes the Old Norse sound system as its starting-point, simply listing its modern reflections in Orkney. Although contemporary evidence suggests that Marwick’s data are characterized by a touch of “Nornomania” and that he had preconceived notions of “correct” answers from his informants, his work is clearly of great importance for the present study. As a phonetician he seems very competent, and fairly narrow distinctions, such as [ɔ] vs. [ɔ] have been noted in individual entries.

Shetland dialect as spoken at the end of the 19th century was carefully documented in the Faroese scholar Jakob Jakobsen’s monumental *An Etymological Dictionary of the Norn Language in Shetland* (1928–1932). As the title suggests, it, too, has a clear Scandinavian bias but provides information about the language variety as a whole, including phonology (pre-structural, naturally). Jakobsen, who was a trained philologist in the German school, notes very fine distinctions indeed, to the degree that he has been accused of practising “phonetics run riot” (cf. Waugh 1996: 6). Some of his headwords have up to twenty-five different realizations, but there is no indication of a systematic account of vowels and consonants. This does not mean that he should be ignored in a study of Shetland phonology.

The phonological section of *The Linguistic Survey of Scotland* (LSS) (cf. Mather and Speitel 1986), which above all was designed to elicit vowel systems, included a number of localities in the Northern Isles (thirteen in Orkney, ten in Shetland). John C. Catford, who was instrumental in setting up the survey, took the view that Shetland phonology was unique among Scottish accents in its rich vowel system, palatalization of final /d/, /n/, and /l/, certain consonant mergers and characteristic syllable structure. Before the actual launching of the LSS, Catford found it necessary to do some pilot fieldwork in Shetland, “a phonological reconnaissance”, which resulted in a special Shetland section in the questionnaire, e.g. eliciting Scandinavian-based words expected to be realized with [ɔ], such as brööl ‘moo’. There was no similar highlighting of Orkney. Catford (1957: 75) assesses Shetland
dialect in general as having a “somewhat archaic character”, suggesting that its vowel system may be similar to Scots as spoken in the metropolitan area of Scotland in the 16th–17th centuries. Interestingly, aspects of Shetland verbal usage can also be characterized as archaic (cf. Melchers, other volume).

A recent excellent study of Insular Scots, i.e. Orcadian and ‘Shetlandic’, based on data from LSS and considering Catford’s preliminary analyses of vowel systems, can be extracted from Paul Johnston’s chapter on regional variation for the *Edinburgh History of the Scots Language* (Johnston 1997).

The only existing account of a particular Insular Scots accent is Elise Orten’s *The Kirkwall Accent* (Orten 1991), an M.A. thesis submitted at the University of Bergen, claiming to be “based on the London School of phonology”, but not making use of the Wells lexical sets.

An interesting source of information is John Tait’s article on Shetland vowels (Tait 2000). Tait, a native Shetlander, first began taking an interest in Shetland phonology for the purpose of creating a workable writing system. He takes a critical view of the LSS material and introduces the concept of “soft mutation”, i.e. the raising of certain vowels before certain consonants, which “provides, along with vowel length, a framework for looking at Shetlandic vowel phonology as a whole” (Tait 2000: 88; cf. section 4.1. below).

With the help of instrumental analysis, van Leyden (2002) has investigated vowel and consonant duration in Orkney and Shetland dialects, taking Catford’s impressionistic observations as her starting-point. Whereas her Shetland data suggested a Scandinavian-like pattern, Orkney showed more affinity with Standard Scottish English.

In addition to the research described above, this presentation draws on material collected for a project entitled *The Scandinavian Element in Shetland Dialect*, directed by the present writer. The material consists of tape-recordings eliciting phonological as well as lexical and attitudinal aspects. In addition, a great deal of material recorded for the purpose of oral history has been placed at my disposal by the Orkney and Shetland Archives. This is particularly useful since the interviewers are mostly dialect speakers themselves, which means that the informants do not tend to adapt their language.

For the purpose of this publication, recordings were made in Shetland and Orkney during the summer of 2002. Regrettably, however, the presentation will still have a marked “Shetland bias”, since considerably more data and information is available on the most northerly part of the Insular Scots region.

### 4. Orkney and Shetland phonology

With the exception of the table showing the realizations of lexical sets, this presentation is not explicitly organized according to region; in other words, there are
no specific Orkney and Shetland sections but the two speech communities are discussed jointly in connections with the various phonetic and phonological issues. Any known differences are of course indicated.

Orkney and Shetland may be small speech communities, but they are both characterized by considerable regional variation, not least evident from the LSS data. In his introduction, Jakobsen (1928–1932) claims that there are nine main dialect areas in Shetland, which, in turn, consist of several sub-areas; Fetlar, for example, which has an area of 39 sq. kilometres, is said to have several dialects, without further specification. In my opinion, such claims must be taken with a pinch of salt and may simply reflect idiosyncrasies.

The local accents mostly singled out as “deviant” by Shetlanders today are spoken in Whalsay and Out Skerries, two close-knit fishing communities east of Shetland Mainland. This view is corroborated by linguistic research, including my own fieldwork. Surprisingly, these particular localities were not investigated by LSS although they are mentioned in Catford’s pilot study (Catford 1957). In Orkney, the northernmost islands (Westray and North Ronaldsay) are held to be different, showing for example traces of palatalized consonants as regularly found in Shetland.

Some established regional variation is accounted for here, e.g. the front-back variation of PALM and START and the realization of initial <wh> as [æ] or [kw], but the bulk of the data refers to Orkney and Shetland accents in general, as commonly heard in the “capitals”, Kirkwall and Lerwick.

4.1. Phonological systems

A traditional phonological inventory of Shetland and Orkney vowels will, naturally, categorize them as Scots/Scottish English (cf. Stuart-Smith, this volume). In his pilot study for the LSS, Catford (1957) argues that most accents in Shetland (along with Angus and parts of Perthshire and Kincardineshire, which is plausible from a demographic point of view) display the maximal Scots vowel system of twelve monophthongs and at least two diphthongs. The twelve-vowel system typically makes a distinction between e.g. bread and bred, sale and sell, where the latter in the pair is considerably more open.

Johnston, who is alone in having made a phonemic inventory of the LSS data, does not dispute Catford’s claims, but draws attention to a series of changes in Shetland and Orkney accents that he calls “the Insular Clockwise Vowel Shift, from the direction in which the nuclei move from the point of view of a conventional vowel chart” (Johnston 1997: 449).

This shift implies that Older Scots /a/ is reflected as [æ], /e/ as [e] or [ei], /ə/ as [ə: ~ ə:], /ɔ/ and /ɔ:/ to [ɒ] or [ɒ:]. Further information from Johnston’s detailed inventory is included in the presentation of lexical sets below.

Tait (2000), also a discussion of LSS data and to some extent a critique of Johnston’s analysis, emphasizes the importance of “soft mutation” (his own term),
by which he means qualitative changes in a number of Shetland vowels before certain consonants, predictable according to phonetic environment. He refers to allophones occurring typically before voiceless consonants as “hard” and those which occur typically before voiced consonants as “soft”. The BATH vowel, for example, is raised from /a/ to /æ/ before /d/. Tait views these systematic changes, in part, as an alternative and an addition to the concept of a clockwise vowel shift. He summarizes his analysis in a vowel table, which lists as many as fifteen contrastive vowel phonemes, six of which have length as “potentially contrastive”. Tait’s interesting vowel analysis is further considered in the presentation of lexical sets.

In her traditional study of Orkney phonology, Orten (1991) identifies twelve vowel phonemes in the accent of her main informant: nine monophthongs and three diphthongs, viz. /i/, /iː/, /e/, /æ/, /a/, /ɔ/, /ɔː/, /ɔ/ /ɔː/ /ɔː/. A general finding by Orten is that the Kirkwall accent is heavily influenced by Standard Scottish English (StScE).

No attempt is made here to identify the number of contrastive vowel phonemes in Shetland or Orkney, however. As should be apparent from the above, such an inventory is very problematic, among other things for the following reasons:

– the wide span of the available speech continuum, from StScE to broad, traditional dialect on a Norse substratum;
– the considerable regional variation within the island communities;
– the striking effect of the phonetic environment as demonstrated by Tait

In connection with the last-mentioned point, a further complication is of course the effects of the Scottish Vowel Length Rule (SVLR). This rule is described in the main chapter on Scottish English (see Stuart-Smith, this volume). As shown by van Leyden (2002), the SVLR is fairly strictly applied in Shetland dialect today, but less so in Orkney, which she ascribes to the influence of “Standard English”. The main research question for van Leyden, however, was to test the claim first made by Catford (cf. section 3) that Shetland dialect retains a Scandinavian-like syllable structure, in that stressed monosyllables, when closed by a consonant, contain either a short vowel followed by a long consonant (VC:), as in back [bakː], or a long vowel followed by a short consonant (V:C), as in baulk [bak]. The results of the study, relying on instrumental analysis, basically confirmed this claim, also showing that it was particularly valid for traditional-dialect lexical items. The Orkney data, however, show that there “this particular relic of Norn has apparently been lost because of the strong influence of mainland Scots dialects” (van Leyden 2002: 15).

Catford (1957: 73) points out that most of the Scandinavian-based features in Shetland phonology have to do with consonants. He ascribes it to the fact that the Norn speakers “had a smaller ‘repertoire’ of consonants than the incomers, and failed to acquire some of the essential consonantal distinctions of Scots”. In addition to the existence of long consonants (geminates), there are, indeed, other interesting systematic characteristics. In Shetland as well as Orkney (though not mentioned in
Orten 1991), there is a categorical palato-alveolar affricate merger to the effect that a word pair such as *gin* and *chin* is homophonous, realized as */tʃiːn/*.

Another feature affecting the phonemic inventory is th-stopping, occasionally found in Orkney dialect, but categorical in Shetland accents, unless adapted to outsiders, i.e. towards the StScE end of the continuum. The familiar form of address, for example, is represented as *thu* or *thoo* in Orkney dialect writing, but as *du* in Shetland. Th-stopping has also taken place in mainland Scandinavia, but after the end of Viking rule in the Northern Isles. Hence it might be due to an independent innovation and/or to the never-ceasing close contact with Norway.

The realization of initial <wh> as in *wheel* and <kn> as in *knee* also deserves mention in this context. In Shetland, initial <wh> is usually [ʍ], but in some regions, notably the west side of Shetland mainland, the outlying islands of Foula and Papa Stour and some pockets on the east side, it is realized as [kw], even in lexical items such as *whisky* and *whole*. Hypercorrections are common in these accents, e.g. [hwin] for *queen*. Similar realizations are believed to have existed in Orkney, but there is no evidence in present-day speech (Marwick 1929). Initial /kn/ clusters are recessive in Shetland, but can still be heard in the speech of some older speakers realized as a voiceless velar nasal followed by [n]. A better-known variant, very lexically restricted, is characterized by enforced articulation of [k], sometimes followed by an epenthetic vowel. In dialect writing, this variant is often represented as *k-n* as in *k-nee*. This pronunciation is something of a stereotype and is particularly well known from an old phrase, denoting the simple Shetland fare in the old days, *kale and knockit corn*, where the force of alliteration obviously plays a part as well.

In Orkney, retroflex, “Scandinavian-like” realizations of */r/ + */s/ as [ʂ] in final position are the rule rather than the exception, i.e. in words such as *force*, *nurse*, *incomers*, *tours*.

### 4.2. Vowels

#### 4.2.1. Lexical sets

Variation in quantity is not indicated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Orkney</th>
<th>Shetland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>i ~ í ~ ē ~ ē</td>
<td>ī ~ ē ~ ē ~ ʰ ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>ɔ ~ ɒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>å ~ ɔ</td>
<td>ö ~ ʊ ~ ʌ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>u ~ u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a ~ a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2. Further comments relating to the lexical sets

KIT
This vowel is always short, but displays considerable qualitative variation, most of which is not exclusive to Insular Scots. The last allophone in the Shetland column is, however. It is found before labials and velars. A piece of evidence of its use before the velar nasal is the following cross-dialectal miscomprehension as experienced in a Shetland knitting course by the present writer: The local teacher asked one of the participants, a lady from Lancashire working on a pair of gloves, whether she had trouble with her fingers, which was perceived as fungus.

DRESS
is usually half-long and often fully-long. Before /d/ and /n/ which are dental in Shetland, it is commonly realized as an upgliding vowel [ɛi]. This is probably
what some lay observers have in mind when they talk about “palatalized” conso-
nants.

TRAP
There are raised variants in Fair Isle and some Orcadian accents. Before certain
consonants, on the other hand, notably the cluster /nd/, the realization is generally
[αː], so-called HAND darkening (Johnston 1997: 485).

STRUT
tends to be rounded, especially in Shetland.

NURSE
As in Scots generally, there is no NURSE merger.

PALM AND START
vary regionally. The use of a back vowel may signal locality as well as influence
from Standard varieties.

GOOSE
In traditional Shetland dialect, a great number of words in this set have an [ø]
vowel. It is popularly believed to be a preserved Norn feature, and is indeed
typically found in Scandinavian-based vocabulary, such as tröni ‘pig’s snout’,
and lôf ‘palm of the hand’, but also in more modern words, such as curious, poor
(with a lowered variant [œ] before the /r/).

The use of these vowels is recessive.

PRICE
varies according to phonetic environment in quality (cf. the table) as well as quan-
tity.

MOUTH
varies along the dialect continuum, i.e. the monophthong is a regular feature of the
traditional dialects.

SQUARE
is very distinctive in Fair Isle and Whalsay, realized as [ɔɪ].

NORTH AND FORCE
are clearly distinctive in the speech of many Shetlanders and Orcadians.
4.3. Consonants – some additional remarks

Consonants that are alveolar in English English, e.g. /d/, /t/, /n/, are generally dental in Shetland accents and /ʃ/, too, is fronted. /l/ is clear. In fact, the articulatory setting in Shetland speech is generally fronted, as shown by some palatograms made for the project investigating the Scandinavian element in Shetland dialect (cf. section 3 above).

In restricted areas (Whalsay and Out Skerries in Shetland, North Ronaldsay in Orkney), /k/ and /g/ before front vowels are palatalized/affricated: cake [tʃɛːk], skerries [ˈstʃɛːris]. During my fieldwork in Whalsay in the early 1980s, a lady told me that unless her grandchildren pronounced cake in the proper “Whalsa” way, they would not get a piece! Some recent data collections suggest that this feature is now recessive.

4.4. A note on prosody

Neither Shetland nor Orkney intonation has been researched. It is popularly believed that the accents have a Scandinavian ring about them. Yet, impressionistically, there seems to be nothing remarkable about the Shetland tone of voice.

A difference between Shetland and Orkney, however, is the unmistakable intonation of the latter. It is often held to be Scandinavian in character, but seems, in fact, to be more similar to Welsh English. Orcadians themselves confirm that they are often taken for Welshmen. Yet the romantic (“Nornomaniac”) view lives on, as the following quote by the Orcadian poet Edwin Muir nicely illustrates:

The men spoke for the most part in a slow deliberate voice, but some of the women could rattle on at a great rate in the soft sing-song lilt of the islands, which has remained unchanged for a thousand years.
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Scottish English: phonology

Jane Stuart-Smith

1. Introduction

Defining the term ‘Scottish English’ is difficult. There is considerable debate about the position and appropriate terminology for the varieties which are spoken in Scotland and which ultimately share a common historical derivation from Old English. Here I follow Aitken (e.g. 1979, 1984) and describe Scottish English as a bipolar linguistic continuum, with broad Scots at one end and Scottish Standard English at the other. Scots is generally, but not always, spoken by the working classes, while Scottish Standard English is typical of educated middle class speakers. Following Aitken’s model, speakers of Scottish English either switch discretely between points on the continuum (style/dialect-switching), which is more common in rural varieties, or drift up and down the continuum (style/dialect-drifting), which is more characteristic of the urban dialects of cities such as Edinburgh and Glasgow. Throughout Scotland, Scots is increasingly becoming limited to certain domains, for example, amongst family and friends, while more formal occasions tend to invoke Scottish Standard English. Of course the boundaries between Scots and Scottish Standard English, and English English, spoken by a small percentage of the population, are not discrete, but fuzzy and overlapping.

Scottish Standard English, taken here as Standard English spoken with a Scottish accent, is a possible variety for many speakers across Scotland, depending on social context. There are only slight regional differences in Scottish Standard English across the country. Scots is also widely available to speakers in the appropriate context. The Scottish National Dictionary recognizes four main dialect divisions of Scots whose names reflect their geographical distribution across Scotland: Mid or Central Scots, Southern or Border Scots, Northern Scots, and Insular Scots. Alongside spoken Scots, there also exists a literary variety, Lallans (literally ‘Lowlands’), but this is rarely spoken and thus not discussed here. Northern Scots, particularly the variety spoken in the North East, is often called the Doric. Urban Scots spoken in the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh and across the Central Belt, is historically derived from forms of Central Scots.

The Scottish English continuum is the result of dialect contact and language change over many centuries. A brief account follows (for more details, see for example Jones 1997; Corbett, McClure, and Stuart-Smith 2003). Before the Anglian invasions during the seventh century AD, Scotland was predominately
Celtic-speaking. The invaders introduced a northern variety of Anglo-Saxon (‘Anglian’) into south-east Scotland. A century and a half later, the southern borders of Scotland were invaded again by the Vikings, who also separately reached the far north of the country. At the time of the Norman Conquest, most people in Scotland spoke a form of Celtic. Anglian was spoken in the south-east, and Norse was used in the far north and possibly in the western borders. Political developments in England and Scotland during the twelfth century led to an influx of northern English speakers into Scotland. The twelfth to the fourteenth centuries saw the gradual development of a particular variety of English in Lowland Scotland which we recognize as Scots, but which was known as ‘Inglis’ (Gaelic was called ‘Erse’ or ‘Irish’). By the fifteenth century Scots was noted as distinct from contemporary forms of southern English English. Despite the early Anglian settlement, the main historical basis of Scots was probably the language of northern English settlers from 1100 onwards, which was considerably influenced by Norse after the long period of Scandinavian occupation of the north of England. Prolonged contact with Norman French also contributed to its distinct character. Before the first large-scale literary work in Scots, Barbour’s *Brus* (1375), preliterary Scots is only scantily attested, e.g. in place names and glosses. In 1398 the Scottish Parliament moved from Latin to Scots as the language of record, and until the Union of the Crowns (1603), Scots flourished as a literary and spoken language. Thereafter, with increasing English influence, particularly after the Act of Union of the English and Scottish parliaments in 1707, the use of literary Scots declined beyond specific literary genres (e.g. comedy, satire) and gave way to Standard Southern English, which is today the written standard. The eighteenth century also saw the development of Scottish Standard English in the emergence of a variety of Standard English spoken with a refined Scottish accent, typically by the middle classes whose reference for prestige were Southern English accents of England. While literary Scots declined, spoken Scots remained vigorous, at least in rural areas and among the burgeoning working classes. Despite ongoing dialect change and levelling of Scots towards Scottish Standard English, this linguistic situation still persists, although with the additional qualification of Scots as either ‘good’, i.e. traditional and rural, or ‘bad’, i.e. degenerate and urban (cf. Aitken 1984: 529).

It is probably fair to say that a good proportion of the population of Scotland, now estimated at 5,062,011 according to the 2001 census (GROS 2003), are potential speakers of Scottish Standard English. There are no official estimates or census statistics for the number of Scots speakers in Scotland, although Scots is now counted as a ‘language’ by the European Bureau for Lesser-Used Languages. Defining the number of speakers of Scots in Scotland is extremely difficult, and cannot be easily resolved by asking speakers (Murdoch 1995; Maté 1996; for discussion, see Macafee 1997: 515–518). The problem is created and exacerbated by a number of interrelated factors:
1. the difficulty of recognizing Scots as a variety which is linguistically distinct from Scottish Standard English (for both linguists and native speakers);
2. the broad range of communicative competence in Scots found in speakers across Scotland;
3. the unresolved difficulty of determining whether Scots is an autonomous language;
4. the negative attitudes held towards Urban Scots, which is often regarded as a degenerate form of speech synonymous with slang (e.g. Macafee 1994);
5. the ongoing process of dialect levelling towards English throughout Scotland

Two recent studies (Murdoch 1995; Maté 1996) have attempted to survey the number of Scots speakers, and at the same time (Maté 1996) to evaluate the feasibility of assessing Scots-speaking population through a survey tool such as a Census question. The number of self-professed Scots speakers was relatively low in both sample surveys (57% in Murdoch, 30% in Maté). In both cases, older working-class speakers were more likely to classify themselves as speaking Scots. The conclusions of Maté’s research, sponsored by the General Register Office For Scotland, state that the “inclusion of such a Census question would undoubtedly raise the profile of Scots” (1996: 2), but at the same time do not argue strongly for the Census as the optimal tool for estimating Scots speakers:

Adequate estimates of the numbers of people who assess themselves as Scots speakers can be obtained from sample surveys much more cheaply than from a Census [...] A more precise assessment of genuine Scots language ability would require a more in-depth interview survey and may involve asking various questions about the language used in different situations. Such an approach would be inappropriate for a Census. (Maté 1996: 2)

The 2001 Census did not include a Scots language question.

It is possible to provide a very gross estimate of Urban Scots speakers by using Census data which refer to the population of the Central Belt. Of the total population of the Central Belt, 3,088,938, 66% are assigned to classes 3–8 of the socio-economic classification index used to compile the Census. If we guess that people assigned to these classes may in some domains and to differing degrees be more likely to use Scots than those in classes 1–2, on the grounds that Scots is likely to be continued in the lower middle and working classes (including those who have never worked or who are long-term unemployed), we could suggest that potentially this proportion has access to Urban Scots in some form. The population of the Central Belt makes up approximately two-thirds of the population of Scotland, and hence those classified as class 3–8 in that area make up 40% of the total population. People assigned to classes 3–8 in Scotland as a whole gives 67%, which might be very roughly indicative of a potential for Scots across the country, though this is much less certain.
Beside the varieties of English origin which make up the Scottish English continuum, there are also other languages spoken in Scotland whose influence on Scottish English is known to a greater or lesser extent. Scottish Gaelic was once widespread across Scotland, particularly in the Western Isles and Highlands of Scotland. The proportion of speakers bilingual in Gaelic and English living in Scotland is now estimated at 58,652 (1.2% of the population; a slightly higher figure reported comprehension of Gaelic: 93,282, 1.84%). These figures are a slight reduction from those registered in 1991 (65,978, 1.3%). The English spoken in these areas, and also in small Gaelic/English bilingual enclaves in the cities, such as in Partick in Glasgow, has particular phonetic and phonological characteristics, for example the realization of /l/ as clear in all environments (e.g. Johnston 1997: 510), or the use of voiceless /s, f, tʃ/ where voiced /z, ʒ, dʒ/ are expected, or the retroflex fricative [ʂ] as the outcome of /rs/ in words like force, some of which are due to Gaelic influence (see for example Wells 1982: 412–414).

Another small subset of the population of Scotland are recorded in the Census as belonging to an ethnic minority. The number of people defined as ‘Pakistani/Indian/Bangladeshi/Chinese/other Asian/Black-African/Black-Caribbean/Black-Other/Mixed/Other’ make up 2% of the total population of the country, and 5.45% of the population of Glasgow (GROS 2003). As Verma (1995: 120) has pointed out, this substantial ethnic minority population also has linguistic implications, leading to “the recent emergence of a bilingual, and culturally and linguistically diverse, population in schools, where for historical reasons monolingualism was the norm”. His analysis of data for ESL provision for the Lothian region reveal 54 languages other than English in primary schools, and 37 in secondary schools, with overall Punjabi and Chinese (Hakka/Cantonese and Mandarin) as most common. The extent of influence of South Asian languages such as Punjabi, on Scottish English and particularly Urban Scots, has not yet been investigated, but my own informal observations suggest that younger members of these communities do show distinctive features, particularly in the realization of FACE and GOAT as closer monophthongs (even with expected breaking), some retraction in the articulation of /t, d/ which are often fronter in Scottish English, and characteristic patterns of intonation (higher nuclear tones) and voice quality (more nasalization and tenser phonation).

Reviews of Scottish English phonology, such as that of Wells (1982: 393), typically concentrate on Scottish Standard English (ScStE), and for good reasons. After all, one could assume that Scots is a language distinct from English and hence not within the scope of any discussion of ‘English’ in Scotland. Certainly, Scots phonology is largely defined through a rather different lexical distribution resulting from differing historical developments in Scots (Wells 1982: 396). However, at the same time, excluding Scots means effectively excluding description of the possible phonological range of a very large number of speakers for whom Scots is a seamless part of their linguistic repertoire (see, e.g. Wells 1982: 395). Certainly any sociolinguistic analysis of urban Scottish English which includes phonetic or
phonological variables and which includes working-class or lower middle class (or even middle-middle class) speakers is going to encounter Scots in some form. This will be most overt in lexical alternations such as *hame* /e/ for *home*, usually ScStE /o/. It will be less clear for those vowels whose lexical incidence is largely the same, such as Glaswegian *KIT/BIT*, and where socially-stratified variation occurs along a continuum correlating with social class (e.g. Macaulay 1977). However, close analysis of such data often reveals particular patterns of variants which may occur in working-class speakers that make more sense if we can acknowledge them as ongoing developments within and from Scots. Vowels and consonants may appear to be ‘the same’ in Scottish Standard English and Scots, but the patterns of variation may be rather different, and these differences may correlate with linguistic heritage (Stuart-Smith 2003). Of course this explanation makes it sound as if ScStE and Scots are distinct linguistic entities and the difficulty is that of course they are not. Nevertheless the blurred observable socio-phonetic continua do seem to show focussing about two poles, or at least about one which is ‘ScStE-like’ and another which owes much, but certainly not everything, to what I call Scots here (see Stuart-Smith 2003: 117). Another motivation for including some discussion of Scots is provided by recent results of variation and change in Scottish English. For it is the speech of working-class youngsters which is showing the most vigorous innovation and change, and hence it seems that Urban Scots is undergoing the most far-reaching changes.

Thus I take the view here that Scottish English must refer to the entire continuum, not simply to Scottish Standard English, and Scots is therefore included in my discussion. However, I too must choose an uneasy compromise in what material may or may not be included, since there is not space here to outline the phonology of Scottish Standard English and Scots in their entirety. Given that around two-thirds of Scottish English speakers inhabit the ‘Central Belt’, which loosely refers to the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh and the relatively small strip of land which lies between and about them, and because much recent phonetic and phonological research has been carried out on these accents, the material in this chapter is biased towards these accents and especially Glaswegian. ‘Scots’ here generally refers to continuations of Central Scots found in contemporary Urban Scots. For an outline of historical developments in Scots see Macafee (2003), for the most comprehensive discussion of regional differences in Scots phonology, see Johnston (1997). Macafee (1997) provides a full review of sociolinguistic results, many of which are phonological.

2. **Phonological system**

I have already argued that Scottish English is a bipolar continuum, and thus to describe the phonology of this continuum we need, at least descriptively, to refer to the phonologies of the two ends, Scottish Standard English and Scots. Both systems...
share inventories of vowels and consonants, but differ in lexical incidence, that is in
the way that they are distributed across the lexicon. This results from the different
historical developments of the two varieties. In fact, for the majority of the lexicon,
lexical incidence largely overlaps, so we can recognise common or shared vowels,
e.g. KIT/BIT, or consonants, e.g. /l/, which differ only in having distinctive (and
sometimes overlapping) realizations in Scottish Standard English and Scots. Those
speakers who have access to the Scots end of the continuum may also use particular
Scots realizations for certain words, e.g. /u/ for /ʌ/ in house, and so have a distinct
system of Scots lexical incidence. Recent research based on recorded interviews
and conversations reveals that the actual number of words involved in Scots inci-
dence is small, and their overall frequency is low (Stuart-Smith 2003), though the
actual frequency may be higher in unobserved vernacular speech. Using the Scots
variant is strongly marked both for speaker and hearer in the Scottish context.

This division into Scottish Standard English and Scots systems inevitably pres-
tents an over-simplistic picture when we look at Scottish English speech. There are
certainly speakers who use Scottish Standard English more or less exclusively. But
there are far more who have access to Scottish Standard English, but who also have
access to Scots, and who drift between the two, and this is especially common
of those living in the Central Belt. What this means in practice is that there is a
large number of Scottish English speakers, of working-class background, either still
working class or recently moved into the middle classes, who may use distinctive
Scots variants for most words, but who may alternate to a Scots variant for a smaller
set of Scots words. Describing the phonological behaviour of these speakers, who
seem to use systematically an alternating system of vowels and some consonants,
preents quite a challenge to phoneticians, phonologists and sociolinguists (Stuart-
Smith 2003).

The phonetic and phonological description that follows owes much to previous
work which is difficult to supersede and where many more details and extensive
further bibliography may be found. Relevant works include Abercrombie (1979),
Aitken (1979, 1984), Johnston (1997) and Macafee (1997). Particularly useful stud-
ies for Edinburgh, and for Glasgow, which is the accent used as the example for the
tables and generally for comments unless noted, include Chirrey (1999), Johnston
maine (1978) and Stuart-Smith (1999, 2003). The source of my comments on Glas-
wegian largely derive from analysis of a recent corpus of Glaswegian collected in
1997 by me with the help of Claire Timmins, a Scottish fieldworker and researcher.

3. Vowels

The vowels of Scottish English are: /i, ɪ, e, ɛ, a, o, ɔ, ʌ, ə, ɒ, œ, æ/. De-
scribing these vowels is complicated by the fact that they show two distinct but
intersecting systems of lexical incidence typical of Scottish Standard English and Scots, which cannot be captured by using Wells’ (1982) lexical sets alone (e.g. Macafee 2003: 139). The picture is further complicated by Scots showing some regional differences for certain vowels. I therefore use three tables to illustrate the vowels of Scottish English. Table 1 shows the phonetic realizations of the vowels of Scottish Standard English together with variants typical of Urban Scots found in Glasgow, which is similar in many, but not all respects, to that of Edinburgh and across the Central Belt (e.g. Macafee 1994: 23–24). Table 2 gives the view from Scots, by showing Scots lexical incidence (after Johnston 1997). The column in the middle reflects the ‘system’ that is found in most Urban Scots speakers in Glasgow, that is certain vowels whose categories, if not realizations, are largely ‘shared’ across Scots and Scottish Standard English, and others which may alternate. Table 3 gives a very broad overview of regional variation in Scots across Central, Southern and Northern dialects according to Scots lexical incidence, which may be translated by detailed reference to Johnston (1997: 453–499); further details cannot be given here. All the tables emphasize phonetic realization, although inevitably the symbols are also used to represent phonemic categories, as in Table 2. After some deliberation I have chosen in general to use narrower transcriptions on the grounds that broader (and more abstract) symbols provoke impressions which may be potentially misleading phonetically and phonologically (see Foulkes and Docherty 1999: 12–13). This leads to the less usual representation of Scots BIT with /ɛ/ as opposed to /ʌ/, and following from this BET with /ɛ/.

**Table 1.** The vowels of Scottish English (example from Glasgow) – the view from Scottish Standard English (ScStE); after Stuart-Smith (1999: 206).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ScStE</th>
<th>Urban Scots</th>
<th>ScStE</th>
<th>Urban Scots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>ī ～ ē</td>
<td>ē ～ ē ～ ʌ ～ ɪ</td>
<td>CHOICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>MOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ʌ</td>
<td>NEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>ɔ ～ ð</td>
<td>o ～ ð</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>ʌ</td>
<td>ʌ</td>
<td>START</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>ʊ ～ ʊ ～ ʌ</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>o ～ ð</td>
<td>CURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>HEAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 1.** The vowels of Scottish English (example from Glasgow) – the view from Scottish Standard English (ScStE); after Stuart-Smith (1999: 206).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ScStE</th>
<th>Urban Scots</th>
<th>ScStE</th>
<th>Urban Scots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>ε ~ ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>STAY</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>STONE</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>STAND</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRTH</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERTH</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>ʌ</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>ʌi</td>
<td>lettER</td>
<td>ɪ ~ ʌ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIZE</td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>commA</td>
<td>ʌ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** The vowels of Scottish English (example from Glasgow) – the view from Scots; after Stuart-Smith (2003: 116). ↔ indicates alternation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Scots</th>
<th>Urban Scots (in practice)</th>
<th>ScStE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEET</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAT</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DEAD)</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i ↔ ɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATE</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BOTH)</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e ↔ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAIT</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAY</td>
<td>ɔi</td>
<td>ɔi ↔ e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOT</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ ↔ ʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e ↔ ʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIT</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BET</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>ʊ ↔ ʌʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAT</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o ↔ ɔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (continued)  The vowels of Scottish English (example from Glasgow) – the view from Scots; after Stuart-Smith (2003: 116). ↔ indicates alternation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Scots</th>
<th>Urban Scots (in practice)</th>
<th>ScStE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ã ↔ ç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LONG)</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ã ↔ ç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WASH)</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ã ↔ ç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAND</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>ç ↔ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ ↔ ã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUGHT</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>ç</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SNOW)</td>
<td>ç</td>
<td>ç ↔ o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PULL)</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ã ↔ u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW/DEW</td>
<td>jθ</td>
<td>jθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BITE</td>
<td>ði</td>
<td>ði</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRY</td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>ae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYE</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i ↔ ae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOIN</td>
<td>ði</td>
<td>ði ↔ oe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>oe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUP ‘jump’</td>
<td>æθ</td>
<td>æθ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.  Outline of main regional variants for Scots vowels. For locations of variants, see Johnston (1997), whose descriptions are the source of this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Scots</th>
<th>Southern Scots</th>
<th>Northern Scots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEET</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i, ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREE</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>εi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAT</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATE</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAIT</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOT</td>
<td>Ë</td>
<td>Ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i, i, e, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIT</td>
<td>Ë</td>
<td>Ë</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (continued) Outline of main regional variants for Scots vowels. For locations of variants, see Johnston (1997), whose descriptions are the source of this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Scots</th>
<th>Southern Scots</th>
<th>Northern Scots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BET</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>æ, a</td>
<td>e ~ ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>u, ü, ü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COW</td>
<td>ü, Åü</td>
<td>Åü</td>
<td>uu, u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAT</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o, ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o, o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>a, à, d</td>
<td>d, à, a</td>
<td>a, d, à, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUGHT</td>
<td>ö</td>
<td>a, d, ö</td>
<td>a, d, à, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUT</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>å, ë, ë, ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>jü</td>
<td>jü, iu, iü</td>
<td>jü, ju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEW</td>
<td>jü</td>
<td>jü</td>
<td>ju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BITE</td>
<td>öi, öi, ëi</td>
<td>öi, öi, ëi</td>
<td>ëi, ëi, ëi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRY</td>
<td>æe</td>
<td>æe, ëe</td>
<td>æe, æe ~ ëe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOIN</td>
<td>öi, öi</td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>ëi, ëi, ëi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>öe</td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>òi, òi, òi, oe, öi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUP ‘jump’</td>
<td>øtt, øtt, øu</td>
<td>øtt</td>
<td>ëy, òu, øtt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhoticity
The retention of underlying post-vocalic /r/ means that in comparison to many other English accents, Scottish English in general does not show phonemic centring diphthongs in words such as near, hair. However, the selection and realization of vowels before /r/ varies considerably. In Scottish Standard English, in words such as fir, fern and fur, some speakers will show one vowel /I/ or /Æ/, others two /e, η/, and still others all three /i, ë, η/. It is also possible to hear the realization [ə] in some types of ScStE (Johnston 1997: 470). There are also differences in the back vowel used before /r/ in NORTH and FORCE (for more discussion, see Wells 1982: 407–408; Macafee forthcoming). In Scots it is common to find vowel breaking in the form of epenthetic schwa emerging before /r/ (and /n, l/) after most high vowels (e.g. MEET, MATE, COAT); see Johnston (1997: 455).

Vowel length
An important aspect of Scottish vowels is vowel length. The Scottish Vowel Length Rule (SVLR, also called ‘Aitken’s Law’) refers to the phenomenon whereby vow-
els are phonetically long in certain environments: before voiced fricatives, before /r/, and before a boundary, including a morpheme boundary. Thus the vowels in breathe, beer, bee, and agreed are longer than in brief, bead, and greed. In diphthongs, e.g. PRICE/PRIZE (BITE/TRY), the SVLR manifests itself in quantity and quality differences which may be phonemic in Scots, e.g. aye [æ], ay [ɔi]. In the refined accents of ScStE, such as ‘Kelvinside’ (Glasgow) and ‘Morningside’ (Edinburgh), these diphthongs can be merged stereotypically as [æ] and show a raised first vowel followed by a reduced second vowel (Johnston 1985: 39, 1997: 493). The SVLR still operates in most varieties of Scots and in Scottish English in general, though it appears to be receding in some middle-class speakers in Edinburgh and in children of English-born parents (Jones 2002: 78). Recent accounts of the SVLR based on durational data conclude that the monophthongs /i, u/ and the diphthong /ai/ alone are subject to the SVLR.

KIT
The usual realization of this vowel in ScStE is [i], though it is often more open [ɛ]. Corresponding to KIT is Scots BIT which is generally in the region of [ɛ] but in certain contexts, e.g. after labials, as in milk, fill, may be substantially lowered and retracted and even merged with CUT (Johnston 1997: 468). A socio-phonetic continuum stretches between KIT/BIT, such that the realization shows clear differences according to class. This has been investigated in Edinburgh (Johnston and Speitel 1983) and Glasgow in the 1970s (Macaulay 1977) and again in the 1990s (Stuart-Smith 1999: 207). In all cases lower-class speakers used lower and more retracted variants than those of higher-class speakers. In a recent study by Viktoria Eremeeva and myself, acoustic data from male Glaswegian speakers show middle-class men using the highest vowels, but middle-class boys using the frontest variants, but lower, at the same height as working-class speakers. Interestingly, in spontaneous speech working-class boys are not as retracted as working-class men, suggesting a move away from stereotypically retracted localized variants for this vowel. Though not part of our analysis, we also noticed that [ɛ] was usual even in contexts where CUT would be expected in these speakers.

DRESS
The ScStE vowel is closer than that of RP, and in Scots corresponding BET is closer still, represented here as [ɛ]; see Johnston (1997: 472).

NEVER
Abercrombie (1979: 74) discusses the possibility of a ‘third’ phoneme between /ʊ/ and /e/ for Scottish Standard English, occurring in a few words such as never, seven, heaven, devil, which he transcribes with /ɛ/, and which may be restricted to certain regions such as the West of Scotland, the Borders, and Edinburgh. My own experience from teaching Scottish students confirms /ɛ/ for some speakers
but with no obvious areal distribution and a good deal of individual variation (cf. Wells 1982: 404). In Scots the equivalent vowel is BIT or BET (Johnston 1997: 471).

TRAP/PALM/BATH
Scottish Standard English usually shows a single vowel for TRAP and PALM, and the same for BATH, represented here as /\a/, though Abercrombie (1979: 75–76) observes that “quite a lot of people, particularly in Edinburgh” do have two vowels but with slightly different lexical incidence, giving rise to /\a/ in e.g. value, salmon. The corresponding Scots vowel is CAT, whose realization tends to be more retracted in Glasgow (Macaulay 1977; Stuart-Smith 1999: 208) and even more so in Edinburgh (Johnston and Speitel 1983). Macaulay (1997) again found social stratification in the realization of /\a/, with fronter variants in higher class speakers and backer ones in lower class speakers. Some of Macaulay’s Class I speakers showed the very front [æ] which is stereotypical of the speech of the middle-class ‘Kelvinside’/‘Morningside’ areas (Wells 1982: 403), where it is said that “‘sex is what the coal comes in’ and ‘rates are large rodents akin to mice’” (Johnston 1985: 37). As in Macaulay’s data, the working-class pronunciation in the 1997 Glasgow data was more retracted than that of middle-class informants, though with some unexpected alignment of allophonic variation with English English lexical incidence such that fronter allophones were found in e.g. cap [kap] and backer ones in e.g. car [ka\r] (Stuart-Smith 1999: 209).

LOT/CLOTH/THOUGHT
Again, Scottish Standard English usually shows one vowel here, transcribed /\o/, but some speakers may have a distinction between LOT and THOUGHT, with again a slightly different lexical incidence such that e.g. lorry would select /\o/ rather than expected English English /\o/ (Abercrombie 1979: 76). Abercrombie observes that an /\o/ contrast assumes an /\a/ contrast. In Urban Scots COT and CAUGHT are distinct but with different realizations, [\o] and [\o] respectively (Johnston 1997: 490).

GOOSE/FOOT
According to Wells (1982: 401), “from a diagnostic point of view, the most important characteristic of the Scottish vowel system is its lack [...] of a phoneme /\o/”. The vowels of these two sets are together realized as a high, usually rounded, vowel which is central or even front, transcribed here as [\u]. As for LOT/THOUGHT and TRAP/PALM, ScStE speakers may show two vowels here, but this is less usual and presumes the other contrasts (Abercrombie 1979: 76–77). The corresponding Scots vowel is OUT, whose realization tends to be fronter (on Scots OUT-fronting, see Johnston 1997: 475), and can even be unrounded to [\i]. (GOOSE and FOOT correspond to the Scots set BOOT and so select the vowel of BIT, though lexical
‘bleeding’ leading to replacement with ScStE /u/ is gradually progressing: Johnston 1997: 466). As with KIT/BIT and TRAP/BATH, PALM/CAT, there is sociolinguistic variation in the realization of GOOSE, FOOT/OUT. Macaulay (1977) reported backer variants in higher class speakers and fronter variants in lower class informants.

FACE/GOAT
The vowels of these sets tend to be monophthongs, though some Scottish Standard English speakers, such as the rather unusual-sounding Scottish-English-speaking BBC Scotland newscasters, will sometimes use diphthongs similar to Southern English English (Macafee 1983: 35). The Scots monophthongs in MATE/BAIT and COAT/COT can be realized as closer vowels. Apart from phonetic breaking before /r/ (and sometimes /n, l/) in working-class speakers in the 1997 Glasgow corpus, there was very little evidence for a diphthongal realization of these vowels in any speakers.

SQUARE
In the Urban Scots of Glasgow, /er/ from all sources, including MORE/MATE and POOR/BOOT, may be lowered to BET, perhaps as a result of Irish/Ulster influence. Macafee’s (1994: 225) analysis of her Glaswegian sample showed weak support for this as a particularly Catholic feature.

Scots OUT
The selection of the Scots vowel /u/ in a word like house (OUT) tends to correlate with social stratification, such that middle-class speakers will avoid Scots variants and working-class speakers will use them to differing degrees depending on the alternating vowel and even the word involved. Though Macafee (1994) has analysed the results for 11 alternating vowels in her sample of Glaswegian, the Scots alternation which has received the most attention is that of OUT (see e.g. Macaulay 1977; Johnston and Speitel 1983; Stuart-Smith 2003). The results of these studies confirm that: (i) the Scots form is characteristic of working-class speech; (ii) few lexical items occur in these data (only 12 in the 1997 Glasgow corpus); (iii) speakers always show some alternation (sole use of Scots /u/ is not attested); and (iv) that the alternation appears to be stable over the past 30 years (in Glaswegian at least). This last finding is interesting as it demonstrates that some features of Scots phonology are vigorous.

4. Consonants
The consonants of Scottish English are: /p, b, t, d, k, g, f, θ, v, δ, s, z, Ё, ʒ, x, m, h, tʃ, dʒ, r, l, m, n, ŋ, w/. As for the vowels, alternations arise from Scots lexical incidence, but fewer consonants are
involved: /v ~ 0/, e.g. give/gie; /θ ~ 0/, e.g. with/wi'; /nd ~ n/, e.g. stand/staun; /t ~ d/, e.g. bastard/bastart; /l ~ V/, e.g. football/fitbaw.

We now have a substantial body of information about the realisation of consonants in Urban Scots, largely as a result of recent work on Glaswegian (e.g. Stuart-Smith 2003), but also arising from other studies (see e.g. the summaries in Johnston 1997 and Macafee 1997). To date 11 consonant variables have been considered in detail from the 1997 Glasgow corpus: t, th, dh, s, x, hw, l, r-realisation, postvocalic r, k, w. In what follows, I restrict my discussion mainly to Scottish English of the Central Belt; for details for regional variation, particularly in Scots, see Johnston (1997).

Stops
Stops are generally reported to be less aspirated in Scottish Standard English (e.g. Wells 1982: 409) and the same is said for Scots, though Johnston (1997: 505) notes that aspiration is creeping into the dialects of the Central Belt. My auditory impressions from the Glasgow data are also that all speakers are less aspirated than typical Southern English English, but this has yet to be investigated acoustically (a recent student project with two informants showed consistently shorter duration of aspiration for a working-class speaker as opposed to a middle-class speaker for /t, p, k/). The place of articulation for /t, d/ can be alveolar or dental, with dental articulations reported for Scots (Wells 1982: 409; Johnston 1997: 505). In Glasgow all speakers showed degrees of advanced tongue tip/blade, indicating a fronted or dental articulation for /t, d/ (and /l, n/); see Stuart-Smith (1999: 216). I deal with /t/-glottalling in the next section, but note here that glottalling of /p/ and /k/ is also reported for Glaswegian, as are ejective realizations of emphatic utterance final stops. See Johnston 1997: 501 for regional variation in glottalling and pregglottalization in Scots.

/t/
/t/-glottalling, the realisation of non-initial /t/ with a glottal stop in words such as butter and bottle, is a stereotype of Glasgow speech and Urban Scots more generally (cf. e.g. Johnston and Speitel 1983; Macafee 1994: 27, 1997; Johnston 1997: 500). It is even spreading into Scots as a general Scottish feature (Johnston 1997: 501). In Glasgow, /t/-glottalling is clearly evidenced in Macaulay’s data with the lower classes using glottals extensively (90% for Class III). An analysis of the 1997 Glasgow data revealed similar patterns, and a cautious real-time comparison across the two suggested some increase among working-class speakers, especially girls (though with the already high numbers in 1973 there was little room for manoeuvre).

Perhaps more interesting were the qualitative patterns of /t/-glottalling which were found from a close analysis of my 1997 corpus. In other accents of English /t/-glottalling is a feature which seems to correlate with social class on a continuum,
with higher class speakers using few glottals and lower classes using more. On the face of it a similar impression can be gained from looking at Scottish English, and certainly this is how it looks for the 1973 and 1997 results. However, when I analysed the patterning of glottals in working-class speakers and middle-class speakers according to phonetic environment, comparing the usage in prepausal position (e.g. *but*) compared with word-final prevocalic (e.g. *a lot of*) and intervocalic position (e.g. *water*), a striking difference in patterning emerged. When all instances where [t] was used (exceptions to /t/-glottalling) were considered, it became clear that /t/-glottalling is the norm for working-class speakers, and we could even say obligatory for working-class adolescents. All exceptions are clearly motivated. Middle-class speakers however show a different pattern. For them [t] is the norm, and /t/-glottalling optional. That these distributions amounted to systematic patterning was shown when speakers tried to shift socially through /t/-glottalling. Movement sociolinguistically seems to require a systematic shift which neither middle- nor working-class speakers achieved successfully. Middle-class children moving ‘down’ approximated the working-class pattern but were not entirely successful, retaining traces of typical middle-class patterning. Working-class adults trying to move ‘up’ approximated their middle-class peers intervocally, but again retained working-class patterns in the categorical use of glottals before a pause. Thus successful style-shifting along the Scottish English continuum requires more than simply increasing or reducing the number of glottals used, and demonstrates the continuation of different constraints inherited from Scots and Scottish Standard English respectively. Variants other than released [t] or glottals were less usual.

/x, ʍ/
/x, ʍ/ are not generally found in southern accents of English English and RP (Wells 1982: 408). However, the extent to which these categories are intact for some speakers of Urban Scots is doubtful. Macafee’s (1983: 32) observation of [k] and [w] as possible realisations in localized Glasgow speech was confirmed for the speech of the working class speakers in 1997, especially the adolescents, for whom [k] and [w] are the majority forms. Johnston (1997: 507) reports [w] for [ʍ] in Edinburgh, and a recent study of the speech of the new town Livingston, which lies between Edinburgh and Glasgow, found [k] but not [w] (Jones 2002: 57). [x] and [ʍ], which we might expect to be characteristic of Urban Scots, are generally maintained in Scottish Standard English. (In Northern Scots [ʍ] has been replaced by [f], see Wells 1982: 397–398; Johnston 1997: 507).

/θ, ɹ/
In Scottish Standard English /θ, ɹ/ are realized as voiceless dental fricatives. In Urban Scots /θ/ has the traditional variant [h], in e.g. *think, something*, which
may also be completely deleted in e.g. think, both, and a possible retroflex or alveolo-palatal fricative or [ɹ] in the initial cluster /θɹ/, in e.g. three (Wells 1982: 410; Macafee 1983: 33). Macafee (1983: 34) noted sporadic instances of /θ/ for /θ/ in Glasgow. By the time of the collection of the 1997 Glasgow corpus [θ] had emerged as a variable but frequent variant in the speech of working-class adolescents (Stuart-Smith 1999: 209). Interestingly [θ] is added to the existing Scots variants to form a constellation of ‘non-standard’ variants for /θ/ such that in spontaneous speech [θ] accounts for less than a third of the overall variation in these speakers.

The traditional Urban Scots variant for /ð/, particularly in intervocalic position, is the tap [ɾ], in e.g. brother, though complete elision is also common, in e.g. the tag, an(d th)at (Wells 1982: 410; Johnston 1997: 508). Again the working-class adolescents in the 1997 Glasgow sample showed [v] for /ð/ in words such as smooth; [v] joins the traditional Scots variants to extend the array of possible ‘non-standard’ variation, though unlike /θ/ this makes up a much smaller proportion of the variation (under 20%).

Stopping of /θ, ð/ occurs occasionally in Scots in Glasgow (Johnston 1997: 506) where it may be due to Irish/Ulster influence.

/s, z/
Urban Scots is commonly noted as having a distinctive articulation of /s, z/, which has been described as apico-alveolar (e.g. Johnston 1997: 509). Auditory and acoustic analyses of the 1997 Glasgow corpus suggest that the traditional Scots articulation is also governed by gender.

/h/ and /j/
/h/-dropping is not generally reported for Scottish English (Wells 1982: 412). It is only rarely apparent in e.g. enclitic him, her. Similarly, yod-dropping appears to function much as Wells states, i.e. after [l] and commonly after [s], with only sporadic instances elsewhere. Clusters with yod, such as [tj] in nature, which have undergone coalescence to [tf] in Standard English are still retained by some speakers (Wells 1982: 412; Macafee 1983: 32–33). In Urban Scots /hj/ in e.g. Hugh, human can be realized as [ʃ] or [ʃ]; see Johnston (1997: 509).

/r/
Scottish Standard English is generally rhotic (Wells 1982: 10–11); in the 1997 Glasgow data articulated /r/ made up around 90% of all variants for postvocalic /r/ in middle-class speakers (Stuart-Smith 2003: 128–129.). In Urban Scots /r/-vocalization is becoming increasingly common (Johnston 1997: 511). Romaine (1978) reported loss of postvocalic /r/ in the speech of working-class children in Edinburgh, where she also noted gendered distribution of variants, with girls showing more approximants and boys showing more r-lessness. The analysis of
postvocalic /r/ in the Glasgow data confirmed Macafee’s (1983: 32) comments in the discovery of extensive /r/-vocalization in working-class adolescents (Stuart-Smith 2003). Two ‘vowel’ variant categories were set up: vowels with audible secondary velarization/pharyngealization (cf. Johnston 1997: 511), and ‘plain’ vowels with no audible secondary articulation. Interestingly, there appears to be subtle conditioning according to gender in the use of these variants: girls overall tended to vocalize more, and to favour plain vowels, especially in contexts such as before a consonant, e.g. *card* or unstressed prepausal, e.g. *better*; boys used both plain and velarized variants before a consonant, but preferred velarized vowels in words like *better* (Stuart-Smith 2003: 126–135).

The phonetic realization of /r/ is variable. Wells states that trills are unusual, and certainly I have rarely heard them amongst Scottish English students. More usual are approximants, post-alveolar [ɾ] and retroflex [ɻ], and alveolar taps [ɾ], which vary according to position in the word, phonetic environment, and sociolinguistic factors. Scots is usually said to favour taps, though Johnston (1997: 510) notes that [ɾ], more typical of Scottish Standard English, is encroaching. My analysis of the realization of /r/ in the Glasgow data showed that all variants were present in all speakers, with differences in distributional patterns and tendencies. Taps emerged as more common in working-class speakers (especially men) but only in read speech; retroflex approximants were more common in middle-class speakers. There was a slight tendency for the working-class adolescents, who produced a high proportion of vocalized variants, to use taps for articulated /r/.

/l/

Across the Scottish English continuum, the secondary articulation of /l/ tends to be dark in all positions in the word (Wells 1982: 11; Johnston 1997: 510). Exceptional use of clear /l/ is sometimes found in Highland English and occasionally in Scottish Standard English with a distribution similar to that of English English (Macafee 1983: 33). In the 1997 Glasgow data velarized, and velarized and pharyngealized secondary articulations were heard. /l/-vocalization was a historical process in Scots, yielding common forms such as *a’ all* (Macafee 1983: 38). More recently, /l/-vocalization of the kind usually found in southern English, to a high back vowel [ɤ] or [o] (Wells 1982: 258) was reported in Glaswegian (Macafee 1983: 34), and confirmed by subsequent analysis, especially for working class adolescents.

### 5. Suprasegmentals

In describing vowels and consonants, the preceding description has emphasized segments, perhaps at the expense of obscuring recurring traits which may occur in
groups of speakers and which may arise from shared features of the longer domain phenomenon of voice quality. However, there are certainly links between a number of features noted above for Glaswegian and features of voice quality in the same data. For example, /r/-vocalization to a vowel with secondary velarization with some pharyngealization in working-class speakers fits well with my earlier observation of raised and backed tongue body with possible retracted tongue root for the same speakers (Stuart-Smith 1999: 215).

Apart from the work of Brown and colleagues on Edinburgh intonation (e.g. Brown, Currie, and Kenworthy 1980), there has been surprisingly little research on intonation in Scottish English. Cruttenden (1997: 136) notes that for accents of Scotland other than those found in Glasgow, statements and questions will invariably show “a sequence of falling tones”. The main difference between the speech of Edinburgh and Glasgow is in terminating mid-to-low-falls in Edinburgh (e.g. Brown, Currie, and Kenworthy 1980) but a tendency towards high rising patterns in Glasgow (e.g. Macafee 1983: 36; Stuart-Smith 1999: 211). The extent to which these continue patterns from earlier forms of Scots is not known, though Northern Irish influence may be invoked to some extent to explain distinctive Glaswegian patterns (Macafee 1983: 37; on Irish English influence more generally, see Cruttenden 1997: 133). It seems unlikely that Glasgow’s ‘high rise’ is linked to the apparently rapid spread of high-rising terminal intonation patterns in southern accents of English English (see Cruttenden 1997: 129).

Even less has been said about rhythm in Scottish English, bar Abercrombie’s (1979: 67) comments that disyllabic words such as table are often pronounced with a short first syllable and long second syllable. This is also my impression when teaching rhythm to Scottish English students. Abercrombie also makes the observation that syllabification in Scottish Standard English tends to favour open syllables, so that a phrase like St Andrews will be syllabified into [sn` tandru`z].

6. **Major issues in current research**

Good summaries of previous phonetic, phonological and sociolinguistic research on Scottish English may be found in Aitken (1984) and Macafee (1997). The most recent fundamental research into the phonetics and phonology of Scottish English has been carried out by James Scobbie (Queen Margaret University College, Edinburgh), who is concentrating on empirical investigation of the Scottish Vowel Length Rule using articulatory and acoustic phonetic analysis (e.g. Scobbie, Hewlett and Turk 1999), but who is also working on other aspects of Scottish English, such as the voicing contrast as reflected in Voice Onset Time (VOT) systems in Shetlandic. Closely related to Scobbie’s work is that of Ben Matthews who looked at the acquisition of the Scottish Vowel Length Rule in Edinburgh children.
The reader is referred to the full bibliography on the CD-ROM for the relevant studies mentioned in this section.

Much other current research on the phonology of Scottish English is concerned with the interrelation of accent and user. Dominic Watt (Aberdeen) is developing research on accent and identity, looking specifically at phonetic and phonological features of Scottish English on the Scottish/English Border, as illustrated by the inhabitants of Berwick upon Tweed. Attitudes and accent change have been investigated recently by Karen Torrance (2002). She tracked the relationship between incoming diffusing features such as /th/-fronting in Glaswegian and attitudes of speakers using such features towards different regional accents of English. Her complex results show that attitudes seem to relate to language use for certain speakers only, thus highlighting the role of the individual in this process. Call centres, outlets of companies which conduct their business with customers using the telephone, have flourished in the Central Belt of Scotland. Features of Scottish English in call centre interaction is thus an obvious but neglected area of research which formed the focus of Suzy Orr’s (2003) study. She found some evidence of accommodation in Glaswegian agents to their callers.

Phonological variation and change in the Scottish English of Glasgow is the subject of my own research with colleagues Claire Timmins, Eleanor Lawson and Viktoria Eremeeva (e.g. Stuart-Smith 2003), which tackles some of the issues raised above and others including sound change in Glaswegian, real time change in Glaswegian, social factors and sound change, mobility and dialect contact in Glaswegian, and acoustic analysis in sociolinguistic investigation. Most of my work has concentrated on consonant change, but Eremeeva (2002) started the work of analysing vowels in the 1997 corpus. The first phase of the work, which took 11 consonants and considered them both singly and together, has identified innovation and change led by working-class adolescents, with few indications of gendered distribution. What emerges from these results is the extent to which Urban Scots is developing as a dynamic mixture of vigorous local and non-local features. Exactly how and why the dialect is changing in these ways remains the subject of further research.

* I am very grateful to the Leverhulme Trust for supporting the data analysis with a research grant (F/179/AX) and the AHRB for supporting its writing up with a research leave grant. Thanks are due to Claire Timmins who acted as researcher on the Leverhulme project, and to Wolf-Gerrit Fruh who compiled the Census statistics. I am grateful to Clive Upton for his editing, and to Caroline Macafee, Claire Timmins, Suzy Orr, and Dom Watt who commented on an earlier draft. All errors and opinions remain my own.
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1. Introduction

The English language was introduced to Ireland with the coming of the Anglo-Normans from West Wales in the late 12th century. Among the settlers were English speakers who coexisted with the Norman French in Ireland, settling down in the towns of the east coast of Ireland and providing the cells out of which the English-speaking population of Ireland was later to emerge. Since the late 12th century, the fate of English has been closely linked with that of the Irish language which it came largely to replace in the late modern period. In addition, the interaction of existing forms of English with the Scots imported in the early 17th century in the north of the country led to the linguistic separation of Ulster, the most northerly province, from the rest of the country. This state of affairs provides the rationale for the division of English in Ireland into two broad groups as reflected by divisions in the current chapter. For the many varieties of English on the island of Ireland there are different designations.

Anglo-Irish is an established term in the literature to refer to works written in English by authors born in Ireland and is also used in politics. The difficulty with the term is its occurrence in these other spheres. Within the context of other varieties, Canadian English, for instance, the term is still used to refer to English in Ireland.

Hiberno-English is a learned term which is derived from the Latin term Hibernia ‘Ireland’. The term enjoyed a certain currency in the 1970s and 1980s but in the 1990s many authors ceased to employ it, as it often needs explanation to a non-Irish audience or readership. However, not all authors share this opinion, see for example Dolan (1998) who uses the term Hiberno-English.

Irish English is the simplest and most convenient term. It has the advantage that it is parallel to the designations for other varieties, e.g. American, Australian, Welsh English and can be further differentiated where necessary. Throughout the present chapter this term will be used.

In the north of the country terms are used which reflect historical origins, e.g. Ulster Scots for the English stemming from the initial Lowland Scots settlers, Mid-Ulster English for geographically central varieties which are largely of northern English provenance. There is much discussion of the status of Ulster Scots as a possible separate language and similarly the status of Scots is debated. A discussion of this issue is, however, well beyond the brief of the current chapter.
Contact English is found occasionally to refer globally to varieties spoken in areas where Irish is also spoken (in Donegal, Connemara and Kerry, see maps at end of chapter).

1.1. Historical background

The most cursory glance at the history of Irish English reveals that it is divided into two periods. The first period starts in the late 12th century with the arrival of the first English-speaking settlers and finishes around 1600 when the second period opens. The main event which justifies this periodisation is the renewed and vigorous planting of English in Ireland at the beginning of the 17th century. One must first understand that during the first period the Old English, as this group is called in the Irish context, came increasingly under the influence of the Irish. The Anglo-Normans who were the military leaders during the initial settlement had been completely absorbed by the Irish by the end of the 15th century. The progressive Gaelicisation led the English to attempt planting the Irish countryside in order to reinforce the English presence there. This was by and large a failure and it was only with James I that successful planting of (Lowland Scottish and English) settlers in the north of the country tipped the linguistic balance in favour of English in the north. During the seventeenth century (after the Cromwellian campaigns at the middle of the century) new forms of English were brought to Ireland: Scots in the north and West/North Midland varieties in the south (where there had been a predominantly West Midland and south-west input in the first period). Although there was renewed Anglicisation, on the east coast, in Dublin and other locations down to Waterford in the south-east, there is a definite continuation of south-west English features which stem from the imported varieties of the first period. This fact underlies a distinctive east coast dialect area.

1.1.1. The medieval period

The documentary record of medieval Irish English is confined for all intents and purposes to the collection of 16 poems of Irish provenance in BM Harley 913 which are known collectively as the Kildare Poems (Heuser 1904; Lucas 1995) after one of the poems in which the author identifies himself as from the county of Kildare to the south-west of Dublin. The collection probably dates from the early 14th century. The language of these poems is of a general west Midland to southern English character. Many of the idiosyncratic features can be traced to Irish influence (see discussion in Hickey 1993). It is a moot point whether the Kildare Poems were written by native speakers of Irish using English as a H-language in a diglossic situation or whether indeed the set was written by one or more individuals. Apart from the Kildare Poems, medieval Irish English is attested in a number of verse fragments and in city records from Dublin and Waterford, comments on which can be found in Henry (1958).
1.1.2. The early and late modern period

At the end of the 16th century attestations of Irish English begin to appear which are deliberate representations of the variety of the time. These are frequently in the guise of literary parody of the Irish by English authors (Bliss 1979). The value of these written representations of Irish English for reconstructing the language of the time has been much questioned and it is true that little if any detail can be extracted from these sources. In addition most of the satirical pieces were written by Englishmen so that one is dealing with an external perception of Irish English at the time. Satirical writings are not the only source of Irish English, however. There are some writers, especially in the 19th century, who seriously attempt to indicate vernacular speech of their time, such as Maria Edgeworth in her novel Castle Rackrent (1801).

1.2. Language shift in early modern Ireland

Literary parodies do not reveal anything about the then relationship of Irish to English, the spread of English and the regional input from England. There were no censuses before 1851 which gave data on speakers of Irish and English. Adams (1965) is a useful attempt to nonetheless produce a linguistic cartography of Ireland at the beginning of the early modern period. The upshot of this situation is that there is no reliable data on the language shift which began in earnest in the early 17th century and which had been all but completed by the late 19th century.

It is clear that the Irish learned English from other Irish who already knew some, perhaps through contact with those urban Irish who were English speakers, especially on the east coast and through contact with the English planters and their employees. This fact had consequences for the nature of Irish English. Bliss (1977) pointed out that this fact is responsible for both the common malapropisms and the unconventional word stress found in Irish English. However, the stress pattern in verbs with final long vowels, e.g. distribute [distri'bjutː], educate [edju'kɛtː], can also be due to English input, particularly as late stress is a feature of southern Irish, not of the west and north, and so influence due to contact with Irish could only be posited for the south of Ireland.

Another point concerning the language shift in Ireland is that it was relatively long, spanning at least three centuries from 1600 to 1900 for most of the country. The scenario for language shift is one where lexical transfer into English is unlikely, or at least unlikely to become established in any nascent supraregional variety of English in Ireland. Such dictionaries as Ó Muirithe (1996) and to a lesser extent Dolan (1998) seem to reveal a large number of Irish loans in present-day Irish English. But the question of currency is the key issue here: there is a great difference between the vocabulary of an older agricultural generation (which is frequently reflected in the entries in these dictionaries) and a younger urban one.
In phonology and syntax the matter is quite different. Speakers who learn a language as adults retain the pronunciation of their native language and have difficulty with segments which are unknown to them. A simple case of this would be the substitution of English dental fricatives by stops (dental or sometimes alveolar, depending on region) in Irish English. A more subtle case would be the lenition of stops in Irish English, e.g. cat [kæt], which, while systemically completely different from lenition in Irish, could be the result of a phonological directive applied by the Irish learning English to lenite elements in positions of maximal sonority.

1.2.1. Contact Irish English

In present-day Ireland there are only a few small remaining enclaves scattered along the western seaboard where Irish is still spoken as a native language in a situation of unbroken historical continuity. Apart from this there is an increasing number of language enthusiasts who speak Irish as a second language and attempt to keep the language alive by using it as much as they can, frequently in an urban environment which is completely English-speaking. In principle, the rural setting just mentioned should be the one in which the language shift scenario of previous centuries (Hickey 1995) is replicated, thus enabling linguists to view the process of language contact and transfer in vivo. Despite this fact there are few studies of contact Irish English today although the Irish language in contact areas has repeatedly been the subject of investigation, e.g. Stenson (1991). This study was carried out on seven informants from the north west of Ireland (Co. Donegal) to see what kinds of /l/-sounds they showed in English. To this end their Irish was investigated. This variety of Irish shows three types of /l/-sounds: a velarised [h], a palatalised [ʎ] and a (lenited) neutral [l]. It turned out that the speakers used the last sound as the realisation of English /l/ in all positions (bar before /j/ as in million /mɪlʃn/ = [mɪʎʃn]) which tallies with the realisation of /l/ in the rest of the country where this was decided a century or two ago.

1.3. Supraregionalisation

It is obvious from English loanwords in Irish that early Irish English had not progressed through the major long vowel shift in England, e.g. Irish bacús ‘bakehouse’ shows unshifted /aː/ and /uː/. The play Captain Thomas Stukeley (1596/1605), the first widespread representation of Irish English in literary parody, consistently uses <oo> for words with /au/ from Middle English /uː/, e.g. toon for town. Furthermore, comments from Thomas Sheridan in the late 18th century (Sheridan 1781) show that Middle English /aː/, as in patron, still had not shifted, nor had Middle English /eː/ as in meat. But present-day Irish English shows little or no trace of these unshifted vowels. The reason is not that the shift took place in Irish English
some time in the 19th century but that the unshifted forms were replaced by mainstream English pronunciations due to a process which I have labelled supraregionalisation. The essence of this process is the replacement of salient features of a variety by more standard ones, frequently from an extranational norm, as with southern British English vis à vis Irish English. The motivation for this move is to render a variety less locally bound, more acceptable to a wider community, hence the term supraregionalisation.

1.4. Vernacularisation

The story of supraregionalisation does not end with the disappearance of strongly local features. There is another pathway which such features can take. This is the relegation to vernacular varieties. Take the instance of Middle English /eː/ as in beat /beːt/. This pronunciation is now confined to strongly local varieties where supraregionalisation has not taken place. Furthermore, non-local speakers can style-shift downwards to achieve a vernacular effect. Another example of this would be the use of youse or yez for the second person plural (also found in other Anglophone areas such as Tyneside). This is shunned by non-local speakers but can be employed when deliberately switching to a vernacular mode.

The process of vernacularisation has in some instances led to a lexical split. Consider the reflex of velarised [h] before [d] in Irish English: this led to the diphthong [au] as in the words old [aul] and bold [baul] with the common post-sonorant stop deletion. These forms are available alongside /oːld/ and /boːld/ to non-local speakers but the meanings are somewhat different as the original forms with [au] have gained additional meaning components: [aul] ‘old + affectionate attachment’, e.g. His [aul] car has finally given up the ghost, [baul] ‘daring + sneaking admiration’, e.g. The [baul] Charlie is back on top again.

2. Varieties of Southern Irish English

It is obvious that linguistically, as well as politically, Ireland is divided into two broad sections, the north and the south. The former consists of the six counties presently within the state of Northern Ireland and of the large county of Donegal which is part of the Republic of Ireland. The north has a complex linguistic landscape of its own with at least two major historical varieties: Ulster Scots, the speech of those directly derived from the original Lowland Scots settlers, and Mid-Ulster English, the speech of those descendants of English settlers to central parts of Ulster. In addition there is the sociolinguistically complex capital, Belfast. Co. Donegal by and large goes with the rest of Ulster in sharing key features of English in the province and also of the varieties of Irish used there.
The north of the country is quite distinct from the south, accents of northerners being immediately recognisable to southerners. A dividing line can be drawn roughly between Sligo, just south of Co. Donegal, and Dundalk on the east coast immediately below the border with Northern Ireland (Ó Baoill 1991). North of this line the accents are distinctly Ulster-like. South of this line the northern features rapidly give way to southern values. The term line here might imply a clearly delimited boundary, perhaps zone might be more accurate, as border counties such as Monaghan, Cavan or Louth show mixed accents which have adopted features from both northern and southern types.

The transition can be clearly seen moving down the east coast: Dundalk has a northern flavour to its speech but this is more or less lost by the time one reaches Drogheda travelling southwards. However, the recordings of *A Sound Atlas of Irish English* show that key features of northern Irish English, such as mid front vowel breaking, as in *save* [se:ɔv], and */u/-fronting, as in *boot* [bɔt], extend quite far down the east coast, indeed in the case of the latter almost to the border of Co. Dublin.

Table 1. Northern features which occur in the transition zone from south to north

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of interdental fricatives for dental stops in the south</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a fronted allophone of */u:/ and */u/, i.e. [tθ()]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reduction in the vowel length distinctions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a retroflex [ɹ] in syllable-final position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater pitch range between stressed and unstressed syllables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater allophony of */æ/, e.g. raised variants in a velar environment</td>
<td><em>bag</em> [bɛɡ] and a retracted realisation in a nasal environment <em>family</em> [ˈfʌmli]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recessive occurrence of glides after velars and before front vowels</td>
<td>as in <em>Cavan</em> [ˌkjavən]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a border county)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1. The East Coast

The east of the country stretches from the town of Drogheda somewhat north of Dublin down to Waterford in the south-east and includes such towns as Carlow, Kilkenny, New Ross, Wexford. This is the area which was first settled by the English from the late 12th century onwards and it is roughly coterminous with that which was encompassed by the *Pale*, the region of English influence in the late medieval ages, at its greatest extension. The original input from south-west England did in fact survive in altered form until the beginning of the 19th century in the archaic dialect of Forth and Bargy which was recorded by a few glossary compilers before it finally ceased to exist.
Table 2. East band features from Dundalk down to Waterford (including Dublin)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortition of dental fricatives to alveolar stops (also south), e.g. think [tɪŋk]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of low vowel lengthening before voiceless fricatives (not Dublin), e.g. path [pat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front onset of /æʊ/, e.g. town [tɛʊn], [tɛʊn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised onset of /ai/ (also south), e.g. quite [kwɔɪt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking of long high vowels (especially Dublin), e.g. clean [klɛɪn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortition of alveolar sibilants in pre-nasal position, e.g. isn't [ɪdɪnt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No lowering of early modern /u/ (only Dublin), e.g. done [dʌn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glottalisation of lenited /t/, e.g. foot [fʊt] → [fʊt ] → [fʊʔ] → [fuh]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. The South and West

This is a large region, from Co. Cork up to Co. Mayo, and was that in which Irish survived longest. As rule of thumb one can say that Irish receded from east to west. Furthermore, in this western and southern half of the country there is no survival of English from the first period with the possible exception of very small pockets in the major cities Cork, Limerick and Galway. Hence the English which developed here was that of the early modern period which arose through uncontrolled adult second language acquisition on the part of the rural inhabitants who represented the vast majority of speakers. Furthermore, the regional English input of the early modern period was of a largely West Midlands character.

The south and the west can also be distinguished from each other, at least on phonological grounds. The major segmental feature is the raising of /ɛ/ to /ɪ/ before nasals in the south and southwest. This phenomenon is not spectacular in itself and is found in many varieties of English, most notably in the Lower South of the United States. But a consideration of the history of Irish English shows that this raising was of a more general type previously. If one looks at the many literary satires which contain Irish English, for instance in the collection by Alan Bliss (1979) or in A Corpus of Irish English (Hickey 2003), then one sees that formerly the raising occurred in non-nasal environments as well, e.g. divil, toghthir, (from Dion Boucicault’s play Arragh na Pogue, 1864). What would appear to have happened in late 19th-century and/or early 20th-century Irish English is that the raising came to be restricted to environments in which it was phonetically natural, i.e. before nasals as these often trigger vowel raising due to their formant structure. This would mean that the situation in the south and south-west of Ireland (roughly the counties of Cork and Kerry) is a remnant of a much wider occurrence of /ɛ/ to /ɪ/ raising.

A suprasegmental feature of the south, especially of the city of Cork, is the large intonational range characterised by a noticeable drop in pitch on stressed syllables.
This intonational pattern is shared by Cork Irish, in the remnants which are still extant, so that this prosodic feature can be viewed as an areal feature of the south/south-west. The city of Cork also has a very open realisation of the vowels in the LOT and THOUGHT lexical sets which is seen in (often stereotypical) pronunciations of the city’s name, [ka\æk].

A distinctive feature of the west is the use of dental stops in the THINK-THIS lexical sets. In vernacular varieties in the east and south, alveolar stops are employed here. In the history of Irish English one can assume that Irish speakers switching to English would have used the nearest equivalent to English /θ/, /ð/, i.e. the coronal stops of Irish. These stops were alveolar in the east and south, but dental in the west so that speakers used /t/, /d/ as equivalents to the English dental fricatives in their second language English. This dental pronunciation of the west has become that of the supraregional variety of Irish English, itself deriving from usage in Dublin and spreading then throughout the country. But in vernacular Dublin English the realisation of dental fricatives has been as alveolar stops so it is not clear how vernacular speakers in Dublin came to use dental stops. One view is that they picked this articulation up from the many immigrants into Dublin in the latter half of the 19th century, because it (i) allowed them to dissociate themselves phonetically from vernacular speakers in the city and (ii) permitted a reversal of homophony in the words thinker and tinker.

2.3. The Midlands

The centre of Ireland is a flat expanse bordered by the hills and mountains which occupy the coastal regions of the country. In general the term Midlands is used in Ireland to describe an area west of Co. Dublin as far as the Shannon and including its western shore linking up with east Clare, Galway and Mayo and on a north-south axis delimited by the border with Northern Ireland in the north and to the south by a line running roughly from Limerick across to Dublin. In this sense, Midlands actually refers to the north-central part of Ireland. Its extension to the south is limited and does not stretch far down into Co. Tipperary. The counties which are regarded as typically part of the Midlands are Westmeath, Longford, Offaly, Laois along with west Kildare and Meath, south Roscommon and north Tipperary. The main town in the Midlands is Athlone, situated on the Shannon about half way on its north-south course.

To the north, the Midlands show the transitional features of the north-south divide (Ó Baoill 1991) such as /u/-fronting, the use of dental fricatives for stops in the THINK-THIS lexical set or a retroflex [ɾ] for the more general, traditional velarised [x] of the south. The single most obvious feature of the Midlands is the shift of /tʃ/ to /k/ in intervocalic position as in fortune [ˈfɔrkuːn], already mentioned in the 19th century. Other features are shared by adjoining varieties.
Table 3. Phonological features of the South, West and Midlands of Ireland

**South and west from Cork through Limerick up to Galway and Sligo**
/e/ to /i/ before nasals
Tense, raised articulation of /æ/ (also east)
Considerable intonational range (only south, south-west)

**West**
Dental stop realisation in THINK-THIS lexical sets
Low central onset for /ai/ and /au/, e.g. *quite* [kwai:t], *town* [taun]

**Midlands**
Shift of /tʃ/ to /k/ in word-internal position, e.g. *fortune* ['fɔrkju:n]

### 3. Varieties of Northern Irish English

Any treatment of English in Ireland must take special account of the situation in Ulster. The reason for this lies in the settlement history of this province which led to the introduction of Scots and forms of northern English which were, and still definitely are, distinctive from all varieties of English in the south of the country. There has also been, as in the south, interaction between forms of English and Irish which has added a further dimension to the linguistic complexity in the north. A common means of alluding to the northern part of the island of Ireland is by the historical name *Ulster* which covers the entire north of Ireland.

#### 3.1. Terminology

Similarly to the south, any discussion of English in the north must begin with a consideration of terminology as there are many and frequently contradictory usages found in treatments of language in Ulster.

**Ulster English:** 1) A cover term for various forms of English used in Northern Ireland. 2) A specific reference to English brought to Ulster from the north-west Midlands of England (Adams 1958: 61) and separate from the Scots element in the province. Because Ulster Scots (see section 3.2) is found in the peripheral counties of Ulster (Donegal, Derry, Antrim and Down), the label *Mid-Ulster English* (Harris 1984) is sometimes used to refer to general forms of English in Northern Ireland which are not derived from Scots.

**Ulster Scots:** This refers to a continuation of the Scots language brought to Ireland chiefly in the 17th century onwards. Some tens of thousands of Scots arrived in the first half of this century and were mainly from the West-Mid and South-West
Lowlands. Ulster Scots today still shows many features typical of the most characteristic form of English in Scotland, Scots.

Northern Irish English: This subsumes all kinds of English in the north of the country, i.e. in all the nine countries of the province of Ulster, and is used in the present chapter.

3.2. Ulster Scots

Of all the varieties of English taken to Ireland since the 17th century, Ulster Scots is the only one which has retained a distinct profile and which can be unambiguously linked to the present-day varieties to which it is immediately related: Scots in western Scotland. Undoubtedly, Ulster Scots, especially in its rural forms, is quite separate from other varieties of English in the north of Ireland, let alone the south. Its highly divergent nature has meant that much debate has taken place concerning its status as a language or a dialect.

The regions where Ulster Scots is spoken are nowadays no longer contiguous. This would seem to imply a reduction of the previous geographical distribution. The areas where it is still found do, however, represent historical regions of settlement. There are three of these located on the northern periphery from north-west to north-east, hence the term Coastal Crescent or Northern Crescent (see maps at end of article).

3.2.1. Delimiting Ulster Scots

A treatment of Ulster Scots must start with differentiating between conservative Ulster Scots (braid, i.e. broad, Ulster Scots, which has its base in rural areas of Ulster) and more standard forms which are spoken chiefly in urban centres, parallel to the established distinction in Scotland between Lowland Scots and Scottish Standard English (Harris 1984: 119). An essential feature of standard Ulster Scots is that most words with non-standard Scots vowel values have re-allocated values which are nearer to those in general Ulster English. The following list illustrates vowel values and some consonantal features which are indicative of conservative Ulster Scots; the yardstick of reference is Older Scots (Older Scots), up to 1700, i.e. before the emigration to Ulster began.

Table 4. Features of conservative Ulster Scots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention of Older Scots ü</td>
<td>(not shifted to /au/) cow /kʊ:/, hoos /hʊs/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A low, unrounded back vowel for Older Scots o</td>
<td>soft /sɑːft/, top /tɑːp/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Scots ei merges with /i/ and not /ai/</td>
<td>[ɔɪ, æi], die /dɪ:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Scots ə has a fronted, unrounded reflex, blood /blɪd/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fronting and raising of Old English ə, home /həm/
Little raising of above vowel after labio-velars, two /twə:
Lowering of /ɪ/ to /ɛ/, thick /θɛk/
No raising of Middle English /ɛ:/ to /iː/, beat /bet/, meat /met/
Raising of Older Scots /a/ especially before /r/, farm /fərm/
Distinct open and close mid back vowels, horse /hɔːrs/, hoarse /hɔːrs/
Distinction between short vowels before /r/, term /tərm/, burn /bərn/
No rounding of /a/ after /w/, swan /swan/
Retention of distinction between /w/ and /ʍ/, whale /ʍæl/, wale /weːl/
Retention of syllable-final /x/, bought /bɔːxt/
Vocalisation of word-final /l/ [l], full /fəl/, wall /wɔːl/

The shifts of vowel values in Ulster Scots when compared to southern British English have led to a re-alignment of vowel space. This can best be indicated diagrammatically as follows. The first shift one should note is that of Middle English /oː/ to a front vowel, with or without rounding, i.e. Older Scots /ɨ, ɵ/. In Ulster Scots this vowel appears as /ɨ/.

| /u/ | ← | /oː/ | loom /lʊm/ |
| /æ/ | ← | /ɨ/ | limb /læm/ |
| /ɑː/ | ← | /æ/ | lamb /lʌm/ |

3.3. Contrasting northern and southern Irish English

In the following sections those features in which varieties in Ulster (both Ulster Scots and general Ulster English) differ from those south of the province will be discussed. In a number of instances it is necessary to distinguish the two main groups within Ulster. The yardstick for the south is the supraregional standard which ultimately is derived from middle-class Dublin English of the early and mid 20th century.

Equivalents of dental fricatives
In the entire area of Ulster the THIN and THIS lexical sets show fricatives. The only exception to this are areas of contact with Irish (in County Donegal) where...
one finds [t] and [d] because of the transfer from Irish of the realisations of /t/ and /d/ in the latter language.

Table 6. The THIN and THIS lexical sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thick</td>
<td>[θɛk]</td>
<td>[tɪk]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>[ðæt]</td>
<td>[fæt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lather</td>
<td>[lɑː(ð)ə]</td>
<td>[læːfə]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td>[bræt]</td>
<td>[bræpə]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dentalisation of alveolar stops before /r/
This is a phonetic process whereby an alveolar stop, typically /t/, is shifted forward to a dental point of articulation when it is followed by an unstressed rhotic schwa. The /r/ is realised as a tap or slight trill due to the position of the tongue parallel to the escaping airstream (Bernoulli effect) and is frequently voiceless.

Table 7. Dentalisation of alveolar stops before /r/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ulster and Conservative Vernacular Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>[wɔːtə]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better</td>
<td>[bɛtə]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allophones of alveolar plosives
The fricativisation of /t/ and often /d/ intervocalically and word-finally before a pause is not generally to be found in the north – nor in other varieties of English, bar the Irish section of Newfoundland – and thus gains the status of a defining feature of southern Irish English.

Table 8. Allophones of alveolar plosives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bat</td>
<td>[bat]</td>
<td>[bæt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bead</td>
<td>[bid]</td>
<td>[bid]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The palatalisation of velar plosives
A conspicuous feature of generalised Ulster English is the palatalisation of /g/ and /k/ to /kj/ and /gj/ respectively. This palatalisation is only to be found before low
vowels. It would appear to be an English and not a Scots feature and is attested in 18th-century mainland English although it was later lost.

Table 9. The palatalisation of velar plosives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cat</td>
<td>[kjat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gap</td>
<td>[gjap]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Off-glides
When mid front vowels occur in stressed position, they tend to develop off-glides. This is particularly clear before a following consonant.

Table 10. Off-glides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>save</td>
<td>[seːv]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bait</td>
<td>[beːt]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstressed vowels
In unstressed positions southern Irish English frequently has the high vowel [i], i.e. without any centralisation to [i], so-called happy-tensing. Ulster English tends to lower an unstressed /i/ to a value approaching /e/.

Table 11. Unstressed vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tricky</td>
<td>[træke]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td>[hæpe]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowel quantity
In Ulster, in strong contradistinction to the South, vowel quantity is often non-distinctive. High and mid vowels, which are elsewhere either long or short, appear phonetically half-long.

Table 12. Vowel quantity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>[ful]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fool</td>
<td>[ful]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Interpreting features of Irish English

In the history of Irish English studies, the pendulum of opinion concerning the role of contact in the genesis of these forms of English has swung back and forth. Initially writers like Joyce, P. L. Henry and, to a lesser extent, Hogan assumed that every feature which had a parallel in Irish was of Irish origin. This stance has been labelled the *substratist* position and came under heavy fire in the mid 1980’s most noticeably in John Harris’ (1984) influential article. The *retentionist* standpoint, which saw the input varieties of English in early modern Ireland as the source of features hitherto accounted for by contact, came into vogue and was represented by various scholars. But in the 1990’s the pendulum moved more to the centre with the gradual acceptance of contact as a source of specific features in Irish English (Hickey 1995), not for ideological reasons, as often previously, but due to a better understanding of the mechanisms of language transfer and language shift, not least due to authors on Irish English, such as Markku Filppula, taking on board the ideas of other linguists examining contact in general, expressed most clearly in the seminal monograph, Thomason and Kaufman (1988). Convergence became the new standard wisdom with contact and retention occupying places of equal standing in the history of Irish English. The following table offers suggestions for sources of key phonological features of Irish English.

*Table 13. Phonological features and their possible sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonological feature</th>
<th>Possible source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental/alveolar stops for fricatives</td>
<td>Transfer of nearest Irish equivalent, coronal stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervocalic and pre-pausal lenition of /t/</td>
<td>Lenition as a phonological directive from Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alveolar /l/ in all positions</td>
<td>Use of non-velar, non-palatal [l] from Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of [ʍ] for &lt;wh&gt;</td>
<td>Convergence of input with Irish /φ/ [ϕ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of syllable-final /r/</td>
<td>Convergence of English input and Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction of short vowels before /r/, e.g. <em>term</em> [tɛɹm] and <em>turn</em> [tɜɹn]</td>
<td>Convergence of English input and Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epenthesis in heavy clusters in syllable codas, <em>film</em> [filəm]</td>
<td>Areal feature of both Irish and English in Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/-fronting in the north, e.g. <em>boot</em> [but]</td>
<td>Areal feature of both Irish and English in Ulster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowering of short front vowels, e.g. <em>bit</em> [bet]</td>
<td>Input to Ulster from Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of retroflex /ɾ/ in Ulster</td>
<td>Input to Ulster from Scotland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1. Ireland as a linguistic area

Table 13 contains features which are traits of vernacular varieties throughout the entire island. When treating features of Irish English, a holistic view can be useful, that is, rather than stress differences, one could examine the features common to most or all varieties and indeed go a step further and compare these to parallel structures in Irish. This approach is largely typological and sees Ireland (north and south) as a linguistic area. Not all of these are strongly diagnostic of Ireland as a linguistic area; they are also found in forms of English in England, quite apart from Anglophone varieties overseas. One should also mention that the non-existence of features across the entire country has led to negative definers for Irish English arising. For instance /r/-lessness and/or /h/-dropping are definite signs that a speaker is not Irish.

5. Urban English in Ireland

5.1. English in Dublin

The English language has been spoken in Dublin since the late 12th century. English never died out in the capital and there are some features of vernacular Dublin English which can be traced to the first period. The records of Dublin English are slight and consist before 1600 mainly of municipal records which here and there betray the kind of English which must have been spoken in the city (Henry 1958). For a historical background to present-day speech one must look to the elocutionist Thomas Sheridan (the father of the playwright Richard Brinsley Sheridan) who in 1781 published *A Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language* with an appendix in which he commented on the English used by middle class Dubliners, the “gentlemen of Ireland” in his words, which he regarded as worthy of censure on his part. When discussing consonants, Sheridan remarks on “the thickening (of) the sounds of *d* and *t* in certain situations”. Here he is probably referring to the realisation of dental fricatives as alveolar plosives as found in vernacular forms of Dublin English today. There is no hint in Sheridan of anything like a distinction between dental and alveolar plosive realisations, which is an essential marker of local versus non-local speech today.

*Table 14. Dental versus alveolar stops in Dublin English*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Dublin</th>
<th>Non-local Dublin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thank, tank [tæŋk]</td>
<td>thank [tæŋk], tank [tæŋk]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.2. Varieties of Dublin English

Any discussion of English in Dublin necessitates a few basic divisions into types. For the present contribution a twofold division, with a further subdivision, is employed. The first group of speakers consists of those who use the inherited popular form of English in the capital. The term *local* is intended to capture this and to emphasise that these speakers are those who show strongest identification with traditional conservative Dublin life of which the popular accent is very much a part. The reverse of this is *non-local* which refers to sections of the metropolitan population who do not wish a narrow, restrictive identification with popular Dublin culture. This group then subdivides into a larger, more general section, *mainstream*, and a currently smaller group which vigorously rejects a confining association with low-prestige Dublin. For want of a better term, this group is labelled *fashionable*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15. Varieties of Dublin English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms of English in present-day Dublin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) local Dublin English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) non-local Dublin English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) mainstream Dublin English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) fashionable Dublin English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A central issue in contemporary Dublin English is the set of vowel shifts which represent the most recent phonological innovation in Irish English (see section 5.1.4 for details). This is not surprising as Dublin is a typical location for language change given the following features: Firstly, the city has expanded greatly in population in the last three or four decades. The increase in population has been due both to internal growth and migration into the city from the rest of the country. Secondly, it has undergone an economic boom in the last 15 years or so, reflected in its position as an important financial centre and a location for many computer firms which run their European operations from Dublin. The increase in wealth and international position has meant that many young people aspire to an urban sophistication which is divorced from strongly local Dublin life. For this reason the developments in fashionable Dublin English diverge from those in local Dublin English, indeed can be interpreted as a reaction to it. This type of linguistic behaviour can be termed *local dissociation* as it is motivated by the desire of speakers to hive themselves off from vernacular forms of a variety spoken in their immediate surroundings.

5.1.3. Features of local Dublin English

Vowel breaking

Long high vowels are realised as two syllables with a hiatus between the two when they occur in closed syllables. The hiatus element is [j] with front vowels
and [w] with back vowels, *clean* [klɪːn], *fool* [fuːˌʊl]. The disyllabification of long high vowels extends to diphthongs which have a high ending point as can be seen in the following realisations: *time* [təːm], *pound* [pʌʊnd]. Among the further prominent vocalic characteristics of Dublin English are the following: (a) Fronting of /au/, e.g. *down* [dəʊn] - [dəʊn], (b) Lengthening of historically short vowels before /r/, e.g. *circle* [səːk], *first* [fəːst], (c) Retention of early modern English short /ʊ/, e.g. *Dublin* [dʌblən].

Cluster simplification

Stops after fricatives or sonorants are liable to deletion. Intermediate registers may have a glottal stop as a trace of the stop in question: *pound* [puːnd(ʔ)], *last* [læːs(ʔ)].

Fortition of dental fricatives:

It is safe to assume that the realisation of the first sound in the THOUGHT lexical set in popular Dublin English as an alveolar plosive [t] is not a recent phenomenon. Hogan (1927: 71–72) notes that it is found in the seventeenth century plays (assuming that *t, d* represent [t, d]) and furthermore in the Dublin City Records (from the first period, i.e. before the 17th century, see above) where the third person singular ending *-th* appears as *-t*.

T-lenition

The clearest phonetic feature of southern Irish English is the realisation of /t/ as a fricative with identical characteristics of the stop, i.e. an apico-alveolar fricative in weak positions. Extensions include the lenition of /t/ in a weak position beyond the initial stage of apico-alveolar fricative to /ɾ/ then to /h/ with final deletion as in the following instance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/t/</th>
<th>[t]</th>
<th>[ɾ]</th>
<th>[h]</th>
<th>[ʔ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>water</em></td>
<td>[wɔːtə]</td>
<td>[wɔːɾə]</td>
<td>[wɔːhə]</td>
<td>[wəɾə]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, the THIN and THIS lexical sets show alveolar stops rather than the dental stops of supraregional Irish English.

5.1.4. Recent developments

As mentioned in section 5.1.2., the major instance of language change in present-day Ireland is undoubtedly the shift in pronunciation of Dublin English. To un-
nderstand the workings of this shift one must realise that in the course of the 1980s and 1990s the city of Dublin, as the capital of the Republic of Ireland, underwent an unprecedented expansion in population size and in relative prosperity with a great increase in international connections to and from the metropolis. The immigrants to the city, who arrived there chiefly to avail of the job opportunities resulting from the economic boom, formed a group of socially mobile, weak-tie speakers and their section of the city’s population has been a key locus for language change. The change which arose in the last two decades of the 20th century was reactive in nature: fashionable speakers began to move away in their speech from their perception of popular Dublin English, a classic case of dissociation in an urban setting.

The variable /ai/ in Irish English
A conservative pronunciation of /ai/ in Dublin is maintained in lower-class speech as [æi] whereas the supraregional variety of the south has for /ai/ a diphthong which has a low mid or low front starting point, i.e., either [æi] or [æi]. For fashionable Dubliners the [æi, æ] pronunciations sufficiently delimit them from local Dublin English. But increasingly a back starting point came to be used with this diphthong. This retracted starting point is particularly noticeable before /r/ so that the name of the country is realised as [ailond] rather than [ailond].

General shift of low vowels
The vowel shift in Dublin English is not just confined to the realisation of /ai/. Other vowels in the area of this diphthong are affected, particularly the diphthong in the CHOICE lexical set and the low and mid vowels in the LOT and THOUGHT sets which usually have a lower realisation than in Britain (or unrounded in the case of the LOT vowel): boy /ɔɪ/ → [bɔi], pot /ɔt/ → [pɔt]; law /ɔl/ → [lɔ:]. These realisations show that the change has the characteristics of a chain shift, that is, it affects several segments by a process of retraction and raising in phonological vowel space. This can be seen from the following tables which summarise the various vowel developments.

Table 17. Summary of the present-day Dublin Vowel Shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retraction of diphthongs with a low or back starting point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>toy</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raising of low back vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>cot</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>caught</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.1.5. The spread of fashionable Dublin speech

Because of the status of Dublin, non-vernacular speech of the capital acts as a de facto standard for the rest of the south when speakers, outside of Dublin, are seeking a non-local, generally acceptable form of Irish English. This has also meant, for instance, that the retroflex [ɹ] used by fashionable speakers in Dublin is spreading out of the capital, especially with younger urbanites from different parts of the country. Various features of fashionable Dublin English, both vocalic and consonantal, are spreading rapidly, especially among the younger female population. For the following discussion, this speech is labelled the New Pronunciation, the capital letters deliberately suggesting a bundle of features which are adopted as a group by innovative speakers.

Apart from vowels, the New Pronunciation of southern Irish English involves above all the realisation of liquids /l/ and /r/. Other segments do not seem to be affected by the shift in pronunciation. Specifically, the complex area of coronal segments has not been altered to any significant extent. In addition to /ai/-retraction and back vowel raising, discussed above, one can note the following features:

/au/-fronting

In Dublin English, and indeed in traditional east-coast varieties of Irish English in general, the vowel in the MOUTH lexical set has a front starting point, either [æ] or [ɛ]. A realisation as [au] is more conservative in Dublin, and in rural areas it is traditionally typical of the south-west and west of Ireland, but is being replaced by the fronted realisation in the speech of the younger generation.

SOFT-lengthening

Here one is again dealing with a traditional feature of Dublin English. The vowel of the LOT lexical set, when it occurs before a voiceless fricative, is lengthened. This in its turn is in keeping with the general Early Modern English lengthening of /a:/ before such fricatives and is seen in words like staff, pass, path in southern British English (Wells 1982: 203–206). In conservative mainstream Irish English SOFT-lengthening (to use a cover term with a typical word involving this length-
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ening) is not found, but again because it is present in fashionable Dublin English, it is spreading to the rest of the country.

/\r/-retroflexion
Traditionally, the realisation of /\r/ in southern Irish English is as a velarised alveolar continuant, a pronunciation found in western and south-western varieties of Irish to this day. Thus, it can be assumed that this type of /\r/ resulted in Irish English from transfer of the Irish realisation of the same phoneme. In Northern Ireland, a retroflex /\r/ is to be found, a parallel with Scotland, which may well have been the source for this realisation. In current fashionable Dublin English a retroflex /\r/ is also to be found, though definitely independently of the occurrence in Northern Ireland, as varieties of English there have played no role in the shaping of the speech of fashionable urbanites in Dublin. Dissociation from the traditional velarised realisation is most likely the reason for the retroflex [\l] which has become so widespread throughout Ireland among younger female speakers. A slightly raised /æ:/ ([æː]), [eː] co-occurs with the retroflexion of the /\r/ so that one has pronunciations like [kæːd] for card.

/l/-velarisation
Traditionally, Irish English has an alveolar [l] in all syllable positions. However, the recordings for young female speakers in A Sound Atlas of Irish English (see below) overwhelmingly show a definite velarisation of /l/ in this position, e.g. field [fiːd]. The development of [h], or its adoption from other accents of English, could be seen as a reaction to the traditional alveolar [l] so long a prominent feature of Irish accents.

Apart from the features described above there are others which play a minor role in the sound profile of the New Pronunciation. One obvious feature of local Dublin English which has avoided stigma and hence is found in fashionable speech in the city is the loss of /hw/ [ʌ] in words like whale and while and which leads to mergers of pairs like which and witch. Traditionally, the occurrence of [ʌ] in all words beginning with wh is a prominent feature of Irish English, but if the New Pronunciation establishes itself as the new supraregional form of English in the next generation then this will no longer be the case.

5.2. English in Belfast

The area of contemporary Belfast is characterised by a conurbation which stretches along the north shore of Belfast Lough at least to Newtownabbey in County Antrim and on the south shore at least to Holywood in County Down. Along the Lagan Valley the city stretches to the south-west at least to Lisburn with a motorway to the triad of towns Lurgan, Craigavon, Portadown to the south of Lough Neagh. The Lagan Valley is the hinterland of Belfast and there is a similarity be-
tween accents in the city and those in its hinterland to the south-west. In general, one can say that Lagan Valley speech is similar to the accents in West Belfast. The east of the city shows greater similarity with accents from rural North Down, an originally Scots area of settlement, as opposed to Lagan Valley which was settled largely by people from England.

5.2.1. Sources of Belfast English

The English spoken in Belfast is an amalgam of features which come from the two main English communities in Ulster with independent traits only found in the capital city. The following is a list of features which can be clearly attributed to one of the two main English-language sources in Ulster (Milroy 1981: 25–26).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18. Ulster Anglo-Irish features in Belfast English (after Milroy 1981)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palatalisation of /k, g/ before /a/, /kjat/ for cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentalisation of /t, d/ before /r/, /bɛɾt/ for better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowering and unrounding of /u/, /pæt/ for pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME /ɛ:/ realised as a mid-vowel, /bɛt/ for beat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/ for /ʌ/ in but, luck, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowering of /e/ to /æ/, set /sæt/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of /au/ before /l/ in monosyllables, /aul/ for old, also a feature of Lowland Scots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising of /æ/ to /ɛ/ before velars, /bɛk, bɛg/ for back, bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising of /æ/ to /ɛ/ after /k/ and (residually) /g/ /kɛp, kɛʃl/ for cap, castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short realisations of high vowels, /bit, bɛt/ for beet, boot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowering and sometimes centralisation of /ʌ/, /bɛt, sens/ or /bæt, ʃæns/ for bit, sense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sociolinguistic developments in Belfast English, which were described in ground-breaking studies by James and Lesley Milroy in terms of social networks in the 1970s and early 1980s, are outside the scope of the present study, for appropriate references, consult the relevant section of Hickey (2002).

Mention should also be made of the distinct intonational patterns in northern Irish English. In her study, Rahilly (1997) notes a general predominance of rises in intonation in Belfast which contrast explicitly with falls in the south of Britain. Indeed the high numbers of rising nuclei and level tails in tone sequences are regarded as typical of the Anglo-Irish group of dialects rather than the British group. Rahilly concludes that the primary cue to prominence in Belfast is a high pitch, but with much less movement than with nuclei in Received Pronunciation.
5.3. English in Derry

The city of Derry has a population of over 95,000 (1991 census) and is ethnically over 70% Catholic as opposed to Belfast which has a majority Protestant population. The designation Londonderry is a variant preferred by both Ulster Protestants and British commentators and goes back to a renaming of the city when London companies were commissioned with the task of transporting English settlers there at the beginning of the 17th century. The city’s name is an Anglicisation of Irish doire ‘oak-grove’, a common name, or element of name, in the north and south of the country.

There is a large degree of segregation in terms of residence for the two communities: east of the River Foyle, which divides the city, are found Protestants and west of the river is almost exclusively Catholic. The segregation increased greatly in the last 30 years because of the sectarian violence.

The only research on the English of Derry city is that of McCafferty (see McCafferty 2001 as a representative example of his work), apart from one study of intonation in Derry. The city has a special status within Northern Ireland as it is on the one hand the second largest and on the other the only major city with a Catholic majority. It is understandable that it would receive innovations which arise in Belfast but also that the Catholic majority in the city might well show an inherent resistance to these. A number of changes are recorded for Derry which are listed in the following.

Table 19. Four major linguistic changes in Derry English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>Recent</th>
<th>Lexical set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ʌ)</td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>[ʌ]</td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>PULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[iə]</td>
<td>FACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ð)</td>
<td>[ð]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>MOTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McCafferty (2001) maintains that there is a tendency for the SQUARE and NURSE lexical sets to merge, a feature spreading from the east of Northern Ireland and
typical of the Protestant middle class. For this group a lack of quantity distinction with the NORTH and FORCE lexical set is also found. The shift of older [i] to [iə] in the FACE class is taken to be characteristic of younger Protestants. Protestant changes are in general incoming innovations which are spreading from eastern Northern Ireland, i.e. from the Belfast conurbation. In this case the changes for the Protestants in Derry have arisen through a process of supraregionalisation of Belfast innovations. The only leading change among the Catholics in Derry is the shift of intervocalic [ð] to a lateral [l]. The Protestants in Derry have no vernacular innovations of their own.

Table 20. Changes in Derry English according to ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>[ɔɹ] → [ɔɹ] Eastern Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ɛɻ] → [ɔɹ] ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ɛ, i] → [iə] ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>[- ɗ -] Local to Derry city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Lexical sets for the phonological description of Irish English

Tables 21 and 22 use the lexical sets as originally introduced by John Wells in the early 1980s. Certain adaptations and extensions of Wells’ original set are necessary for the correct description of Irish English, for instance the PRICE vowel can have a different realisation before voiceless and voiced consonants. In addition the NORTH and FORCE sets must be kept separate, though increasingly with supraregional speakers in the south, a distinction is not made between the vowels in each of these words.

The five columns in each table correspond to the five sound samples which accompany this chapter.

6.1. Vocalic sets

Table 21. Lexical sets and representative values in Irish English (vowels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical set</th>
<th>Rural Northern</th>
<th>Popular Dublin</th>
<th>Fashionable Dublin</th>
<th>Rural South-West/West</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>e´</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. (continued) Lexical sets and representative values in Irish English (vowels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical set</th>
<th>Rural Northern</th>
<th>Popular Dublin</th>
<th>Fashionable Dublin</th>
<th>Rural South-West/West</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td>i;</td>
<td>i;</td>
<td>i;</td>
<td>i;</td>
<td>i;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>e:ø</td>
<td>e:</td>
<td>e:</td>
<td>e:</td>
<td>e:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>a(:)</td>
<td>æ:</td>
<td>a:</td>
<td>a:</td>
<td>a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>o(:)</td>
<td>o:</td>
<td>o:</td>
<td>o:</td>
<td>o:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT</td>
<td>o(:)</td>
<td>æ:</td>
<td>æ:</td>
<td>æ:</td>
<td>æ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>u(:)</td>
<td>u:</td>
<td>u:</td>
<td>u:</td>
<td>u:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>εɪ</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td>æɪ</td>
<td>æɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIDE</td>
<td>εɪ, æɪ</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td>æɪ</td>
<td>æɪ</td>
<td>æɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>εu</td>
<td>εu</td>
<td>εu</td>
<td>æu, æu</td>
<td>æu, æu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>ι</td>
<td>æι</td>
<td>æι, oι</td>
<td>æι</td>
<td>æι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>æυ, o:</td>
<td>æυ</td>
<td>æυ</td>
<td>æυ, æυ</td>
<td>æυ, æυ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR</td>
<td>i;</td>
<td>i:(ζ)</td>
<td>ιζ</td>
<td>ιζ</td>
<td>ιζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>o(:)ιζ</td>
<td>ε; (ζ)</td>
<td>εζ, οεζ</td>
<td>εζ</td>
<td>εζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START</td>
<td>a(:)ιζ</td>
<td>æ; (ζ)</td>
<td>æζ</td>
<td>æζ</td>
<td>æζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>æ; (ζ)</td>
<td>æζ</td>
<td>æζ</td>
<td>æζ</td>
<td>æζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE</td>
<td>o; (ζ)</td>
<td>ο; (ζ)</td>
<td>οεζ</td>
<td>οεζ</td>
<td>οεζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
<td>u; (ζ)</td>
<td>u; (ζ)</td>
<td>u; (ζ)</td>
<td>u; (ζ)</td>
<td>u; (ζ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>o; (ζ)</td>
<td>ο; (ζ)</td>
<td>οεζ</td>
<td>οεζ</td>
<td>οεζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMA</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETTER</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPY</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANCE</td>
<td>æ, æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ, (æ:)</td>
<td>æ, æ:</td>
<td>æ, æ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATH</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ, (æ:)</td>
<td>æ, æ:</td>
<td>æ, æ:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks

1) The vowel values which are associated with the now unfashionable Dublin 4 accent are not shared entirely by younger fashionable Dublin English speakers.
In particular the retraction of /aː/, and raising of the rhotacised version /ðːt/, is avoided so that the earlier pronunciation of Dart as [dɔːt] / doːt] is regarded as “uncool”.

2) The vowel transcribed as [ʌ] is a variant which is somewhat more centralised than the corresponding [ʌ] vowel found in supraregional varieties.

3) The realisation [ɔː] in the SQUARE lexical set can be interpreted as a deliberate reaction to the very open, unrounded realisation of population Dublin English, [ɛ:(ʌ)].

4) Popular Dublin English is weakly rhotic and early conservative forms of this variety are often entirely non-rhotic.

5) There is a complex distribution of low vowels in northern Irish English. Basically one can say that a front and raised vowel is found before velars and a retracted variant before labials and nasals, giving pronunciations like bag [bɛg] and family [ˈʃæmlı].

6.2. Consonantal sets

Wells’ lexical sets were designed to deal with the vowel distinctions found in Received Pronunciation. They do not handle consonants. For that reason new sets are necessary for the current discussion. A number of key words have been chosen and the consonant which is at issue in each case is underlined as can be seen from Table 22.

Table 22. Lexical sets and representative values in Irish English (consonants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical set</th>
<th>Rural Northern</th>
<th>Popular Dublin</th>
<th>Fashionable Dublin</th>
<th>Rural South-West/West</th>
<th>Supraregional Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THIN</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREATHE</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t, t̂</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>r, ?, Ø</td>
<td>? h</td>
<td>r̂t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>r, t̂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GET</td>
<td>t̂, ?</td>
<td>h, Ø</td>
<td>t̂</td>
<td>t̂</td>
<td>t̂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEL</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>l, t̂</td>
<td>l̂</td>
<td>l̂</td>
<td>l̂, t̂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORE</td>
<td>l̂</td>
<td>s, Ø</td>
<td>l̂</td>
<td>ŝ</td>
<td>s, l̂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WET</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHICH</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks

1) The distinction between dental and alveolar stops is sociolinguistically significant in Ireland. All speakers can hear this difference clearly and the use of alveolar for dental stops in the THIN and THIS lexical sets is highly stigmatised.
2) Fashionable Dublin English speakers may have a slight affrication of syllable-initial /t-/ as in two [tˈuː].

3) The allophony of syllable-coda and intersyllabic /t/ is quite complicated. With conservative supraregional speakers the apico-alveolar fricative [tʃ] is found. With younger supraregional speakers a flap occurs. In popular Dublin English the lenition of /t/ continues through a glottal stop to /h/ and frequently to zero, especially in word-final position. In many forms of northern Irish English, final alveolar stops may be unreleased.

4) The merger of [w] and [ʍ] is increasingly frequent with supraregional speakers so that word pairs like which and witch now consist of homophones.

5) It is merely a coincidence that fashionable Dublin English shares a flap and a retroflex /r/ with northern Irish English.

7. Data sources for Irish English phonology

In the recent history of Irish English studies there have been two incomplete surveys of English in Ireland. The first was initiated by P. L. Henry and preliminary findings were published in 1958 (see Henry 1958). Nothing more was heard of the project, but the material presented is of value for the study of Irish English up to that date.

The second survey is called The Tape-Recorded Survey of Hiberno-English Speech and was supervised by Michael Barry, then of the English Department at Queen’s University, Belfast. A large amount of material was collected, particularly for the north and approximately 50% of this material, which by a fortunate circumstance was given to the present author in the mid 1980s, has been digitised and is available as two CDs from the present author. The material comes with a software interface to examine the data of the survey which in this form consists of some 80 files (approximately 22 hours of recording). The survey includes both wordlists and free speech.

The Irish English Resource Centre is a website dedicated to all matters pertaining to academic research into Irish English. It is maintained by the present author at the following address: http://www.uni-essen.de/IERC. The resource centre as it stands contains much information on past and current research on Irish English, an online history and overview of Irish English, summaries of issues in the field, biosketches of scholars, details of various corpora and data collections, links to related sites, etc. Importantly, it contains much bibliographical information of use to interested scholars and students. The website is updated regularly with new information as this becomes available. It is intended as a primary source for up-to-date data on topical research into Irish English which can be used liberally by scholars and students alike.
A Sound Atlas of Irish English (Hickey 2005) is a set of over 1,500 recordings of Irish English from the entire country covering urban and rural informants with an age spread from under 10 to over 80 (both genders). A supplied software interface allows end-users to view the recordings in a tree divided by province and county and then listen to individual recordings. The recordings can also be sorted by county, age, gender and rural versus urban speakers. Five of these recordings are available on the accompanying CD-ROM.
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Map of chief dialectal divisions in Ireland

Comments The south of Ireland can be divided into two broad dialect regions. The first and oldest is the east coast dialect area which stretches from Waterford up to beyond Dublin, probably as far as Dundalk in its original extension before 1600.

The second area is that of the south-west and west and is the part of the country which was latest to engage in the language shift from Irish to English. Indeed for a few small pockets on the western seaboard, in Kerry, Connemara and Donegal, the Irish language has not died out yet.

In the centre and north-central part of the country there is a diffuse and dialectally indeterminate Midlands region which extends from southern Offaly and Laois up to Cavan and south Leitrim.

Between Sligo in the west and Dundalk in the east there is a broad transitional band which shows a mixture of southern and northern features (see discussions above).

The north of Ireland consists of the counties of Ulster and can be divided into a large central region, that of Mid-Ulster English, and a ‘Coastal Crescent’ run-
ning from Co. Down, south-east of Belfast, up to Antrim in the extreme north-east, through Co. Derry and across to the north-east of Donegal (but excluding the city of Derry). This area is that of strongest Scottish settlement and hence it represents Ulster Scots in its most original form (there are also some other smaller areas, such as north Co. Armagh). In the west of Donegal, contact forms of Ulster English are spoken.

Map of provinces and counties in Ireland

There are thirty two counties in present-day Ireland distributed in somewhat uneven fashion across four provinces. The counties vary in size, Cork and Galway being the largest, Louth and Carlow the smallest. The population of counties depends on whether they contain large towns or cities. Some counties, like Leitrim and Clare do not, while other have an associated town or city, e.g. Limerick, Cork, Wexford, etc.

The province of Ulster contains nine counties, six of which are within the borders of Northern Ireland, formed on the partition of Ireland in 1921. There is a limited presence of Ulster Scots speech outside of Northern Ireland, in the Lagan district of north-west Donegal. Features of northern speech spread much further southwards than previously thought as attested by *A Sound Atlas of Irish English* (see remarks above).
Welsh English: phonology

Robert Penhallurick

1. Cultural and socio-historical background

The longer-standing language of Wales is Welsh, belonging to the Celtic branch of the Indo-European family. In pre-Roman times, Celtic speakers were dispersed over most of western Europe, but during the age of the Roman Empire Celtic appears to have been pushed to the peripheries, with two branches developing: Goidelic or Q Celtic, and Brittonic or P Celtic, to which Welsh belongs. The arrival of Angles, Saxons and other Germanic-speaking tribes in Britain from the fifth century onwards exerted a pressure on Welsh which continues to the present day. Celtic speakers were driven into the area now known as Wales, thereafter to be subject to a long process of anglicization. At the end of the eighth century AD, a physical boundary was constructed to mark the political separation of the nascent England and Wales, in the shape of Offa’s Dyke, a linear earthwork running north/south for some 130 kilometres from the River Dee to the Severn Estuary. It was constructed by Offa, king of Mercia, to indicate the western boundary of his territory. Aitchison and Carter (2000: 24) point out that whilst the construction of Offa’s Dyke should not be understood as marking a firm divide between Welsh and English speakers, it does serve “as a base line from which to chart the slow and complex westward retreat of the Welsh language”, or to put it another way, the inexorable advance of English to all parts of Wales.

The first major incursions of English came in the wake of the Norman invasion of Wales, which began towards the end of the eleventh century AD. The Normans established strongholds through the north and south, and English speakers arrived in numbers. The areas most affected were the lower-lying borders with England, and substantial parts of south Wales, with perhaps the most interesting developments occurring in the Gower Peninsula and south Pembrokeshire. Here, dialects of Welsh English influenced by the south-west of England existed from the twelfth century onwards, brought about it seems by population movement across the Bristol Channel from Somerset and Devon.

Anglicization down the centuries was aided by events which boosted the status of English and lowered that of Welsh. Under the Acts of Union of 1536–1543, English was made the sole language of government and law in Wales. Aitchison and Carter (2000: 27) state that although this “formally abstracted a domain of use from Welsh which had effectively been lost long before”, it also meant that “[i]f
Welsh were not to be used in a significant formal context then it meant, too, that its use in informal contexts would diminish”. They add:

Inevitably, if the Welsh gentry wished to participate in public life then that participation would be in English and the language of polite society, if such it can be called, would also be English. There followed the conviction that Welsh was the language of the barbarous past, English the language of the civilized future. (Aitchison and Carter 2000: 27)

Aitchison and Carter here probably borrow from the (at least in Wales) well-known editorial of *The Times* of 8 September 1866 which argued that the “antiquated and semi-barbarous” Welsh language, together with ignorance of the English language, was responsible for the exclusion of the Welsh people “from the civilization, the improvement and the material prosperity of their English neighbours”. Certainly, higher prestige (further enhanced by the education system during the second half of the nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth especially) and increasing incoming speaker numbers (from the Industrial Revolution onwards) helped establish English as a language of the whole of Wales by the second half of the twentieth century. Census statistics show large increases in the numbers of monolingual and bilingual English speakers in Wales during the twentieth century, and the extinction of monolingual Welsh speakers.

However, none of this has led to the demise of the Welsh language. Even in the areas subject to the earliest anglicization, Welsh-speaking persisted for centuries, and although its traditional geographical heartlands continue to shrink, up until the end of the twentieth century Welsh remained the first language in much of rural Wales (in the north-west, west midlands and south-west). The concerted attempt in recent decades to promote the use of Welsh, in particular through expanding the availability of Welsh-medium education, has apparently led to positive news for the language’s supporters in the most recent statistics, but arguably what lies ahead for Welsh is a process of ‘Latinization’, in which its use becomes restricted to a decreasing number of social domains as its traditional regional dialects decline.

These regional dialects in particular have had the greatest influence overall on the special character of English in Wales. As noted in Penhallurick (1993: 33), there are notable differences between the traditional Welsh dialects of north and south Wales, in phonology, lexis and grammar. These differences are mirrored to a degree, more so in pronunciation, in spoken English. Thus it is possible to talk of two main types of Welsh English, one centred in the north-west, the other in the mid-south. In these main northern and southern sub-varieties, non-standard features tend to be derived from Welsh-language influence. But there are other determining factors, such as influence from the neighbouring non-standard dialects (rural and urban) of England, particularly but not exclusively in the border areas, south Pembrokeshire and Gower.

As for the term *Welsh English*, it has not been the universal label of choice. At the outset of the only national survey of spoken English in Wales, David Parry
chose the term *Anglo-Welsh* for the varieties used by elderly English-speaking Welsh people. In addition, *Welsh English* has the potential to arouse nationalist sensibilities. As Coupland and Thomas (1989: 2) noted:

> the language question in Wales is sufficiently highly charged that some might infer that even to pay analytic attention to English in Wales, or ‘Welsh English’ [...] represents an ideological position, perhaps even a form of capitulation, or collusion with the forces threatening the Welsh language.

My view, briefly, is that English is a thoroughly established language of Wales, a language used by and belonging to the Welsh people – not that they have sole ownership of it, of course. My only anxiety over using the umbrella *Welsh English* could apply equally to other similar labels: that it masks diversity (that is, of English in Wales) and connections (between English inside and English outside Wales).

2. The phonological system

The most comprehensive collection of Welsh English data is in the archives of the *Survey of Anglo-Welsh Dialects* (henceforth SAWD) at the Department of English, University of Wales Swansea. Under the directorship of David Parry, material was collected in rural areas of Wales between 1968 and 1982 (cf. Parry 1977–1979, 1999), and in urban areas between 1985 and 1987. SAWD is the chief source of the present chapter, which aims to provide an overview of Welsh English phonology, focussing on traditional, rural Welsh English. Use will be made, in particular, of the analysis and description attempted in David Parry’s *A Grammar and Glossary of the Conservative Anglo-Welsh Dialects of Rural Wales* (1999). Parry (1999) attempts a general phonemicization for Welsh English based on the rural data, drawn from the 60-plus age-group, which can be presented as follows:

Short vowels: /ɪ ɛ ə ɔ u/  
Long vowels: /iː eː oː ɔː uː/  
Diphthongs: /iə ai au ɔi oʊ iə/  
Unstressed vowels: /ɪ ə ɜ/  
Consonants: /p b t d k ɡ f v θ ð s z ʃ ʒ x h tʃ dʒ m n n̩ l w j r/

Table 1 maps this broad phonemicization against the lexical set. STAY and SNOW are included for comparison with FACE and GOAT respectively, and highlight a tricky area in the phonemicization. In Table 1, the vowels for STAY and SNOW are not given phonemic status, in order to remain consistent with the system above. However, discussion of alternative analyses and the status of the vowels in FACE/STAY and GOAT/SNOW can be found in section 2.1. below.
The remainder of the chapter discusses the phonological system in detail, including realizations of the vowel phonemes and significant regional variations (under headings from the lexical set), followed by a description of noteworthy consonantal and prosodic features.

Table 1. Traditional rural Welsh English vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>ñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>ñ ~ ñë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>û</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>a ~ a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td>ñë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>ñë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td>i:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAY</td>
<td>[ei]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>o:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW</td>
<td>[ou]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>ñ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>ù:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>ñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>ë:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START</td>
<td>a:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>ñ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE</td>
<td>ñ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAR</td>
<td>ñë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
<td>(i)uwë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>auwë</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued)  Traditional rural Welsh English vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>aijə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR</td>
<td>iə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARS</td>
<td>œ: ~ iə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happY</td>
<td>i:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lettER</td>
<td>œ ~ ʌ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horsES</td>
<td>ɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commA</td>
<td>œ ~ ʌ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1. Stressed vowels

KIT
The realization of KIT words throughout Wales is [ɪ].

DRESS
Similarly, the realization of DRESS is [ɛ].

TRAP
Through most of Wales the realization of TRAP is [ə], but in mid Wales, where the county of Powys borders with the English counties of Shropshire and Hereford, a raised [æə] or even [ɛ] is recorded. A long [aː] is also recorded very sporadically.

LOT
The chief realization in LOT words is [ɔ], though [ɒ] is also recorded frequently, more so in the north than in the south. Some words which have the LOT vowel in RP but an <a> in their spelling, such as quarry, wash, and wasps, may have [a ~ æ] in Welsh English. Such forms are recorded in all regions. In Welsh-speaking areas they might be spelling pronunciations influenced by Welsh-language conventions (orthographic <wa> is pronounced [wa] in Welsh), but such [a ~ æ] vowels were also recorded widely by the Survey of English Dialects.

STRUT
In STRUT there is a marked tendency to a vowel raised and centralized compared with RP /ʌ/, even to the extent that [ɔ] is a common variant. There is also variation in unstressed syllables between [ʌ] and [ɔ]. Wells (1982: 380) speaks of the “STRUT-Schwa Merger” in Welsh English, that is to say, the lack of phonemic distinction between /ʌ/ and /ɔ/. Parry (1999: 15) opts for /ʌ/ as the phonemic designation for
STRUT vowels (rather than /ɔ/), which can be justified on grounds of frequency of occurrence, but he adds the rider that [ʌ] in his STRUT group is “most commonly a raised and centralized Cardinal Vowel 14”. The Welsh language has no /ʌ/ phoneme, but it does have /ɔ/, and this may be behind both the centralizing tendency in STRUT and the blurring or even erasing of distinction between /ʌ/ and /ɔ/ (cf. also section 2.2. below on unstressed vowels). In addition, it should be noted that occasionally the realization of the STRUT vowel strays into [a] territory, as recorded in Parry (1999: 15) in butter, furrow, uncle. These instances are few and are mainly restricted to the north and mid Wales border with England.

Also, [ʊ] can occur in STRUT words, and is recorded, interestingly, in the north-east corner and the south-west corner. The north-east occurrences can be readily explained by the presence of the well-known northern English [ʊ] in STRUT in neighbouring Cheshire. The south-west occurrences, mainly in south Pembrokeshire, an area subject to anglicizing influences since the twelfth century, are more mysterious. One could presume that they result from historical connections with south-west England, but as Parry (1999: 18) points out, there is only a small amount of evidence of [ʊ] in STRUT words in the traditional accents of Cornwall, Devon and Somerset.

ONE
Wells (1982: 362) notes that one and other words (for example, none, nothing), which have /ʌ/ in RP and an <o> in their spelling, have /ʌ/ as their stressed vowel across a wide band of the mid-north of England. Similarly, in Wales ONE words sometimes fall in with the LOT group, though more frequently they belong with STRUT. ONE with [ɔ ~ ɔ] is associated with the traditional Welsh-speaking areas of north and west Wales, where it may result from Welsh-influenced spelling pronunciation, and also with the north and mid border with England and the long-anglicized areas of south Pembrokeshire and the Gower Peninsula, to where it may have travelled from the accents of the north-west, west and south-west of England.

As with STRUT, [ʊ] can occur in ONE words. The details in Parry (1999: 18) indicate that [ʊ] occurs less frequently in ONE than in STRUT, but as with STRUT there is an association with the north-east and south-west corners of Wales.

FOOT
By far the most widespread realization of FOOT words is [ʊ]. Very rarely, in the north, unrounded [ʌ] is recorded. There are also instances of ‘hypercorrect’ [ʌ] in FOOT words, recorded in Parry (1999: 16) in the north-west, eastern mid Wales, and the south-west. The instances that occur in Welsh-speaking areas, in the north-west and south-west, are all of FOOT words with orthographic <u> (bull, butcher, put), and these might conceivably be spelling pronunciations. The instances elsewhere (eastern mid Wales, the south-west corner) might in most cases be linked with traditional [ʌ]-forms in west and south-west of England accents.
BATH
In BATH words there is competition between the short forms [a ~ æ] and long forms [a: ~ æː ~ əː], with [a] the most common realization, occurring in all regions. Of the long realizations, [a:] is also fairly common, whilst [æː] is less so, though it too is not regionally restricted. Wells states that “[t]he situation in the BATH words is not altogether clear” (1982: 387), and the same could be said now that SAWD material for the whole of rural Wales has been made available. Nevertheless, Parry’s (1999: 214) phonemic map for chaff shows /a/ dominating, with a few instances of /æː/ in the mid- and south-eastern border areas. His phonetic map for draught (Parry 1999: 217) shows a similar distribution of [a] and [æː], with one significant difference: an area dominated by [a:] in the north-west corner of Wales. The general picture (as Wells concluded) seems to be of confrontation between a non-standard short /a/ and a standard-influenced long /æː/, with the short vowel more than holding its own. However, whilst it is clearly sensible to differentiate between two phonemes here (a short and a long), this is one of those areas in Welsh English phonology where there is fluidity, as indicated also by the sporadic occurrence of the long vowel in TRAP words. On the other hand, it is likely that variation between the short and long forms can be correlated to some extent with register and social class.

CLOTH
Parry (1999: 24–25) shows a scattering of long [ɔːː] realizations in CLOTH words, the majority in mid-Wales, but overall the pattern is similar to LOT, with [ɔ] the main realization, and [d] common also.

NURSE
A realization of NURSE identified with the southern region of Welsh English is the long, rounded, centralized-front, half-open [œː]. There is no ready explanation for this realization, although it may mark an intermediate stage between Welsh English stressed /æ/ + /r/ and RP (the NURSE group is one of several subject to rhoticity in Welsh English – see /r/ in section 3 below). Parry (1999: 21) shows that this realization is not exclusive to the south, but occurs throughout Wales. However, its main competitor, /œː/, which is also widespread, is notably absent from the mid-south-east (that is, the Rhondda Valleys), the area associated in the public mind with [œː].

FLEECE
The dominant realization is [iː], though [iə], that is, realizations with a glide to the centre, are recorded (Parry 1999: 32), mainly in more strongly Welsh-speaking regions in mid-Wales.

FACE/STAY and GOAT/SNOW
The regional patterning of two characteristic sounds of Welsh English, the long monophthongs [eː] and [oː], is complex. They occur in both the main northern
and southern areas in words such as *bacon, break, great, make* (FACE) and *coal, road, spoke, toe* (GOAT) respectively. In these cases, the monophthongs can be regarded as phonemic, but overall their distribution is complicated by their occurrence also in words such as *clay, drain, weigh, whey* (STAY) and *cold, shoulder, snow* (SNOW). In STAY and SNOW, it is difficult to argue that the monophthongs are phonemic, for in these groups diphthongs, [ei] and [ou], are more likely. In addition, diphthongal forms can occur in FACE and GOAT. Table 2 summarizes the situation for the whole of Wales, outlining the competition between monophthongs and diphthongs in FACE, STAY, GOAT, and SNOW.

[ei] occurs most commonly in FACE, being dominant (in these words) in the north and south, and in the northern peripheries. [ei] in FACE is dominant only in the southern peripheries. In STAY, however, the diphthong is prevalent throughout the south, whilst the monophthong is dominant in the north. The sequence is the same for the [oː] – [ou] pair: the monophthong is dominant in GOAT everywhere but the southern peripheries, and in SNOW the diphthong dominates in the south, the monophthong in the north.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[eː]</th>
<th>[ei]</th>
<th>[oː]</th>
<th>[ou]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>north, south, northern peripheries</td>
<td>southern peripheries</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAY</td>
<td>north</td>
<td>southern peripheries</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>north, south, northern peripheries</td>
<td>southern peripheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOW</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>north</td>
<td>south, southern peripheries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of processes have produced this pattern. Firstly, the Welsh language has no diphthongs of the /ei/ and /ou/ types, and the Welsh monophthongs /eː/ and /oː/ have exerted an influence in Welsh English over words which have /ei/ and /ou/ in RP. Running counter to this are spelling pronunciations affecting STAY and SNOW, leading to the diphthongal forms, the general rules being: spellings with <ai>, <ay>, <ei>, <ey> encourage [ei], and spellings with <ou>, <ow> encourage [ou], with <ol> spellings falling in with SNOW rather than GOAT. Furthermore, there has been
influence from neighbouring accents of English English: [ei:] and [ou:] have been reinforced in the north of Wales by the influence of monophthongs occurring in the north-west of England; [ei] and [ou] have been supported by the diphthongs of the west and south-west of England, as well as those of RP, of course.

It is worth emphasizing that Table 2 simplifies a fluid situation. For example, the accents of particular localities or even individuals exhibit register-sensitive movement between monophthongal and diphthongal types, especially in the FACE and GOAT groups. Table 2 also simplifies the overall regional pattern: we can note here, for example, that neither monophthong nor diphthong dominates in STAY and SNOW in the northern peripheries.

PALM
There is some evidence from SAWD that PALM words are subject to the same competition between short [a] and long [a:] that occurs in BATH and, to a lesser extent, in TRAP. Parry’s phonetic map for calf (1999: 216), for example, shows a sizeable area in Carmarthenshire and north Pembrokeshire dominated by the short realization. However, through the rest of Wales a long vowel dominates and, furthermore, across mid Wales and in the area surrounding Swansea this long vowel is a back [ar:]. The short forms recorded for calf are probably not typical of PALM words, in which the main contest is between non-standard front [ar:] and RP-style back [ar:].

THOUGHT
The dominant realization in THOUGHT words is [ɔː], with, however, a significant sprinkling of r-coloured versions recorded (Parry 1999: 25) along the south-eastern border and in south Pembrokeshire, perhaps under the influence of west of England accents. For example, the Survey of English Dialects records r-colouring in saw-dust, slaughter, straw in Shropshire and Warwickshire.

GOOSE
The dominant realization in GOOSE is [uː], although short [u] is also recorded in certain words, especially tooth. Parry’s map of tooth (1999: 229) shows the short form covering the majority of Wales, with the exception of most of the north and a pocket in the south-west corner. In other GOOSE words used by Parry (goose, hoof, root, stool), the short form is more sporadic.

PRICE, CHOICE, MOUSE
Common to these three groups is a very close final element in the diphthong: [i] in PRICE and CHOICE, [u] in MOUSE. The first element in PRICE and MOUSE tends also to be very open: [a]. There is, however, a major counter-tendency in PRICE and MOUSE, that is, for a central [ɔ] to be used as the first element. Indeed, Wells (1982: 385) talks tentatively of the possibility of a phonemic distinction between [ai] and [ɔi], and between [au] and [ɔu], although this does seem unlikely. SAWD
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data shows a pretty clear regional distribution, with [ɔi] and [əu] restricted to the main southern, especially south-eastern, areas. Tench’s (1989: 141) view is that this variation in PRICE and MOUTH diphthongs tells us something about the chronology of English spoken in Wales: diphthongs with central first elements indicate areas where English was spoken relatively early, while diphthongs with open first elements indicate the more recent arrival of English.

SQUARE, START, NORTH, FORCE, BOAR
The main point of interest in each of these groups is rhoticity, to which all are subject. An outline of types of rhoticity and their regional distribution is given in section 3 below. However, whilst the situation varies from word to word, it is non-rhotic forms that have the upper hand in terms of frequency of occurrence.

Also worth noting in START is competition between front [ɑː] forms and back [oː] forms, with front realizations dominating in SAWD data. Parry’s (1999: 215) phonetic map for arm shows only pockets of back realizations in the south-west and mid borders (cf. BATH in section 2.1. above).

There is a notable tendency also for a raised [oː] realization to occur in BOAR words.

CURE, POWER, FIRE
Of interest in these groups is their tendency to be firmly disyllabic, with /w/ separating the syllables in CURE and POWER, and /j/ separating them in FIRE. The first syllable in CURE tends towards the /iu/ found in TUESDAY; the first syllable in POWER exhibits the variation between [au] and [əu] found in MOUTH; and the first syllable in FIRE falls in with the division between [ai] and [ɔi] found in PRICE. In their final syllable, all three tend towards an [ʌ] realization (cf. section 2.2. below).

NEAR, EARS
Two points to note here: a sporadic rhoticity (r-colouring) in both groups in south Pembrokeshire, Gower, and the borders; and a strong tendency for EARS to have an initial /j/ followed either by [œː] (as in NURSE, above) or [ɔː]. This latter feature, especially as [jœː:], is prevalent throughout south Wales except for pockets in the west.

TUESDAY
In TUESDAY words we find a Welsh English phoneme, /iu/. This phoneme is recorded in the overwhelming majority of SAWD localities. It is found also in the CURE group. As both Parry (1999: 28) and Walters (2003: 76) note, it is likely that there are two separate sources for this /iu/: one is influence from Welsh-language /iu/ (represented in ordinary orthography by <iw>), which probably lies behind /iu/ in Welsh English in most regions; the other is influence from similar diph-
thongs occurring in west of England accents, which probably lies behind the forms recorded in the south-east border regions.

2.2. Unstressed vowels

Walters (2003: 74), referring to Rhondda Valleys English (south Wales), reports that “the vowel in the final unstressed syllables of butter, sofa etc. is characteristically lengthened and with a fuller quality than normally ascribed to schwa”, which he attributes to Welsh-language influence, “which has a single central vowel and in which final unstressed syllables are said never to be reduced to schwa”. The data in Parry (1999: 34–35) corroborates this to some extent: [ʌ] is shown as a widespread realization in the lettER group, but occurring in most other parts of Wales as well as in the south-east. Its chief competitors are [ə] and [ɛ ~ ɛ], which occur chiefly in the long-anglicized areas of south Pembrokeshire, Gower, and the borders. However, we should remember that the “single central vowel” of Welsh is actually schwa, and in the STRUT group above (section 2.1) there is a considerable trend towards a central vowel. Thus whilst both STRUT and lettER exhibit variation between [ʌ] and [ə] types, in STRUT the movement is towards schwa, in lettER the movement is away from schwa.

Also worth noting is the widespread tendency in happy for the final unstressed vowel to be very close and, according to Parry (1999: 36), long.

2.3. Pharyngalization

Just as, for example, [œ:] in NURSE is particularly associated with southern Welsh English in popular opinion, so too is a certain ‘throatiness’ associated with northern Welsh English. This ‘throatiness’ is actually pharyngalization, that is, contraction of the pharyngeal arches. Jones (1984: 57) has noted that pharyngalization affects the articulation of the two high central vowels of northern Welsh, but Penhallurick (1991) records it with many Welsh English vowels in the traditional Welsh-speaking areas of west and central north Wales (Anglesey, Gwynedd, Conwy and Denbighshire). In Penhallurick (1991: 34–95), the only unaffected Welsh English vowels are the most open ones. [ɪ] tends also to be pharyngalized in northern Welsh English, as mentioned in section 3 below.

3. Consonants

Strong aspiration of /p, t, k/

In north Wales, strong aspiration (which sometimes approaches affrication) affects the voiceless plosives /p, t, k/, particularly in word-initial and word-final positions. This strong aspiration is exceptionally prominent in the north, but Parry (1999:
37–38) notes that throughout Wales each voiceless plosive “normally has strong aspiration in initial stressed position, and often finally before a pause”.

Dental /t, d, n/
In mid Wales and especially in the north (where they are the norm), dental realizations of /t, d, n/ occur. In the Welsh language, /t, d, n/ tend to have dental realizations in northern accents, and presumably Welsh-derived sound-substitution lies behind dental /t, d, n/ in northern Welsh English. Such dental realizations are infrequent elsewhere in Welsh English.

Unvoicing of /d/ and /z/
Parry (1999: 37) records the very occasional use of [t] finally in cold, second, which he links to certain English loanwords in Welsh in which final /ld/ becomes /lt/, and final /nd/ becomes /nt/ (for example, golt “gold”, diamwnt “diamond”).

Also, in traditional Welsh-speaking regions in the north-west and west-to-southwest, there is a considerable tendency to use [s] for RP /z/ in word-medial and word-final positions, for example, in thousand, and cheese. This again can be explained by influence from the Welsh language, which has no /z/, although the phoneme can occur in loanwords from English.

Should these cases of ‘unvoicing’ in Welsh English, when compared with RP phonology, be treated as phonemic substitution (/t/ for /d/, and /s/ for /z/), or as variant realizations (of /d/, and /z/)? The decision is not altogether straightforward. Given the evident phonotactic constraints, the latter analysis is perhaps tidier. However, the apparent underlying cause (originating in the Welsh language) is phonemic.

Initial fricative voicing
Parry (1999: 39) records the use of initial /v/ where RP has initial /f/ in first, four, furrow in south-eastern Powys, Monmouthshire, south Pembrokeshire and in south Gower. He also records one instance of /ð/ for /θ/ in third in west Powys (Parry 1999: 40). Such Initial Fricative Voicing, as Wells (1982: 343) calls it, is associated with west-country accents of England, where traditionally it can affect /f, θ, s, ð/. Penhallurick (1994: 145–148) provides evidence of voicing of initial /f, s/ in the southern half of the Gower Peninsula from the seventeenth century to the late twentieth century, though by the 1980s it was very much a relic feature in Gower English. Where it occurs, or has occurred, in Welsh English, Initial Fricative Voicing is no doubt due to longstanding influence from west English English.

/ɬ, ʃ/ These two fricatives belong to the sound system of the Welsh language, in which they are represented orthographically by <ll> and <ch> respectively. Excepting place-names, they each have a very limited occurrence in traditional Welsh Eng-
lish, in loanwords from Welsh, such as *cawellt* ‘wicker basket’ and *crochon* ‘bread-basket’.

/l/
The detail of the distribution of clear [l] and dark [ɬ] in Welsh English is rather intricate, but the data from SAWD permits the following summary. In the south and midlands of Wales, [l] dominates in all phonetic environments. In the north, particularly in Gwynedd, [ɬ] dominates in all positions. The peripheral, historically anglicized regions follow RP, with [l] before a vowel, and [ɬ] before a consonant or pause. This Welsh English pattern is influenced by the Welsh language, in which /l/ is clear in southern Welsh and noticeably dark in northern Welsh, where it is accompanied by strong pharyngalization. Thus /l/ provides two of the popular diagnostics of Welsh English: dark, pharyngalized [ɬ] in all positions for the main northern variety, and clear [l] in all positions for the main southern variety.

Dropping of initial /w/
Initial /w/ is foreign to Welsh as an unmutated form (several consonants in Welsh are subject to mutation rules in word-initial position), and influence from this may lie behind the occasional dropping of initial /w/ in traditional Welsh English, particularly in words with a following back, close, rounded stressed vowel, such as woman, wool. Parry (1999: 40–41) records zero-/w/ initially in these words scattered through north, mid and south Wales, though forms with initial /w/ are dominant overall.

/r/
The Welsh language has two r phonemes: a voiced alveolar rolled /r/, which is sometimes realized as a flap [ɾ] and sometimes, particularly in the Bala area, north Wales, as a uvular rolled [ʀ] or uvular fricative [ʁ]; and a voiceless alveolar rolled /r/ (⟨rh⟩ in ordinary orthography). Welsh /ɾ/ impacts little on Welsh English, but rolled [ɾ] realizations occur often in the spoken English of north and south Wales, excepting the border areas, and the Gower Peninsula and south Pembrokeshire, where an approximant [ɹ] dominates. There is also a high frequency of flapped [ɾ] in Welsh English, particularly in traditional Welsh-speaking areas, and this can be interpreted as further evidence of Welsh influence on Welsh English /ɾ/. Uvular realizations of Welsh English /ɾ/ are confined to the north, where they are rare and possibly usually idiolectal.

Orthographic /r/ is always articulated in the Welsh language, in all word-positions, and this practice is carried over at times into Welsh English, resulting in post-vocalic /ɾ/ word-medially and word-finally in the north and the south, this rhoticity being centred in the traditional Welsh-speaking areas in the west half of Wales. This Welsh-influenced rhoticity in *NURSE*, *SQUARE*, *START*, *NORTH*, *FORCE*, *BOAR* sometimes leads to a short vowel followed by /ɾ/ (Parry 1999: 14–17), such
as: /ʌr/ in first, third, work in western mid Wales; /æt/ in heard (a spelling pronunciation) and in chair, mare, pears in pockets in the west; /æt ~ ʌt/ in arm, farmer, farthing in the west; /ɔt/ in forks, morning and in boar, four a few times in north, mid and west Wales. Occasionally the short vowel minus following /r/ is recorded. Rhotic forms with long vowels are common in NURSE, SQUARE, START, NORTH, FORCE, BOAR, with the general pattern as follows: long vowel followed by /r/ (that is, forms influenced by the Welsh pronunciation convention of always articulating orthographic r), widespread in the western half of Wales; long r-coloured vowel without a following /r/ (that is, forms influenced by west of England accents), occurring in the mid- and south-eastern border areas, and in south Pembrokeshire and the Gower Peninsula.

Lengthened consonants
The consonants /p, b, t, d, k, g, v, θ, s, f, tʃ, m, n, ɲ, l/ are all recorded by Parry (1999: 37–40) as being subject to lengthened duration of pronunciation in Welsh English, when located in word-medial position. Parry records these lengthened forms in most parts of Wales. In the Welsh language, medial consonants tend to be long, especially between vowels when the preceding vowel is stressed. The most likely cause for these lengthened consonants in Welsh English is therefore once again influence from Welsh. However, it should be noted that SAWD data shows lengthening affecting medial consonants when followed by a consonant as well as when followed by a vowel (for example, [mː] in thimble). Furthermore, many instances occur in the more anglicized regions of Wales.

4. Prosody
Wells (1982: 392) notes: “Popular English views about Welsh accents include the claim that they have a ‘sing-song’ or lilting intonation”, a characteristic associated particularly with the industrial valleys of south Wales. Comparatively little has been published on Welsh English intonation, but studies have been carried out since Wells’s Accents of English. Tench (1989: 140), on the English of Abercrave in the Swansea Valley, notes “the high degree of pitch movement on an unaccented post-tonic syllable” and “the high degree of pitch independence of unaccented syllables in pre-tonic position”, features which, says Tench, lie behind the sing-song claim. The detailed analysis in Walters (2003: 81–84), which draws on his substantial 1999 study, describes striking pitch movement in the pronunciation of Rhondda Valleys English (for example, the tendency for pitch to rise from the stressed syllable), which Walters connects with influence from Welsh-language intonation patterns.
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Joan Beal

1. Introduction

1.1. Defining “the North of England”

The North of England is a region whose boundaries have been defined in a number of different ways by laypersons, members of the tourist industry and linguists. Wales (2002), using the methodology of perceptual dialectology, demonstrates that undergraduate students in a British university vary widely in their perceptions of the geographical boundaries of the North. Typically, when asked to draw a line on a map of Britain, students resident in the South of England would place this line much further South than those resident in the North or Midlands. Expressions such as “North of Watford Gap” testify to the perceptions of southerners in this “austrocentric” nation (Wales 2002: 46). Historically, we might think of the North as the area covered by the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria, stretching from the Humber to the Firth, with Sheffield marking its southernmost point on the border with Mercia. This area would include the modern counties of Northumberland, Cumbria, Tyne and Wear, Teesside, Humberside, Yorkshire, Merseyside, Greater Manchester and Lancashire, but exclude Cheshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. Tourist maps tend to agree with this definition: the National Trust handbook has Merseyside and Lancashire in the North-west, but Cheshire in the central area; the route maps in Country Walking magazine place Cheshire in the “Heart of England”, Lincolnshire in the “East of England” and Derbyshire alongside Nottinghamshire in the East Midlands. Confirming this last location, a film released in the cinema in summer, 2002, is set in Nottingham and entitled Once upon a time in the Midlands.

Dialectologists have attempted to define the North in purely linguistic terms. Whilst these more objective judgements do not show the same range of divergence as the students in Wales’s (2000) study, there are differences, particularly apparent when we contrast accounts of “traditional” dialects with those of “modern” ones. Ellis (1869–1889) divided England into six major dialect areas, on the basis of ten isoglosses. His area V, the northern division, covers “the entire North and East Ridings with some of the West Riding of Yorkshire, northern Lancashire, most of Cumberland and Northumberland, all Westmorland and Durham” (Ihalainen 1994: 245). Ellis’s divisions are based on four phonological criteria: the pronunciation of words like some, the pronunciation of r, the pronunciation of the definite article and the pronunciation of words like house. His northern division excludes the southern
parts of Lancashire and Yorkshire, and the far North of Northumberland and Cumbria (these latter belonging to area VI, “the lowland division”). Wakelin (1983) divides the traditional dialects of England into four regions, roughly corresponding to the dialect areas of Middle English: North, West Midlands, East Midlands and South-west. Wakelin’s northern region reaches slightly further South than Ellis’s, with its southern boundary stretching from the Humber to the Ribble. The SED likewise follows the divisions of Middle English dialects. The Basic Materials are divided into four volumes: the northern counties and Man; the West Midlands; the East Midlands and the South. The northern Counties covered in volume I are Cumberland, Westmorland, Northumberland, Durham, Lancashire and Yorkshire. By using county boundaries to delimit the regions covered by their volumes, Orton (1962–1971) thus brings the territory covered by “the North” further south than either Ellis or Wakelin to coincide with Anglo-Saxon Northumbria. Although Orton and his fellow SED researchers seem to have organised their volumes in this way for administrative convenience rather than as a theoretical statement, as Wales (2002: 48) points out, their “northern Counties” division does accord with popular perceptions, especially those of northerners. Wales herself follows the SED’s example in her cultural history of northern English (Wales 2002: 48). Most recently, Trudgill (1999) divides the traditional dialect areas of England into three regions: North, central and South. Trudgill’s criteria are the pronunciation of long as /læŋ/ vs. /lɒŋ/, night as /nɪt/ vs. /nait/, blind as /blɪnd/ vs. /blaind/, land as /lænd/ vs. /lɒnd/, arm as /ɑːm/ vs. /ɔːm/, hill as /hɪl/ vs. /hl/, seven as /ˈsɛn/ vs. /ˈzɛn/, and bat as /bæt/ vs. /bæt/. Trudgill’s northern region is subdivided into the Lower North and Northumbria, with Lancashire in the western central and South Yorkshire in the eastern central regions. Trudgill’s definition of the North is thus closer to Ellis’s, with Northumberland separated from the rest of the North, and Lancashire and South Yorkshire outside the North altogether.

Trudgill uses a different set of criteria to classify modern dialects, of which he writes:

In Britain, they are particularly associated with those areas of the country from which Standard English originally came – the southeast of England; with most urban areas; with places which have become English-speaking only relatively recently, such as the Scottish Highlands, much of Wales, and western Cornwall; with the speech of younger people; and with middle- and upper-class speakers everywhere. (Trudgill 1999: 6).

These criteria are: the vowel in but /bʌt/ vs. /bæt/, the pronunciation of arm as /ɑːm/ vs. /ɔːm/, the pronunciation of singer as /ˈsɪŋə/ vs. /ˈsɪŋə/, the pronunciation of few as /fjuː/ vs. /fjuː/, the pronunciation of ee in coffee as /ɪ/ vs. /iː/, the pronunciation of gate as /ɡeɪt/ vs. /ɡeɪt/ and the pronunciation of l in milk [mɪlk] vs. [mɪlk]. On the basis of these criteria, Trudgill divides the modern dialects into two major areas, North and South, with the North subdivided into northern and central. Merseyside is here classified along with the West Midlands.
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and Northwest Midlands as part of the West central group, on the basis of having /singo/ for singer. The northern division is then further subdivided into the Northeast (from the Tees to the Tweed) and the Lower North (Humberside, central Lancashire and the central North). The single criterion for the major division between North and South here is the vowel in but, pronounced /but/ to the North of a line running from the Wash just south of Birmingham to the Welsh border and /bat/ South of this line.

Wells likewise uses this feature as one of the main criteria for dividing English accents into northern and southern types:

We cross from the south to the linguistic north at the point where we pass the northern limits (in broad local accents) of the FOOT-STRUT split and of BATH broadening. In a northern accent, then, put and putt are typically homophones, [pʊt], while gas and glass rhyme perfectly, [ɡɑs, ɡlas]. (Wells 1982: 349)

Like Trudgill, Wells (1982) notes that the North, so defined, also includes “most of the midlands. It includes, for example, the Birmingham-Wolverhampton conurbation, Leicester and Peterborough” Wells (1982: 349). He then goes on to subdivide the North into the Midlands, the middle North and the far North. The geographical areas covered by these subdivisions are similar to those in Trudgill (1999), except that, for Wells, Liverpool is in the middle North rather than the Midlands.

The accounts of linguists thus differ according to the type of dialect classified (traditional vs. modern) and the range of linguistic criteria used in classification. They do, however, all agree on a core area which is indisputably northern, an area roughly corresponding to the territory of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria, south of the present-day border with Scotland. It is acknowledged that the far North, or the North-east from Tees to Tweed, has dialects which are markedly different from those of the lower or middle North. Whilst acknowledging that, according to the criteria selected by Wells, the Midlands share certain highly salient characteristics with the North, in this chapter I shall define “the North of England” as coterminous with that of Anglo-Saxon Northumbria, i.e. stretching from Berwick-upon-Tweed and Carlisle in the North, to Sheffield in the South, and including Merseyside and all of pre-1972 Lancashire (thus Warrington and Widnes, which are now in Cheshire), and all of Yorkshire and Humberside. This area is coterminous with the six northern counties of the SED, and is also the area covered in Wales’s (2002) cultural history of northern English.

1.2. A brief history of northern English

The origins of northern English can be traced to the language of the first settlements of northern Germanic tribes in what was to become the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria. However, as Wales (2002: 47) points out, the Romans had already divided Britain into Britannia superior (south of the Mersey-Wash line);
Britannia Inferior, north of this line; and Britannia Barbara, north of Hadrian’s Wall. Thus, even before English was spoken in this country, the threefold cultural division of South, North and far North was recognised. What can further be established is that Britain had been invaded by Germanic tribes before the end of the 5th century, and that by the 9th century, written records show clear dialectal differences between texts written in the North and South of what is now England. Versions of Caedmon’s hymn, which is found in Bede’s History of the English Church and People, exist in both West Saxon and Northumbrian dialects. Both these versions were written in the 9th century, when Bede’s Ecclesiastical History was translated from Latin. Differences between the two texts include West Saxon <ea> for Northumbrian <a>, and West Saxon <eo> for Northumbrian <e> suggesting that the West Saxon had diphthongs where Northumbrian had monophthongs in words such as bearne/barn (‘child’, cf. present-day northern bairn) and heofon/hef n (‘heaven’) (see Freeborn 1998: 32–33 for a full transcription of these two versions).

Opinion is divided as to whether these dialectal differences in Old English have their origins in the different tribal dialects of the Angles in the North and the Saxons in the South, or whether they evolved in the 200 years between the first settlements and the first written records. Certainly, by the 8th century, the geographical distribution of the dialects of Old English coincided with some of the political boundaries of the Heptarchy, but even at this early stage, the differences between northern and southern dialects were the most distinctive, with Northumbrian and Mercian more similar to each other than to the dialects of East Anglia, Wessex or Kent.

Texts from the Middle English period provide evidence both of a number of differences between northern, midland and southern dialects of English, and of a growing awareness of these distinctions on the part of writers. By the 14th century, there is clear evidence that northern dialects were becoming stigmatised, at least in the eyes (or ears) of southerners. Perhaps the most frequently-quoted example of this is John of Trevisa’s (1380) translation of Higden’s Polychronicon, in which Trevisa inserts the following comment:

Al the longage of the Northumbres, and speciallich at York, is so scharp, slitting and frotyng and unshape, that we southerne men may that longage unnethe understande. I trowe that that is bycause that they beeth nigh to straunge men and aliens that speketh strongeliche (cited in Freeborn 1998: 259).

Notable here is the characterisation of northern English as both harsh and unintelligible to “we southerne men”, an in-group whose superiority is assumed. However, the superiority of the South did not go unchallenged: in the Second Shepherd’s Play of the Townley Cycle (Wakefield), the sheep-stealer Mak disguises himself as a court official in order to trick the locals. His attempt is received with ridicule, as he is told ‘let be thy southern tooth and set in it a turd’. Thus the stereotypes of
the condescending southerner and the proudly defiant Yorkshireman are already established by the end of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century.

Some of the dialectal differences between northern and southern dialects of Middle English are apparent in versions of the \textit{Cursor Mundi}, originally written in the North towards the end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, but copied by a southern scribe in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century. The southern scribe makes several changes which provide evidence of dialectal differences. One clear North-South distinction is that between \textit{<a>} spellings in the North and \textit{<o>} spellings in the South for words like \textit{know}, \textit{none} and \textit{hold}. As the modern spellings show, the \textit{<o>} spelling has prevailed in Standard English, but survival of pronunciations with /\textit{e}/ in Scots provide evidence for an earlier /\textit{a}/ or /\textit{a}/ which is retained in the North, but rounded to /\textit{o}/ in southern dialects. This change seems to have happened at least by the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, for texts from this period show the same pattern of \textit{<a>} spellings in the North (and Midlands) but \textit{<o>} in the South (Examples can be found in Freeborn 1998: 116).

Many of the differences between northern and southern dialects of Middle English can be attributed to the greater influence of Scandinavian languages in the North. The first recorded landing of Viking invaders was the raid on Lindisfarne in 793, but sustained contact between English- and Scandinavian-speaking people did not occur until the second half of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, when the great armies of the Vikings settled in East Anglia, the eastern part of Mercia, and southern Northumbria. Along with those of the Norwegians who sailed from Ireland to the North-west of England, these settlements make up the ‘Scandinavian Belt’ crossing England diagonally from Cumbria to Lincolnshire, in which the greatest concentration of Scandinavian features in English dialects is still found. In the Middle English period, northern dialects of English were characterised by Scandinavian features such as the pronouns \textit{they}, \textit{their}, \textit{them}, as well as the levelling of inflections which has been attributed to language contact. These morphological features were to be adopted into the Standard English which developed in 15\textsuperscript{th} century London, and so are no longer recognised as northern. As Wales (2002: 45) points out, no comprehensive history of northern English has ever been written: typically, histories of English confine their accounts of northern dialects to an enumeration of the characteristics of Middle English dialects and the contributions of northern dialects to the 15\textsuperscript{th} century standard. References to northern English after 1500 tend to consist largely of quoting the derogatory remarks of southerners as proof that only Standard English mattered in the modern period. Perhaps the most frequently-quoted extract is the following, from Puttenham’s \textit{Art of English Poesie}, where the author says of the would-be poet:

\ldots neither shall he take the termes of Northern-men, such as they use in dayly talke, whether they be noblemen or gentlemen, or of their best clarkes all is a matter: nor in effect any speach used beyond the river of Trent, though no man can deny but that theirs is the purer English Saxon at this day, yet it is not so Courtly nor so currant as our Southerne English is, no more is the far Westerne mans speach: ye shall therefore take

Representations of northern English in 16th-century literature emphasise the outlandishness of these dialects to Londoners’ ears. In William Bullein’s *Dialogue both Pleasant and Pitiifull* (1578), the character Mendicus is quite literally the beggar at the gates of London. His Northumbrian dialect is noticed at once by the lady of the house, who remarks: “What doest thou here in this Countrie? me thinke thou art a Scot by thy tongue.” Mendicu’s speech is one of the few 16th-century representations of Northumbrian dialect, characterised by the use of <o> for <a> in words such as *mare* for *more* and *sarie* for *sorry*, as well as a number of words which would have been familiar to Londoners from the Border Ballads sung in the streets: *limmer* ‘scoundrel’, *fellan* ‘brave’, *deadlie feede* (the blood feud of the North Marches). Other words, such as *barnes* ‘children’ and *ne* ‘no’, are still used in Northumberland today. Bullein had spent several years in Tynemouth, and so had had the opportunity to observe the Northumbrian dialect first-hand. His representation of the dialect seems accurate, but the effect in the play is to reinforce the stereotype of the uncivilised northerner.

The quote from Puttenham suggests that the acceptable model for literary English was that of an area within a 60-mile radius of London, and that the English spoken north of the Trent was singled out, along with that of the South-west, as particularly outlandish, albeit northern English is acknowledged to be ‘purer’. This double-edged attitude towards northern English was to persist throughout the modern period. John Ray’s *Collection of English Words not generally used* (1674) shows an antiquarian interest in northern dialect, and even Dr Johnson acknowledged that, having “many words…commonly of the genuine Teutonic race…the northern speech is…not barbarous but obsolete” (1755). On the other hand, 18th century grammarians and elocutionists catered for readers who were anxious to rid themselves of the stigma of provincialism in an increasingly London-centric society. John Walker’s *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary* (1791), after outlining his “Rules for the Natives of Scotland, Ireland and London for avoiding their respective peculiarities”, makes the following remark about “those at a considerable distance from the capital”:

If the short sound of the letter *u* in *trunk*, *sunk*, &c. differ from the sound of that letter in the northern parts of England, where they sound it like the *u* in *bull*, and nearly as if the words were written troonk, soonk, &c. it necessarily follows that every word where the second sound of that letter occurs must by these provincials be mispronounced. (Walker 1791: xii, my emphasis)

Walker’s remarks here show a clear judgement that any dialect diverging from the polite usage of London (not that of the Cockneys, who are the “inhabitants of London” intended to benefit from Walker’s rules) is simply wrong, and must be corrected with the help of the *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary*. A by-product of
this is that Walker, along with other 18th-century authors such as Thomas Sheridan, William Kenrick and the northerner John Kirkby, give us detailed information about northern pronunciation in the 18th century, if only in order to proscribe it. The feature described by Walker in the quote above is of course one of the most salient markers of northern English pronunciation to this day: the lack of what Wells (1982: 196) terms the “FOOT-STRUT split” (see 2.1.1. below for a further discussion of this feature). Other features of northern pronunciation particularly singled out for censure in the 18th century include the Northumbrian burr, first noticed by Defoe, who wrote:

I must not quit Northumberland without taking notice, that the Natives of this Country, of the ancient original Race or Families, are distinguished by a Shibboleth upon their Tongues in pronouncing the Letter R, which they cannot utter without a hollow Jarring in the Throat, by which they are as plainly known, as a foreigner is in pronouncing the Th: this they call the Northumberland R, or Wharle; and the Natives value themselves upon that Imperfection, because, forsooth, it shews the Antiquity of their Blood. (Defoe, Daniel. 1724–1727. A Tour Thro’ the Whole Island of Great Britain. Volume 3. London, 232–233)

Although Defoe calls this an “imperfection”, he acknowledges that the Northumbrians themselves take pride in this feature, possibly alluding to the folk-belief that it arose from copying a speech impediment of local hero Harry ‘Hotspur’ Percy, heir to the Duke of Northumberland. 18th-century authors, in condemning northern dialects, provide us with a good deal of information about the characteristic features of these dialects at the time (see 3.4.2. below for further discussion of the Northumbrian burr).

The 19th century saw the rise of the large industrial towns and cities of the North, and a corresponding awakening of working-class consciousness and regional pride. This found its expression in various forms of dialect writing: almanacs, poetry, dialogues and music-hall songs and recitations. At the same time, the new discipline of philology gives rise to scholarly accounts of northern dialects such as Joseph Wright’s (1892) Grammar of the Dialect of Windhill and numerous dialect glossaries such as Richard Heslop’s Northumberland Words (1892). By the end of the 19th century, universal primary education was perceived as a threat to the survival of traditional dialects: Heslop expresses his concern that “the tendency to assimilate the form of the dialect with the current English of the schools is increasing”, but the construction which he uses to illustrate this point, Me and my marrow was ganning to work, is still in use today.

Similar concerns about the viability of English dialects have been expressed throughout the 20th century, and continue into the 21st. The SED, which began in the 1950’s, set out with the intention of recording “traditional vernacular, genuine and old”, before such dialects were irretrievably lost due to the effects of urbanisation, mobility and the BBC. Echoes of these concerns can be found in accounts of dialect levelling at the turn of the millennium, both in scholarly texts such as the
papers in Foulkes and Docherty (1999) and in popular accounts of the spread of Estuary English (see also Altendorf and Watt, this volume). It is certainly the case that traditional dialects are being replaced by more modern, urban vernaculars, and that, within certain regions, the dialect of influential towns and cities is spreading (see Newbrook [1986, 1999] and Llamas [2000] for accounts of the influence of Liverpool and Newcastle on their respective hinterlands). But even where there is clear evidence of levelling in the North, this seems to be in the direction of a regional, or pan-northern, rather than a national model, so that we can confidently expect northern dialects to remain distinctive for some time yet.

1.3. Differences between dialects in the North of England

According to Wells (1982), “local differences in dialect and accent as one moves from valley to valley or from village to village are sharper in the north than in any other part of England, and become sharper the further north one goes” (Wells 1982: 351). In the light of recent studies which provide evidence of levelling in the North of England (discussed in 1.2 above), this may seem too bold a statement. Nevertheless, it is certainly the case that, even with regard to modern dialects, more features differentiate northern dialects from each other than are common to all of them. Even in areas where levelling occurs, new shibboleths are emerging to represent perceived differences between speakers living as little as 10 miles apart (cf. Beal [2000a] for an account of differences between ‘Geordie’ [Newcastle] and ‘Mackem’ [Sunderland]).

Whilst all northern dialects share certain phonological features, notably the short /a/ in BATH and ‘unsplit’ /u/ in FOOT/STRUT, others differentiate dialects within the North. Some of these distinctions are not strictly geographical, except insofar as they distinguish the more traditional speakers in rural areas from their urban neighbours. Even in the most remote corners of England today, young people attend high school and carry out leisure pursuits in larger towns and cities, so speakers of traditional dialects are likely to be older as well as rural. An example of a distinctive feature of traditional dialect can be found in the North-east, where increasingly only traditional dialect speakers have the Northumbrian burr /w/. However, other North-eastern features, such as /h/-retention, would be common to all speakers in this area, at least north of the Wear.

Other features distinguish dialect areas within the North from each other. In Trudgill’s account (1999: 65–75), the area which I have defined as the North in 1.1. above includes six dialect areas: Northeast, lower North, central Lancashire, Merseyside, Humberside and Northwest Midlands (the last of these includes Manchester). These divisions are arrived at on the basis of five phonological criteria: /h/-dropping/retention, monophthong versus diphthong in FACE, velar nasal plus in SING, rhoticity versus non-rhoticity, and the final vowel of HAPPY. As we shall see in the next section, whilst these features do serve to distinguish the major
dialect divisions in the North of England, they are not the only features which are salient.

2. Vowels and diphthongs

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td></td>
<td>FACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>PALM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>START</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>o ~ e</td>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>u ~ o</td>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>u ~ uu</td>
<td></td>
<td>CURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>ai ~ a: ~ ei ~ i:</td>
<td></td>
<td>happY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lettER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>æ:<del>ei</del>œ:~ɔ:</td>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>aʊ ~ a: ~ eʊ ~ u:</td>
<td></td>
<td>horsES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CommA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1. FOOT and STRUT

One of the most salient markers of northern English pronunciation, and the only one which involves a difference between dialects of the North (and Midlands) and those of the South as far as their phonemic inventories are concerned, is the lack of what Wells (1982: 132) terms the “FOOT–STRUT split” everywhere in England north of Birmingham. This split is of relatively recent origin, and is the result of unrounding of the Middle English short /œ/ in certain environments. By the middle of the eighteenth century the ‘unsplit’ /ʊ/ was already recognised as a northern characteristic. The Cumbrian John Kirkby remarked in 1746 that his “seventh vowel”, found in skull, gun, supper, figure, nature, “is scarce known to the Inhabitants of the North, who always use the short sound of the eighth vowel instead of it.” (quoted in Bergström 1955: 71) (Kirkby’s “eighth vowel” is long in too, woo, Food, etc., short in good, stood, Foot, etc. and so most likely to be /u/, but William Kenrick (1773: 36) indicates otherwise in his New Dictionary of the English Language.

It is further observable of this sound, that the people of Ireland, Yorkshire, and many other provincials mistake its use; applying it to words which in London are pronounced with the u full… as bull, wool, put, push, all of which they pronounce as the inhabitants of the Metropolis do trull, blood, rut, rush. Thus the ingenious Mr. Ward of Beverley, has given us in his grammar the words put, thus and rub as having one quality of sound.

Thus both Kirkby and Kenrick (as well as Walker, see 1.2. above) attest to the lack of any FOOT–STRUT split as a salient feature of northern speech in the 18th century,
but whilst Kirkby suggests that the unsplit northern phoneme is /u/, Kenrick’s account indicates that it is more like /ɔ/. In fact, both types of pronunciation exist in the North of England today. Wells (1982: 132) writes that “relatively open, STRUT–like qualities may be encountered as hypercorrections in FOOT words, as [ɔaʊə]” whilst Watt and Milroy (1999: 28) note that in Newcastle “STRUT/FOOT may be heard as [ɔ], among middle-class speakers, particularly females.” Kenrick’s “Mr Ward of Beverly” could well have been describing a similarly hypercorrect or middle class pronunciation in his grammar. Quite apart from these hypercorrect pronunciations, realisations of the FOOT–STRUT vowel vary from [ʊ] in the lower North and central Lancashire to something more like [ʏ] in Tyneside and Northumberland.

Distribution of /u/ and /ʊ/ across the FOOT and GOOSE sets also varies within and between northern dialects. Except in Tyneside and Northumberland, older speakers throughout the North have /u/ in some FOOT words, notably cook, brook, hook. These words, along with such as stood, good, foot etc. would have had a long vowel until the 17th century. 17th century evidence shows that pronunciation of these words was very variable, with /ɔ/, /ʊ/ and /u/ all attested for the same words. In the case of words in which the vowel is followed by /k/, this shortening has simply taken much longer to affect certain northern dialects, but the short vowel is now spreading. There are also some words in which pronunciation varies idiosyncratically: in Tyneside, both /fʊd/ and /fuːd/ can be heard, but the distribution seems to be idiolectal rather than regional, and soot is likewise highly variable.

2.2. BATH

Although /a:/ exists as a contrastive phoneme in northern English dialects, its distribution is more restricted than in the South. In the North, this vowel is notably absent from the BATH set. This feature and the unsplit FOOT–STRUT vowel are the two most salient markers of northern English, but the vowel in BATH words is the more stable and salient of the two. Wells (1982: 354) puts this point elegantly: “there are many educated northerners who would not be caught dead doing something so vulgar as to pronounce STRUT words with [ʊ], but who would feel it to be a denial of their identity as northerners to say BATH words with anything other than short [a]”. Like the FOOT–STRUT split, lengthening of an earlier short vowel /a/ in BATH words dates from the 17th century. The history of these words is very complex, but the lengthening certainly seems to have been a southern innovation, which was, in fact, stigmatised as a Cockneyism until well into the 19th century. Today, it is the northern short /a/ which is stigmatised, popularly described as a flat vowel, but as Wells’s quote suggests, it is a stigma which is worn with pride by the vast majority of northerners. Indeed, in northern universities, students from
the South are observed to shorten their pronunciation of the vowel in BATH words, assimilating to the pronunciation of their peers. In some northern varieties, there are lexical exceptions to the rule that BATH words have a short vowel: in Tyneside and Northumberland, master, plaster and less frequently disaster are pronounced with /ɑː/ (phonetically more like [ɔː]), but faster with /aː/, whilst master alone is pronounced with /ɑː/ in other varieties (Lancashire, Sheffield). As with unsplit FOOT–STRUT, the short vowel in BATH words is a feature of all northern English dialects, but is also found throughout the Midlands, at least as far south as Birmingham. Nevertheless, these are the features most often referred to in stereotypes of northern speech, and most often mentioned when subjects are asked to name features of northern dialect. All the features discussed below differentiate dialects in the North of England from each other.

2.3. GOAT and FACE

These lexical sets have monophthongal pronunciations /oː/ and /eː/ respectively in traditional dialects in the lower North, central Lancashire and Humberside, but diphthongal pronunciations in the far North and Merseyside. In Tyneside and Northumberland, traditional dialect speakers have centring diphthongs /uə/ and /iə/ in these words, whilst in Merseyside the corresponding diphthongs are more like RP. In the North-east, there is evidence of levelling in younger and/or middle-class speakers, not towards the closing diphthongs of RP, but to the monophthongal pronunciations found throughout most of the North. Watt and Milroy (1999) report that, in a study of speech recorded in 1994, only the older, working-class males used /eɪ/ in the majority of tokens of FACE vowels. Amongst all other groups, the most frequent variant was /eː/, with /eɪ/ emerging as a minority variant in the speech of young, middle-class males and females. Watt and Milroy suggest that the younger Tynesiders are signalling that they do not wish to identify with the old-fashioned cloth-cap-and-whippet image of their fathers, but still wish to be identified as northerners, so they are assimilating their speech to a pan-northern norm. At the opposite end of the northern dialect region, pronunciations of FACE words vary between older monophthongal /eː/ and the diphthongal /eɪ/ found in Merseyside and the Midlands as well as in RP. In these areas, the monophthongal pronunciations would be the old-fashioned variants, and the diphthongal variants are spreading from urban centres such as Liverpool. Some northern dialects retain traces of an earlier distinction between /eɪ/ in e.g. eight, weight and /eː/ in e.g. ate, wait. Both Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 89) and Petyt (1985: 119–124) note this distinction in speakers from West Yorkshire. However, the maintenance of a phonemic distinction appears to be recessive in these dialects. Petyt concludes that the influence of RP has led to confusion as to the incidence of these two phonemes, though some speakers retain a distinction between [eɪ] in wait and [eː] in weight.
To a certain extent, the variants of GOAT words are parallel to those of FACE: traditional North-eastern dialects have a centring diphthong /uə/, most of the North has a monophthong /o/, whilst Merseyside has /ou/. Some West Yorkshire speakers maintain a distinction between /o/ in e.g. nose and /ou/ in e.g. knows, but, as with the parallel distribution of variants in the FACE set, this is recessive (Petyt 1985: 124–132). Whilst Watt and Milroy found an overall preference for the pan-northern monophthongal variant /o/ in every group of their Tyneside informants except the older working-class males, another conservative variant [ɔ:] was used more by young, middle-class males than any other group. Watt and Milroy suggest that, for this group, the adoption of this variant is a “symbolic affirmation of local identity” (Watt and Milroy 1999: 37). A similar fronted variant is found in Humberside and South and West Yorkshire, and has become a stereotypical marker of the dialect of Hull, where humorous texts use semi-phonetic spellings such as fern curls for phone calls.

2.4. MOUTH

In traditional dialects, especially in the far North (and Scotland), words of this class are pronounced with [uː]. This monophthongal pronunciation is the same as that of Middle English: in the far North, the Great Vowel Shift did not affect the back vowels, so that /uː/ remains unshifted. In traditional dialects, this pronunciation could be found north of the Humber, but this receded in the later 20th century. In Tyneside and Northumberland, it is now used mostly by speakers who are older and/or working-class and/or male, and most speakers would use a diphthongal pronunciation [uʌ] for the majority of words in this set. However, in certain words which are strongly associated with local identity this pronunciation has been lexicalised and reflected in the spelling (Beal 2000a). For example, the spelling Toon (pronounced /tuːn/) has traditionally been used by Northumbrians to refer to the City of Newcastle, where they would go for shopping and leisure. The Toon is also the local name for Newcastle United Football Club, but more recently this spelling has also been adopted by the national press (“Toon must hit back” Daily Mirror April 14th 2003). This semi-phonetic spelling and monophthongal pronunciation can also be found in the words brown (when referring to Newcastle Brown Ale), down and out, all of which either refer to local items, or are used in collocation with town in phrases such as down the Town, a night out in the Town.

In some parts of the middle North, especially South Yorkshire, this set is pronounced /aː/. According to Petyt (1985: 82–91), accounts of the traditional dialects of Bradford, Halifax and Huddersfield suggest that words such as down, ground, town had /a/ in Bradford, /eə/ in Halifax, and that there was variation between /a/ and /eə/ in Huddersfield. Petyt’s own investigation (conducted from 1970 to 1971) revealed that the monophthongal pronunciation was recessive, but that a compromise between “traditional” /a:/ and “RP” /au/, in which the diphthong has a
lengthened first element “may be among the regional features that persist”. (Petyt 1985: 165)

2.5. PRICE

Most words in this set have the diphthong /aɪ/ in the majority of northern English dialects. In Tyneside and Northumberland, the diphthong is a narrower [ɛɪ], whilst in parts of the ‘middle North’, including West and South Yorkshire, a monophthongal [ʌɪ], distinct from the monophthongal [æɪ] variant in down, etc., is found in more traditional dialects. In such dialects, ground and grind would be pronounced [ɡraʊnd], [ɡraʊnd] respectively. As with MOUTH words, Petyt found that a compromise variant comprising a diphthong with a lengthened first element was more common in the speech of his 1970–1971 informants. In words such as night or right, northern dialects retained the consonant /χ/ when this was vocalised in southern dialects in the 16th century. In dialects which retained this northern pronunciation, the vowel before /χ/ remained short, and so was not shifted to /aɪ/ in the Great Vowel Shift. When northern English dialects later lost this consonant, the preceding vowel was lengthened to /iː/ giving pronunciations such as /niːt, riːt/ for night, right etc. This is now retained mainly in frequently-used words and phrases. Thus [ɑːrɪt] all-right is a common greeting between working-class males on Tyneside and [niːt] is similarly used for night especially in the expression the night (‘tonight’), but [leɪt] would be the more usual pronunciation of light. Petyt (1985: 164) notes that /iː/ was used in words of this subset by his West Yorkshire informants, but that the compromise diphthong described above was also used in these words.

2.6. SQUARE and NURSE

Whilst in RP SQUARE is pronounced with /ɛː/ and NURSE with the central vowel /ɑː/, the two sets are merged in certain dialects within the North. In Liverpool, words from either of these sets can be pronounced either as [ɛː] or [ɜː], thus fur and fair can both be heard as [fɛː] or [ɜː]. The [ɜː] pronunciation in SQUARE words is typical of traditional Lancashire dialects, and so can be heard in e.g. Wigan and Bolton, but is less common in the city of Manchester. Since Liverpool was in the old county of Lancashire, the [ɜː] pronunciation is perhaps a more traditional variant, and is heard in smaller Merseyside towns such as St Helens. However, [ɛː] in NURSE is also found in Hull and Middlesbrough on the East coast, but not north of the Teesside conurbation. More research needs to be carried out on the history of northern dialects of English before we can know whether this distribution is significant. In each locality, the [ɛː] in NURSE acts as a local shibboleth, distinguishing Liverpool from Lancashire, Hull from the rest of Yorkshire, and Teesside from the rest of the North-east.
2.7. NURSE and NORTH

These are merged for older/working-class speakers in Tyneside and Northumberland, where, in traditional dialects the vowel in NURSE words has been retracted to [ɔ]. Påhlsson (1972) explains this retraction as having been caused by “burr-modification”, the effect of the following uvular [ʁ], or Northumbrian burr, prior to loss of rhoticity in this dialect (see section 3.4. below for a discussion of rhoticity on northern dialects). This merger is a stereotypical feature of Tyneside and Northumbrian dialects, often referred to in humorous dialect literature (see Beal [2000a]). However, recent research shows that the retracted pronunciation of NURSE is found mostly in the speech of older, male speakers, whilst a front, rounded variant [ɔ] is found in the speech of younger women in particular (Watt and Milroy 1999).

2.8. happy

The unstressed vowel at the end of words in this set varies between tense and lax realisations in northern dialects. Dialects with what Wells (1982: 255–256) terms “happy-tensing” include those of the North-east, Liverpool and Hull. Elsewhere in the North, lax realisations of this vowel as [ɪ] or [ɛ] are heard. In the happy-tensing areas, the realisation may be [i] or even long [ii]. Perhaps because the tense vowel is found throughout the South and Midlands and in RP, both Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 57) and Wells (1982: 258) describe this as a southern feature, which has spread to certain urban areas in the North. However, a closer examination of 18th century sources reveals that the tense vowel was found both in the North-east and in London, suggesting that this is not such a recent innovation in these dialects (Beal 2000b). In all the northern happy-tensing areas, the lax vowel is a shibboleth of the neighbouring dialects: it marks the difference between Teesside and Yorkshire, Humberside and West Yorkshire, and Liverpool and Lancashire. In every case, it is the lax variant which is stigmatised. For example, young, middle-class women in Sheffield, which is on the border of the North and the Midlands, are increasingly using either a more tense variant or a compromise diphthong [eɪ], perhaps in order to avoid the stigmatised Yorkshire [ɛ].

2.9. letter

This unstressed vowel has a range of realisations in different northern dialects. Whilst the majority of northern speakers have [ɔ] in this context, speakers in Manchester and Sheffield have [ʊ], whilst Tynesiders have [ʌ]. In the case of Tyneside, the [ʌ] is also heard as the second element of centering diphthongs in e.g. *here*, and *poor* [hɪʌ, puː].
3. Consonants

3.1. /ŋ/ in SING

This phoneme is not part of the inventory of dialects in the south-western corner of the North as here defined, i.e. from Liverpool and South Lancashire as far across as Sheffield. Here, [ŋ] is only ever pronounced before a velar consonant, e.g. in singing [sɪŋɪŋ]. Thus [ŋ] in these varieties is an allophonic variant of /n/. Speakers in other parts of the North would often have [m] for the bound morpheme -ing, but would have [ŋ] elsewhere, thus singing would be [sɪm]. In the areas which retain the velar nasal plus pronunciation, [m] occurs as a less careful, stigmatised variant, whilst [ŋ] is perceived as correct, almost certainly because of the spelling. The [m] pronunciation was not perceived as incorrect until the later 18th century, when it began to be proscribed in pronouncing dictionaries. John Rice in his Introduction to the Art of Reading with Energy and Propriety (1765) writes that whilst /m/ is “taught in many of Our Grammars” it is “a viscious and indistinct Method of Pronunciation, and ought to be avoided”. However, well into the 20th century, this pronunciation was also perceived to be stereotypical of the English aristocracy, whose favourite pastimes were huntin’, shootin’ and fishin’. In the words something and anything, a variant pronunciation [m] is heard throughout the North, though in the North-east, the nasal may be dropped altogether to give [smk]. These words are not used in traditional northern dialects, where the equivalents would be summat and nowt, so the [ŋ] pronunciation here is perhaps hypercorrect.

3.2. /h/

Pronunciation of initial <h> is socially stratified in most areas of the North, as in most of England. Petyt's study of West Yorkshire (1985: 106) shows that h-dropping is near-categorical for working-class males in casual speech style (93% in class V), but that class I males in the same speech style only have 12% h-dropping. The one area of the North in which initial <h> is retained, at least in stressed syllables, is the North-East. Trudgill (1999: 29) shows the isogloss for [hl], [Il] (hill) just north of the Tees, but Beal (2000a) demonstrates that h-dropping is perceived as a salient feature of Sunderland speech within Tyne and Wear. In fact, close examination of the SED material shows a set of very loosely bundled isoglosses for individual words, with that for home as far north as mid-Northumberland, and those for house, hear and hair following the Tees. Recent studies indicate that the h-dropping isogloss is moving further north, with even younger speakers as far north as Newcastle providing some evidence of this. Given that h-dropping is the most stigmatised feature of non-standard speech in England, this is a surprising development, but in the context of the spread of other pan-northern features such as the monophthongal pronunciation of GOAT and FACE, it is perhaps more
understandable. Young north-easterners are converging with their northern peers rather than with RP speakers.

3.3. /t/, /p/, /k/

The voiceless stops are subject to both regional and social variation within the North. Of this set, /t/ is the most variable. It can be realised as /r/, as an affricate [ts], as a glottal [ʔ] or glottalised [ʔt].

Throughout the North, the pronunciation of /t/ as /r/ is found in certain phonological and morphological environments. Usually, this occurs intervocally before a morpheme boundary, as in get off [ɡɛ rif] or put it [pʊ rt], or an environment perceived as a morpheme boundary, e.g. matter [mɑrə]. According to Watt and Milroy (1999: 29–30), in Newcastle this realisation of /t/ is heard “most often in the speech of older females”.

In many urban areas of Britain, and in the North-east of England generally, /t/ can be glottalised. Glottalisation of /p/, /t/ and /k/ is a sociolinguistic variable correlating with age and gender in the North-east. According to Foulkes and Docherty (1999: 54), there are two distinct patterns of what may be loosely termed glottalisation in the speech of Newcastle:

First, what sounds on auditory analysis to be a plain glottal stop occurs categorically before syllabic /l/ (e.g. in battle). The second type of variant presents the auditory impression of a glottal stop reinforcing any of the three voiceless stops /p, t, k/ when they occur between sonorants (e.g. in happy, set off, bacon). These variants are usually labelled ‘glottalised’. (Foulkes and Docherty 1999: 54)

The glottal stop pronunciation, especially of /t/, has been observed to be spreading to almost all urban centres in Britain, and is often cited as evidence of the influence of Estuary English (see also Altendorf and Watt, this volume). However, it was first noticed at the turn of the 20th century as occurring in the North of England and in Scotland. In the second half of the 20th century, use of the glottal stop for /t/ has spread to most urban areas of Britain. Indeed, Trudgill describes this as “one of the most dramatic, widespread and rapid changes to have occurred in British English in recent times” (Trudgill 1999: 136). In the North of England, it is found in every urban centre except Liverpool, and even here, Newbrook (1999: 97) notes glottal pronunciation of pre-consonantal and final /t/ in West Wirral. In the North-east, the glottalised [ʔt] pronunciation is more characteristic of traditional Tyneside speech. However, research carried out at the University of Newcastle shows that younger speakers, and especially middle-class females, use [ʔ] in the non-initial prevocalic context (as in set off), whilst the glottalised forms tend to be used mainly by older, working-class males. There is thus a pattern of variation correlating with age, gender and social class, suggesting that young, middle-class females are in the vanguard of a change towards a non-localised pronunciation.
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(See Watt and Milroy [1999]; Docherty and Foulkes [1999] for further discussion of this.) Although this pattern might suggest that the glottalised forms are recessive in Tyneside, Llamas (2000) demonstrates that these variants are being adopted by younger speakers on Teesside, which “suggests that Middlesbrough English is converging with the varieties found further north in Tyneside, Wearside and Durham”. (Llamas 2000: 11)

Whilst the glottal stop pronunciation of /t/ is, as reported above, spreading to all urban areas of Britain, glottal and glottalised forms of /p/ and /k/ are confined to the North-east. In Tyneside, glottalised forms of these consonants, as of /t/, are found, though less frequently in the speech of females than males. In Middlesbrough, these glottalised forms are increasingly used by younger speakers, but there is also a trend towards a full glottal stop for /p/ in younger speakers (Llamas 2000: 10).

In Liverpool, /t/, /p/ and /k/ can be affricated in all positions, thus right, time [ra/_711ts, tsa/_711m], hope, pay [h/_007upf, pfa/_711]. In final position, they may be realised as full fricatives [♂, s, ]. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 93) suggest that this phenomenon may account for the relative lack of glottal forms in this conurbation.

3.4. /r/

The phonetic realisations and distributions of /r/ vary considerably between different northern dialects. In two areas of the North, /r/ was attested in preconsonantal environments in the SED. These rhotic areas were found in Lancashire and in Northumberland. In the latter case, there was more r-colouring (in which the articulation of the vowel anticipates the position of the /r/, but the consonant is not fully realized) than full articulation of /r/. In modern dialects, rhoticity is more likely to be found in north Northumberland, which borders (rhotic) Scotland, than further south, and it would certainly not be found in Newcastle. In Lancashire, rhoticity is still found in central Lancashire, including some of the towns within Greater Manchester, but not in the City of Manchester itself, except perhaps in the speech of older people. The dialect of Liverpool was not rhotic even at the time when the SED data was collected: this lack of rhoticity has been one of the features distinguishing Liverpool from its Lancashire hinterland, but, increasingly, rhoticity is being lost even in Lancashire.

Where speakers in Lancashire and Northumberland are rhotic, the quality of the /r/ or /r/-colouring is distinct in each area. In Northumberland, the traditional dialect has a uvular /s/, known as the Northumbrian burr. As the quote from Defoe in 1.2. above indicates, this pronunciation has been a source of pride to Northumbrians, many of whom today will perform the burr as a party-trick even though they would not use it in everyday speech. In the 18th century, the burr was heard in Durham and Newcastle as well as Northumberland; however, Påhlsson’s (1972)
study shows that, even in north Northumberland, the burr is now recessive, confined as it is mainly to the speech of older, working-class males in rural or fishing communities. The influence of the burr remains in the burr-modified vowel of NURSE, as discussed in 2.7. above.

In Lancashire, the /r/ is a retroflex [ɻ], especially in rhotic accents, but in Liverpool and the surrounding areas of Lancashire and Cheshire, the /r/ is a flap [r].

3.5. Clear vs. dark /l/

In RP /l/ has clear [l] and dark [ɻ] allophones, the former occurring intervocally as in silly, the latter pre- and postvocally, as in lip, film. In Tyneside and Northumberland, the dark allophone is not used, so that, e.g. lip, film are pronounced with clear [l]. Where the /l/ occurs before a nasal, an epenthetic vowel is inserted between the /l/ and the nasal, so that film, elm and the river Aln are pronounced [fɪlm, ɛlm, əl₇]. Conversely, in Lancashire, the dark [ɻ] is used in clear contexts, as in Lancashire, really [lɛŋkɪʃ̞, ږɛɻ].

4. Prosodic and intonational features

Although popular discussions of dialect often refer to the speech of a certain area as sing-song, lilting or monotonous, until very recently there has been relatively little research on the prosodic and intonational features of northern English dialects, except for the discussion of the sociolinguistic patterning of intonational variation in Tyneside English in Pellowe and Jones (1978). However, preliminary results from the Intonational Variation in English (IviE) project indicate that “dialect variation is a significant variable in prosodic typology” (Grabe and Post 2002: 346). An intonational pattern known as the Urban Northern British Rise occurs in Newcastle (as well as in Belfast and Dublin). In this pattern, there is a rise-plateau intonation in declarative sentences, distinct from the high rising tone heard in Australian and New Zealand English. This intonation is highly salient for Tyneside English, but can also be found in other northern British varieties. Grabe and Post (2002) also found differences between dialects of English with regard to the truncation or compression of falling accents on “very short IP-final words” (Grabe and Post 2002: 345). Whereas speakers in Leeds and Liverpool tended to truncate these patterns, those in Newcastle compressed them. Clearly, there is much work to be done on the study of intonational variation in English dialects, but these findings support the division of northern dialects into middle North and far North discussed in 1.1.

Even less research has been carried out on prosodic variation in English dialects. Here, again, the North-East is distinct from the rest of the North, with a tendency for level stress, or with the main stress on the second element, in compounds. The place name Stakeford (in Northumberland) is pronounced with equal stress.
on each element, whereas a speaker from outside the region would pronounce it /ˈstɛɪkʃəl/. Likewise, *pitheap*, the Northumbrian word for a colliery spoil heap, is pronounced /ˈpiːθɛp/.

5. Articulatory setting

We have seen in the sections above that northern English dialects can be differentiated from each other with regard to segmental phonology and intonation. In some cases, though, the distinctive voice of a region, is produced by the articulatory setting. The only full and accessible study of articulatory setting in a northern English dialect is Knowles’, description of what he calls the “‘Scouse voice’, the total undifferentiated characteristic sound of a Liverpudlian” (Knowles 1978: 88). This voice quality is described here and elsewhere (Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 94) as velarization. Knowles describes this in detail as follows:

In Scouse, the centre of gravity of the tongue is brought backwards and upwards, the pillars of the fauces are narrowed, the pharynx is tightened, and the larynx is displaced upwards. The lower jaw is typically held close to the upper jaw, and this position is maintained even for ‘open’ vowels. The main auditory effect of this setting is the ‘adenoidal’ quality of Scouse, which is produced even if the speaker’s nasal passages are unobstructed. (Knowles 1978: 89)

Hughes and Trudgill describe this more succinctly as “the accompaniment of other articulations by the raising of the back of the tongue towards the soft palate (as in the production of dark /l/)”. (Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 94)

Although the articulatory setting of Liverpool English is very distinctive, it would be interesting to see whether the study of articulatory setting in other northern dialects might indicate typological distinctions parallel to those found for segmental and non-segmental phonology.
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The English West Midlands: phonology

Urszula Clark

1. Introduction

Today, the term West Midlands (WM) is generally used to refer to the conurbation that includes Wolverhampton, Birmingham, Walsall, West Bromwich and Coventry, and can also be used to refer to speech associated with the modern urban area, although the historical Middle English WM dialect covered a much wider area (see Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 85; Wells 1982: 364). Within the modern urban area at least two main dialect types can be identified: those of Birmingham, and those of the Black Country to the west.

The Black Country dialect – currently the focus of a research project, the Black Country Dialect Project (BCDP) at the University of Wolverhampton – is often considered to be particularly distinctive. Wells (1982: 364) explains that the variety is linguistically notable for its retention of traditional dialect forms such as have disappeared from the rest of the Midlands. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 25) define the Black Country dialect as “a working class dialect spoken in the South Staffordshire area of the English Midlands”, and similarly note that it has “retained many of its distinctive lexico-grammatical features” (Chinn and Thorne 2001: 30). At the present state of BCDP research, it is as yet unclear how many of these forms may survive in widespread use, in the Black Country at least.

It is also unclear whether and if so to what degree the dialect of the large but geographically distinct city of Coventry may differ from other West Midlands varieties. Therefore, while some data are also available from Cannock (Heath 1980), which is technically just outside the West Midlands administrative area, the term West Midlands will be taken to refer to Birmingham and the wider Black Country, unless explicitly stated otherwise. The wider Black Country here is taken to include Walsall, West Bromwich and Wolverhampton.

According to Todd and Ellis (1992b), the Midland group of Middle English (ME) dialects can be considered to have had clearly defined boundaries: north of the Thames, south of a line from the rivers Humber to Lune, and with the Pennines subdividing the area into East and West Midlands sub-areas. Brook (1972: 68) maintains that the WM dialect of ME was intermediate between the East Midlands and South-Western dialects, with its southern part most resembling the latter. During the Old English period the region had been part of the Mercian dialect area,
but following the Danish wars it came under the West-Saxon-speaking kingdom of Wessex, and it retained a closer connection with Wessex than the South-west, even after the unification of England. The result is that the ME dialect resembles the East Midlands in terms of early dialect characteristics, and the South-west in terms of later ones.

Todd and Ellis (1992b) say some dialectologists consider the ME dialect boundaries as still significant in contemporary dialect research, but others maintain that the post-industrial urban dialects of cities like Birmingham and Wolverhampton now exert greater influence than those of rural areas.

Chinn and Thorne (2001) suggest that Birmingham was clearly within the ME West Midlands dialect area: “Beginning as a place of some importance in 1166 when it first had a market, it was a town that was clearly embedded within its rural hinterland. For centuries it drew most of its people from the surrounding villages” (Chinn and Thorne 2001: 14–19). They cite evidence regarding the origins of 700 people who came to live in Birmingham between 1686 and 1726, to the effect that more than 90% came from within 20 miles of Birmingham; of these, more than 200 had migrated from within Warwickshire and a similar number from Staffordshire; almost 100 came from Worcestershire and some 40 from Shropshire. Of the remainder, about 60 came cumulatively from Leicester, Cheshire, Derbyshire, Lancashire and Middlesex, and another 50 from other parts of Britain. For Chinn and Thorne, it is not surprising that Birmingham speech should have evolved from the dialect of north Warwickshire, south Staffordshire and north-eastern Worcestershire – essentially encompassing the ME West Mercian dialect area. In the 19th century Birmingham attracted people from further afield (including Cornwall, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Italy and the Jewish pale of settlement in Tsarist Russia), but Chinn and Thorne (2001: 19) maintain that “local migrants continued to form the great majority of newcomers, and as late as 1951, 71% of Birmingham’s citizens had been born in Warwickshire”.

Biddulph (1986: 1) similarly suggests that the conurbation of the Black Country was populated largely from the surrounding farming counties of Worcestershire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire and Shropshire.

The Black Country is a relatively small area, centring on the major towns of Dudley and Walsall, and probably including Wolverhampton, plus surrounding areas. One reason given for the distinctiveness of the Black Country dialect is its relative geographical isolation. The local area is essentially an 800ft plateau without a major river or Roman road passing through it, so it was only when the Industrial Revolution got into full swing in the 19th century that the area ceased to be relatively isolated from other developments in the country. During the Industrial Revolution, Birmingham, Wolverhampton and Walsall grew into large manufacturing towns, separated from the centre of the plateau by belts of open land which provided raw materials – iron and coal – for the heavy industries of the towns. Today’s urban areas were originally small villages which developed with the grow-
ing industries, and with the exception of Birmingham these still have relatively small populations. Again with the exception of Birmingham, development in the region was relatively slow and the population remained relatively stable. Until the 1960s, there was no sudden influx of workers, immigrant or otherwise, who might have significantly altered the character of the area. Similarly, there was little out-migration, as the Black Country generally remained prosperous. As a result, there was little alteration in the population, and communities remained close-knit and generally introspective. Consequently, although the dialect is usually classed synchronically as an urban dialect, it has strong links with a recent, rural past and with traditional dialects. Indeed, the *Survey of English Dialects (SED, Orton 1962-1971)*, a project which concentrates on the traditional dialect typical of rural areas, nevertheless includes the Black Country village of Himley among the Staffordshire localities covered. Data sources comprise:

(1) **For the WM dialect generally:**
   a. Ongoing work for the BCDP. The corpus used here comprises mainly younger and young middle-class speakers, especially from the Black Country;
   b. Wells (1982);
   c. Lass (1987);
   d. Hughes and Trudgill (1996);
   e. Todd and Ellis (1992a, 1992b);

(2) **For Black Country specifically:**
   a. Mathisen (1999): the most extensive study accessed to date. Based on 30 hours of data from 57 informants, collected in Sandwell (Wednesbury, Tipton and Rowley Regis), 1984;
   b. Painter (1963): Data from three speakers in Rowley Regis, analysed in detail. Note that Painter analyses Black Country in terms of a dialect-specific phonemic system; hence, his citations include both phonemic and phonetic forms;
   c. *SED* traditional dialect data for Himley (south Staffordshire), from non-mobile older rural males, collected in the 1960s;
   d. Biddulph (1986): a semi-professional analysis of the Black Country dialect writing material in Fletcher (1975). This includes an attempt at phonological analysis based on an interpretation of Fletcher’s respelling rules, combined with Birmingham-born Biddulph’s own claimed insights into WM accents. The particular variety represented by Fletcher is intended to be that of Bilston;
   e. Dialect writing material from the *Black Country Bugle*, the *Walsall Observe*, Chitham (1972), Parsons (1977), Solomon (2000), and
various websites on the internet (see full bibliography on the CD-ROM).

(3) For Cannock (south Staffordshire): Heath (1980). Cannock is some nine miles north-east of Wolverhampton, eight miles north-west of Walsall, and according to Heath (1980: 1) “just outside the Black Country”.

(4) For Middle English dialects of the West Midlands, Kristensson (1987; analysis based on place-name data).


Caution has to be exercised with the dialect writing material, since it may contain inaccuracies, sometimes due to archaising; that is, such forms often reflect canonical forms for dialect writers, which may in turn reflect traditional dialect forms that are now highly recessive or obsolete in terms of contemporary usage. Some distinctive forms, which may indeed be obsolete or recessive, act fairly clearly as identity markers within the Black Country at least: e.g. [dʒɛd] dead, [lɒf] laugh, [saft] soft ‘stupid’, [ɪəz] years.

2. Vowels

Table 1. Summary of “typical” West Midlands vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BC (Himley) (O/B)</th>
<th>BC (R. Regis) (CP)</th>
<th>BC (S’well) (AM)</th>
<th>Bm (RL) (JW)</th>
<th>WM (BCDP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i &gt; i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i &gt; i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e &gt; e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>a &gt; æ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a &gt; æ &gt; æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>ð &gt; ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ð &gt; ø</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ð &gt; ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>ø &gt; u</td>
<td>ð &gt; u</td>
<td>ð &gt; u &gt; ø</td>
<td>ð &gt; ð &gt; ø</td>
<td>ð &gt; ¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u &gt; ¥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a &gt; ø</td>
<td>æ &gt; a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a &gt; a &gt; ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ø(ː)</td>
<td>ð &gt; ø</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>æ &gt; æː</td>
<td>æː</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
<td>æː</td>
<td>æː ~ æː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td>iː &gt; i &gt; ei</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>iː &gt; i &gt; ei</td>
<td>iː</td>
<td>iː</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1. (continued) Summary of “typical” West Midlands vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BC (Himley)</th>
<th>BC (R. Regis)</th>
<th>BC (S’well)</th>
<th>Bm (RL)</th>
<th>WM (AM)</th>
<th>WM (BCDP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>e &gt; æ</td>
<td>e &gt; æ</td>
<td>e &gt; æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a &gt; a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>œ &gt; œ</td>
<td>œ &gt; œ</td>
<td>œ &gt; œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>u &gt; u</td>
<td>u &gt; œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>u œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>œ &gt; œ</td>
<td>œ &gt; œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>a œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>a œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
<td>æ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>e (æ)</td>
<td>e &gt; e</td>
<td>e &gt; e</td>
<td>e &gt; e</td>
<td>e &gt; e</td>
<td>e &gt; e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ (æ)</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ æ æ</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE</td>
<td>æ &gt; æ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>æ œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
<td>u u u u</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>œ œ œ œ</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
<td>– – – –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happY</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lettER</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horsES</td>
<td>i – i i</td>
<td>– i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
<td>i i i i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commA</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
<td>Æ Æ Æ Æ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- Bm = Birmingham
- BC = Black Country
- R. Regis = Rowley Regis
- S’well = Sandwell
- WM = West Midlands
- AM = Mathisen (1999)
- BCDP = Black Country Dialect Project
- CP = Painter (1963)
- JW = Wells (1982)
- O/B = Orton and Barry (1998 [1969])
- RL = Lass (1987)
2.1. The WM dialect as a Northern variety

It is widely recognised that the broader WM dialect, located as it is just on the Northern side of the main North-South dialect isoglosses, has features typical of both Northern and Southern British English accents (see Todd and Ellis 1992b).

As Wells (1982: 349, 353) explains, the main isoglosses dividing North from South are the FOOT-STRUT split and BATH-broadening. Under such a criterion, the linguistic North includes the Midlands, incorporating the Birmingham-Wolverhampton conurbation, i.e., the West Midlands. Wells notes that the local accent of the WM dialect is markedly different from that of the East Midlands, although there is a transitional area including Stoke and Derby.

Trudgill (1999; see also Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 85) provides a fuller list involving nine diagnostic features for British English dialects. In terms of this analysis, the West Midlands:

1. lacks a FOOT-STRUT distinction (shared with Northern Anglo-English varieties; note “fudged” realisations [Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 55]);
2. lacks a TRAP-BATH distinction (shared with Northern Anglo-English varieties);
3. has happy-tensing (shared with Southern Irish, many Northern, and with Anglo-Welsh and Southern accents);
4. is non-rhotic (like most varieties of British English except those of the South-West, parts of Wales and the North of England, and those of Scotland and Ireland);
5. distinguishes FOOT from GOOSE and LOT from THOUGHT (like most varieties of British English except Scots);
6. has /h/-dropping as a normal feature (like most varieties of British English except those of the South-West, Wales, parts of the North of England, Scotland and Ireland);
7. has velar nasal plus – i.e. the possibility of [ŋ] in cases where other varieties have [n] or [ŋ] (occurring in a band stretching from the West Midlands as far as Lancashire, and including the urban vernaculars of the WM dialect, Stoke, Manchester, Liverpool and Sheffield);
8. retains yod in the NEW subset of GOOSE (like most varieties of British English except those of the East Midlands, South Midlands and East Anglia);
9. has broad diphthongs for FACE and GOAT (shared with other Midlands varieties, the South-East and East Anglia). As Hughes and Trudgill (1996:
66) note, Southern and Midlands dialects have undergone long mid diphthonging (Wells 1982: 210–211), such that the more southerly an accent is, the wider are its FACE and GOAT diphthongs.

Such an analysis supports the contention that the WM accent evidences features typical of both the Northern and Southern dialect types. Typical Northern features include (1) and (2), whereas more typically Southern features include (3) and (9) (as well as partial PRICE-CHOICE merger, shared with some London accents).

Of the two main North-South isoglosses (for FOOT-STRUT and TRAP-BATH), the former clearly runs to the South of the West Midlands, while the situation for the latter is much less clear. However, it is perhaps significant that the WM dialect also shares features particularly with North-Western varieties, including (7), as well as [uː] in the BOOK subset of GOOSE, and [ɔ] in the ONE subset of STRUT.

Trudgill’s (1999: 68) diagnostic test sentence, “Very few cars made it up the long hill”, would therefore yield, for the West Midlands generally, something close to the following:

\[
\text{very fyoow cahs meid it oop the longg ill} \\
\left[\text{\textasciitilde vE\textasciitilde }'fju:\ 'k\textasciitilde a:z \ 'm\textasciitilde id \ it \ up \ \delta \ 'l\textasciitilde ng \ 'I}\right]
\]

For Birmingham (Bm) and the Black Country (BC) specifically (and more precisely), the following broad-accent realisations would probably be typical:

Birmingham: \[
\left[\text{\textasciitilde vE\textasciitilde i }'fju:\ 'k\textasciitilde a:z \ 'm\textasciitilde i d \ it^b \ \delta \ 'l\textasciitilde ng \ 'I}\right]
\]
Black Country: \[
\left[\text{\textasciitilde vE\textasciitilde i }'fju:\ 'k\textasciitilde a:z \ 'm\textasciitilde e d \ it^b \ \delta \ 'l\textasciitilde ng \ 'v\textasciitilde I}\right]
\]

Wells (1982: 363) claims the shifted diphthongs in parts of the WM dialect system resemble London diphthongs, while other parts of the system resemble more typically Northern accents.

Wells (1982: 351–353) notes that in the area that has not undergone the FOOT-STRUT split there is sociolinguistic variation with the prestige norm. In the WM conurbation probably all speakers distinguish STRUT from FOOT, although the distinction is variably realised and sometimes of uncertain incidence. For instance, he notes that Heath’s (1980) study of Cannock found that all except the lowest of five socio-economic classes had some kind of opposition. Wells notes that intermediate accents or speech styles may have either a fudge between STRUT and FOOT, such as [u ~ η ~ ȧ ~ ə ~ ɔ], or hypercorrect avoidance of [u] in FOOT, for example as [ə]. However, Wells notes that short-vowel BATH is retained higher up the social scale than unsplit FOOT-STRUT.

Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) also comment on the fudging issue, maintaining that it is especially younger middle-class speakers in the south Midlands who tend to fudge the vowel. The phenomenon is also dealt with in some detail in Upton (1995).
2.2. The WM dialect as a distinctive variety

Gugerell-Scharsach (1992) is an attempt to discover whether the Middle English WM dialect as defined by Moore, Meech and Whitehall (1935) can be traced in the SED material. Glauser (1997: 93) notes that Moore, Meech and Whitehall defined their WM dialect with the help of a single phonological feature, ME /o/ before nasals, locating it in a semicircular territory with the Welsh border as its diameter and reaching as far east as Derbyshire and Warwickshire. Glauser further notes that 19th-century evidence in favour of a single WM dialect is scanty, with Wright (1905) showing no east-west divide at all, Bonaparte (1875–1876) setting up an area similar to the ME one, and Ellis (1889) delimiting the WM with the aid of the criterion used by Moore Meech and Whitehall. Glauser says the SED still documents TRAP/BATH rounding before nasals in much the same area Moore, Meech and Whitehall did, but notes (1997: 95) that Gugerell-Scharsach finds herself able to identify (partially using phonological data) three main WM dialect areas from the SED data, namely a Staffordshire, a Shropshire and a Southern WM dialect. Of these, the dialects of the WM urban conurbation are likely to constitute the latter grouping.

Brook (1972: 68–69) claims that certain phonological features can indeed be taken to be characteristic of a WM (traditional) dialect area, the most important being:

1. Retention of late ME /ŋ/ as WM [ŋ], where other dialects have [n] (e.g. in among, hang, sing, tongue);

2. Rounding of ME /a/ and /o/ to WM [ɔ] before nasal consonants, where other dialects have [a ~ æ] (the correlation highlighted by Moore, Meech and Whitehall 1935). However, Wakelin notes (1981: 164) that in parts of the WM, with great variation from word to word, [n] occurs in other positions also (e.g. rat, apples, latch); also Brook (1972: 68) points out that OE /a/ before nasals remained /a/ under non-heavy stress);

3. OE /o/ tended to become ME /u/ before /ŋ/; see LOT below.

Chinn and Thorne (2001: 22) propose that the WM accent once had much more in common with general Northern speech, but has been gradually pulled in the direction of prestige Southern variants (see his data on LOT below).

2.3. Birmingham versus Black Country

According to Gibson (1955, cited in Heath 1980: 87), it is apparent “even to the casual visitor” that the phonetic system of the Black Country differs fundamentally from that of other localities in the neighbourhood of the Black Country – or at least, it was so in the 1950s. However, Heath (1980: 87) considers this an exaggerated claim.
Biddulph (1986: 17) claims (anecdotally) to have noted significant differences between the Black Country (Bilston) dialect as represented by Fletcher (1975), and his own native dialect, that of the Nechells area of Birmingham. Specific differences he proposes would seem to include (at least):

1. **MOUTH:** Bilston [aː] versus Nechells [εu];
2. **TRAP/BATH:** Bilston [d] versus Nechells [æ] before nasal consonants;
3. **D:** Bilston [dʒ] versus Nechells [d] in *dead, death*;
4. **H:** Bilston [j] versus Nechells ∅ in *head*;
5. **H:** Bilston ∅ versus Nechells [j] in *year*.

### 2.4. Prosodic features

Wells (1982) points out that many Northern dialects, the WM dialect included, tend not to reduce vowels in unstressed Latinate prefixes (e.g. *con-, ex-*) as much as do RP and Southern-based varieties. Such a tendency was indeed noted in the BCDP audio data.

Although relatively little work has so far been done on dialect intonation, Wells (1982: 91) points out that certain British accents (including Birmingham, Liverpool, Newcastle and Glasgow) appear to have some tendency to use rising tones where most other accents have falling tones. Such tendencies are also noted by Biddulph (1986: 3), who suggests that WM speech characteristically has a “peculiar” intonation involving terminal raising in statements, as well as negative verbs (such as *<wor>* wasn’t/weren’t) taking a markedly high tone.

Wells (1982: 93) also points out that the working-class accents of the WM dialect (as well as Liverpool and some New York) characteristically have a velarised voice quality (with the centre of gravity of the tongue backer and higher than for other accents).

### 2.5. Vowels

**KIT**

All data sources indicate a characteristic strong tendency towards high realisations for the WM dialect – BCDP [i] or even [i]; Wells (1982: 28, 363) and Mathisen (1999: 108) close to [i]; Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 85–86) [ɪ]. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 20) note /i/-like realisations as typical of Birmingham in both stressed and unstressed position, e.g. in stressed *lip, symbol, women*; also unstressed *women, ladies, lettuce, private, bracelet, chocolate, necklace, harness*. Painter (1963: 30–31) has Black Country /i/, realised as stressed [i] and unstressed [ɪ], with sporadic stressed [ɛi] and unstressed [ɛ]. Heath (1980: 87) has [i] for Cannock.
Audio and written data also suggest that in the WM dialect generally there is a tendency to lower KIT to \([\gamma]\) or \([\sigma]\) before /l/ (which typically appears to be dark), e.g. in will (as dialect spellings such as Bm <ull>, BC <wool> suggest). That there has been a historical tendency towards backing before /l/ is suggested by Kristenson’s (1987: 209) claim that /y/ in forms derived from OE *hylr* ‘hill’ was retained at least until the ME period in place names in much of the WM area, including Staffordshire, Warwickshire and Shropshire.

**DRESS**

Most data sources suggest \([\epsilon]\), including BCDP and Mathisen (1999: 108). However, Painter (1963: 30–31) records BC /e/, realised as [ë], with sporadic \([\epsilon]\) > [e ~ ë]. Heath (1980: 87) has [ë] for Cannock.

Furthermore, the BCDP data indicate that before /l/ (which is typically dark) there is a strong tendency towards lowering and/or breaking (e.g. [weʰ], [wɤɾ], well). There is some written evidence for BC lowering to [a], especially before /l/ in <bally> belly, <ballies> bellows, belluck ‘to bellow’, but also in other environments, e.g. <zad> zed, <franzy> frenzy ‘fretful’. Similar realisations occur in the SED data for localities close to Black Country.

Written data also suggest possible [ɪ]-type realisations in some words, e.g. Bm <git> ‘get’, Bm/BC <bibble> ‘pebble’.

**TRAP**

As noted, the WM dialect, being a Northern accent, generally lacks a TRAP/BATH distinction.

Most data sources suggest a typical realisation [a] (BCDP; Painter 1963: 30), with a tendency in more formal styles to approximate to [æ] (BCDP). Chinn and Thorne (2001: 20) note [a]-like realisations as typical of Bm in e.g. cat, plait, and Heath (1980: 87) also has [a] for Cannock.

For Sandwell (Black Country), Mathisen (1999: 107) found the TRAP vowel to be fronter than most Northern varieties, closer to [æː] and very short. The older, overlong [æːː] occurred occasionally, even among teenagers.

There is also evidence, although so far mainly only from written, SED or informants’ anecdotal material, for rounding of TRAP (to [ʊ]) especially before nasals. This may in fact be the only phonological characteristic of the historical WM dialect area (see section 2.2. above), although its relative absence from the interview material may indicate it is now recessive. Pre-nasal examples include: Bm/BC <‘ommer’/’omber> hammer; BC <clomber> clamber; Bm/BC <mon> man, <donny> danny ‘hand’; BC <con> can (v.), <pon> pan, <’ond> hand, <sund> sand, <stond> stand, <caercumstonces> circumstances; Bm/BC <bonk> bank ‘hillock’; Bm <Bonksmen> Banksmen ‘Black-Countrymen’; Bm <donky> danky ‘damp, dank’; BC <ronk> rank.
As also noted in section 2.2. above, Wakelin (1977: 96) points out that rounding of ME [a] to WM [ɔ] can occur other than prenasally. Written examples in other environments include: BC <scrobble/scromble> scrabble/scramble ‘tangle’, <op-ple> apple, <thot> that, <gobble> gabble; Bm/BC <boffle> baffle ‘hinder; thwart’; BC <motches> matches, <sholl> shall, <gollopin > galloping, <volve> valve.

There is written evidence for TRAP-raising in some words, e.g. Bm <ess-hole> ass-hole, BC <ketch> catch, Bm <ketchpit> catch-pit, <reddle> raddle, <sleck> slack ‘small coal’. Many of these forms are evidenced in the SED material.

LOT
The BCDP data indicate that the WM dialect typically has [ŋ], with some raising. However, for Sandwell, Mathisen (1991: 108) characterises the LOT vowel as [ŋ > œ], and Painter (1963: 30–31) has BC /œ/, realised as [œ], with sporadic (rare) [ɔ]. Heath (1980: 87) has [ŋ] for Cannock.

The [u]-type realisations are particularly interesting. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 21–22, 30) suggest that for Bm speakers, LOT is typically [ŋ ~ ɔ], with [ŋ] especially for younger speakers and [u] especially for WC and/or older speakers. He claims that the latter pronunciation is still largely retained in the Black Country and the more westerly parts of Birmingham; as noted above, he suggests the historically Northern-type WM accent has been influenced by Southern variants. There is indeed evidence (especially written, but some audio) for [u] realisations (especially before nasals, and especially /ŋ/), e.g. Bm <lung> long; BC <sung> song, <(w)rung> wrong, <frum> from, <bunnyfire> bonfire, <Aynuk> Enoch, <wuz> was. This alternation would seem to go back to ME times: as noted above, Brook (1972: 69) claims as a defining characteristic of the Middle English WM dialect the tendency for OE /œ/ to become ME /u/ before /ŋ/.

There is written evidence for unrounded realisations in words such as BC <drap> drop, <shaps> shops; similar failure to round also occurs in some cases of CLOTH (e.g. soft, wasp) and THOUGHT (e.g. water); see below.

STRUT
As noted above, the WM dialect maintains the typically Northern lack of distinction between STRUT and FOOT, with STRUT typically realised as [u]. However, the BCDP data revealed a tendency in more formal styles to produce a more RP-like fudge vowel with [x].

Wells (1982: 363) claims that the Bm FOOT-STRUT opposition is apparently variably neutralised (e.g. as [x]), while Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [ɔ > ə]. Broad WM accents typically have [u], less broad accents [a]. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 21) indicate that in Bm, STRUT is typically [u], e.g. in tuck, putt, cud, stud, while Heath (1980: 87) also has [u] for Cannock.

In the subset ONE, the WM dialect is typical in having [ŋ] (see Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 55; Chinn and Thorne 2001: 21). Wells notes (1982: 362) that there
is a difference in lexical incidence from RP and many other accents as regards this subset, in that parts of the North (including Birmingham, Stoke, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield) have [d] in one; accents in a more restricted area also have this vowel in once, among, none, nothing.

However, Mathisen (1999: 108) claims that Sandwell actually has [d] as the most common variant, for all generations, and especially in words where most Northern varieties have [u]. It occurs frequently with the elderly, in all phonetic contexts, and especially before /l/ and /ŋ/ for younger speakers (as the BCDP data also suggest). Mathisen also notes the appearance of fudge-type, closer variants (occasionally even [ɔ]), especially in disyllables and quite frequently among teenagers in monitored speech. Painter (1963: 30), too, notes a lower rounded vowel: BC /o/, realised as [o].

One salient feature (attested in speech as well as writing) is [d]-type realisations (especially before nasals) in Bm <mom> mum; Bm/BC <lommock> lummox, <ackidock> aqueduct, <bost(in’)> bust(ing), Bm <chock> chuck (v.) (note chuck may derive from French chuquer, choquer ‘to knock’).

FOOT
Chinn and Thorne’s (2001: 21) analysis suggests Bm speakers typically have [u], e.g. took, put, could, stood. BCDP data show that FOOT is typically [u]. However, there is some tendency towards (probably hypercorrect) unrounding to [ʏ], particularly for younger speakers. Painter (1963: 30) has BC /u/, realised as [ʊ].

Wells (1982: 362) and Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) point out that there is a difference of lexical incidence in much of the North in that several words spelt <ook> (the subset BOOK) have kept their historically long vowel, [uː]. This is evidenced in the BCDP data, although it is recessive, and Wells notes that Birmingham conversely has some shortened vowels in [tuθ] tooth, which is echoed in some of the SED data. Heath (1980: 87) has Cannock [u].

BATH
As an essentially Northern accent, the WM dialect generally lacks a TRAP/BATH distinction. According to the BCDP data (and see Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 55), BATH is typically [a]. Some speakers (in more formal registers) may have long realisations. According to Painter (1963: 30) BC has /a/, realised as [a]. Heath (1980: 87) has Cannock [a], while Chinn and Thorne’s (2001: 20) analysis similarly suggests that for Bm speakers, BATH is typically [a], e.g. in fast, mask, grass, bath, daft, after, chance, command. However, he suggests that this is a relatively recent development, since older speakers often produce a long sound similar to Cockney [ɑː].

Mathisen (1999: 108) notes [æ] predominantly for Sandwell, with typically Northern [a] occurring less commonly, perhaps associated especially with older males. Middle-class users (especially females in monitored speech) sometimes use [ɑː].
There is evidence that some speakers (particularly in Birmingham rather than in the Black Country) may have a TRAP-BATH contrast. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 20) provide written evidence for long vowels in Bm <last> ([aː]?) ([ɔː]), <can’\’t> ([ɔː]); also <after> after (although compensation for /u/-loss could also be implicated here; see F below). They claim that many working-class Bm speakers vary between a “short and long vowel sound” for after <arfter> ([ɔːʃt]) and <after> ([aftə]), also <barstud> vs <bastard>. Such a distinction may be what is intended in the spelling BC <aste> asked. However, there is also written evidence for a short, rounded realisation ([p]) in <loff(in’)> laugh(ing).

CLOTH
According to the BCDP data, this vowel is typically [ɔ]; Wells (1982: 357) notes that CLOTH is short throughout the North.

Although there is written evidence for long vowels ([ɔː]) in Bm <’orspital/orsepickle> hospital, <orf> off, there is also written and audio evidence for a more widespread process: unrounding.

A salient example involves the locally distinctive pronunciations of soft ‘stupid’. Mathisen (1999: 108) notes that many adults in Sandwell have [saft], while older speakers may have [əsaft ~ səft]. Such pronunciations, indicated by the typical Bm/BC dialect spelling <saft>, are claimed by Chinn and Thorne (2001: 141) to be especially typical of Black Country; these forms may perhaps be compared to Early OE sēftē. For failure to round following /w/ (as in wasp), see W below. Unrounding may also affect some LOT words; see LOT above.

NURSE
The BCDP data indicate that NURSE is somewhat variable, between [ɔe: ~ ɔ:]. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [ɔe:].

According to Wells (1982: 360–361, 363), Northern accents often have [ɔː], but some western Midland accents (such as Birmingham and Stoke) typically have [ə: ~ ɪː]. He suggests that merger with SQUARE may variably occur in the WM dialect (probably as [ɔː]). For Sandwell, Mathisen (1999: 108–109) notes that while teenagers and elderly both typically have [əː], teenage women and middle-class speakers prefer the RP-type [æː]. Some speakers, especially the elderly and working-class, have [ə]. Heath (1980: 87) has Cannock [ə].

Painter (1963: 30) has BC /eə/, realised as [æə]. He notes that speakers using [eə] for NEAR do not also use the “common free variant” [eə] for NURSE.

Written evidence (note conventions) suggests a typically non-RP-like pronunciation in various cases. Given that typically the same conventional spellings are used as for (some) FACE, START and THOUGHT words, the intended pronunciation may be in the region of [eə ~ eː], which may in turn represent a merger or near-merger for dialect writers. Examples include:
(1) Bm <Baernegum> Birmingham, <taerned> turned; Bm/BC <taernip(s)> turnip(s); Bm <Gaertie> Gertie; BC <shaerty> shirty; Bm <thaerteen> thirteen; BC <baerk> burke; Bm <waerks> works; BC <caercumstance> circumstances; Bm <Aerbut> Herbert, <distaerbed> disturbed; BC <’aeard> heard, Bm <baerd> bird, BC <waerd> word, <ocaerred> occurred; <Baertha> Bertha, <baerthday> birthday, <naerse> nurse, <paerse> purse, <caerse> curse, <faerst> first; Bm <thaerst> thirst, <naerves> nerves, <saervice> service, <Waerthingtons> Worthington’s; BC <paerchase> purchase, <chaerch> church; Bm <early> early; BC <waerld> world.

(2) Bm/BC <werk> work; Bm <shert> shirt; BC <werds> words, <tern(ed)> turn(ed).

(3) Bm <Pairsher> Pershore.

(4) BC <wourkin> working.

There is written evidence for shortened realisations ([u]) before historical /rs/ in BC <fust> first (though compare <faerst>), <puss> purse, <cuss> curse (but compare <caerse>; see also Wells [1982: 356]), <wuss/wussen> worse, <wust> worst (but compare <wurse>). Written evidence also suggests shortened realisations in Bm/BC <gansey> guernsey ‘long johns’ ([a]) and BC <gel> girl ([e]).

FLEECE

The BCDP data confirm that, as in South-East England, there is a definite tendency towards diphthongisation, typically [i:]; compare GOOSE. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [œi], while Mathisen (1999: 109) maintains that in Sandwell, diphthongal variants often occur, especially with working-class and elderly speakers. Painter (1963: 30) has BC /œi/, realised as [œi], with sporadic unstressed [i ~ ɛi].

Wells (1982: 357) notes that FLEECE merger has not fully carried through everywhere in the North, so that one can find the historical opposition preserved, especially in traditional dialect, but also in some less broad dialects. For example, a distinction is found in Staffordshire between MEET [œi] and MEAT [i:]. Wells (1982: 363) notes, for Birmingham, [i~ œi]. It is possible that some speakers (particularly in Black Country) may retain a distinction between MEET and MEAT.

Chinn and Thorne (2001: 21) maintain that Bm speakers’ realisation of FLEECE is typically “closer to an ‘ay’ sound” ([œi ~ i]), e.g. need, these, disease, piece, receive, key, quay, people, machine. Indeed, there is considerable written evidence for Bm/BC diphthongisation (to [i ~ œi]), possibly representing (partial?) lack of operation of the FLEECE merger (or MEET-MEAT merger). Various spellings are employed, especially representing StE <ea> spellings (i.e. representing Middle English /e/:).
Chinn and Thorne (2001: 138–139) note that many local Birmingham place-names with spellings in <ea> have a FACE-type pronunciation, e.g. (River) <Rea>, <Weaman> (Street). There appears to be a potential shortening (to [ɛ]) before obstruent in BC <chep> cheap. Chinn and Thorne also note that short [i] is usual in week, seen, been, a claim supported for Black Country also by written, SED and audio evidence (apparently for shortening before an obstruent), but especially involving words with <ee> spellings (i.e. usually derived from ME /eə/). Examples include BC <bi> be; Bm/BC <bin> been; BC <(tha) bist> (thou) art; Bm/ BC <sin> seen; BC <sid> seed ‘seen’; BC <kippin’> keeping; Bm/ BC <wi(c)k> week (from OE wice); BC <wi(c)k> weak, <Haysich Brook> Hayseech Brook.

Heath (1980: 87) has [ii] for Cannock.

FACE
This is one of the few variables for which there appears to be a consistent difference between the Black Country and Birmingham conurbations.

As Wells (1982: 210–211) explains, the West Midlands variety has undergone long mid diphthonging, producing diphthongs rather than pure vowels in FACE. It appears from the BCDP data that Birmingham typically has [ʌɪ], much as in South-East England, while the Black Country typically has [æɪ]. In more formal styles, [ɛɪ] occurs in both areas.

According to Wells (1982: 357), the long mid mergers (see also GOAT) were generally carried through in the Midlands, so that distinctions are no longer made between pairs like mane and main.

Mathisen (1999: 109) maintains that Sandwell speakers typically have [æi], compared to Bm [ʌi]; elderly speakers also have [ɛi], or [ɛ] as in TAKE. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [æi]. Painter (1963: 30) similarly has BC /æv/, realised as [ʌi], alternating with /ɛ/, realised as [ɵ], the latter presumably in the TAKE subset. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 22) maintain that Bm speakers’ realisation here is typically “very open, similar to (…) Cockney speakers” ([ʌi]), e.g. in break, way, waist, weight. However, he notes [ɛ] in various verb forms of the TAKE subset, e.g. make, made, take.
There is evidence for various non-short realisations (quality unclear – possibly [æɪ]). See also NURSE, START, THOUGHT, PALM, where the same written convention may be used:

- **<aer>** e.g. Bm <taerter> potato; BC <aerprun> apron, <baerked> baked, <baersun> basin, <caerke> cake, <caerse> case, <aerl> ale, <paerstin'> pasting, <paerpers> papers, <thraerpe> thrape “a hiding”
- e.g. Bm <naeme> name = StE <aCe`
- e.g. BC <fairce> face, <mairt> mate, <tairter> potato = StE <aCV`
- e.g. Bm <baacon> bacon, <caake> cake = StE <aCV`
- e.g. BC <rayn> rain, <pain> pain, <tayste> taste, <Ayli> Eli (possibly ‘eye-dialect’?) = StE <ai>; <aCe>, <e`
- e.g. BC <wert> weight, <nerbours> neighbours, <wertin> waiting = StE <eigh>, <ai`

There is evidence (written, also audio) for various short-vowel realisations, apparently:

1. [e] in verb forms in Bm <en’t/ennit> ain’t; Bm/ BC <tek/tekin’/tekin> take/taking; Bm/ BC <mek/mekin/med> make/making/made (the TAKE subset).

2. [i] in Bm <in’t/inarf> ain’t/ain’t half (isn’t/isn’t half), <agin> again(st), <allis> (also Bm/ BC <allus>) always. Note especially [i] or [ii] in Bm <causey> causeway (as in other dialects, e.g. North-eastern place-name Causey Arch).

3. [a] in Bm/ BC <babby> baby.

Heath (1980: 87) has [ei] for Cannock.

**PALM**

Data from the BCDP, Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) and Mathisen (1999: 109) suggest that the WM dialect typically has [aː]; Wells (1982: 360) claims this is typical of the Midland cities. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 23) similarly maintain that Bm speakers’ realisation here is typically long ([(aː)]), e.g. half, aunt, laugh, laughter.

Painter (1963: 30) has BC /a/, realised as [a], apparently alternating with /aː/, realised as [aː].

There is written evidence for a BC pronunciation of (grand)father possibly in the region of [ɛʊ ~ eɪ], with spellings <faerther>, <fa(i)rther> and <grandferther> (as for NURSE and FACE).
THOUGHT
BCDP found that THOUGHT was typically higher than RP, i.e. [ɔː]. Mathisen (1999: 109) maintains that Sandwell speakers typically have [ɔː], while Painter (1963: 30) has BC /ɔː/, realised as [ɔː]. There is written evidence for BC shortening (to [ɑː]) before stops in <brod> broad, <ockerd> awkward and for BC failure to undergo rounding, along with other processes:

(1) apparently to [ɑː] in <dahb> daub, <aanchboon> haunchbone;
(2) in <allus> always;
(3) after /w/ in <wairter>, <waerter>; see section 3 below.

GOAT
According to the BCDP data, typically [ʌʊ]. Before /l/, there is a tendency for onset lowering (e.g. GOAL [gæʊɻ]). It is possible that some speakers, particularly in the Black Country, may retain a lack of distinction between NOSE and KNOWS, although according to Wells (1982: 357), the long mid mergers (see also FACE) were generally carried through in the Midlands (typical realisations being [ʌʊ ~ ɔʊ] ). Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [ʌʊ], while Mathisen (1999: 109) has [aʊ > ɔʊ] for Sandwell.

Painter (1963: 30) has BC /ɔʊ/, realised as [ɔʊ], with sporadic [ʊʊ ~ ʊʊ], as well as sporadic [ʊʊ ~ ʊʊ] or (rare) [ʊʊ], while Chinn and Thorne (2001: 22) maintain that Bm speakers’ realisation here is typically “something similar to ‘ow’” ([ɔʊ]), e.g. in do, mood, rude, group, flew, shoe, juice, blue.

There is some evidence (mostly written, some audio) for lack of a NOSE/KNOWS merger, in the form of /ʊ-/type vowels at least in forms of the verb go (e.g. Bm <goo/a-gooin’/gu/guin’/guz>, as well as <’um/um> home, <wunnarf> won’t half, <dun’t> don’t. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 160) claim that the feature also occurs in home in Worcestershire and Black Country, although in the latter case <wum> is said to be more frequent.

In fact, the written material may provide evidence for lack of NOSE/KNOWS merger: words especially with StE <oCe> may be respelt as follows (suggesting something like [ʊ ~ ʊʊ ~ ʊʊ]):

<oo> e.g. Bm/ BC <goo> go; BC <boone> bone,  
<wool> whole, <Joones> Jones \(=\) StE <oC(e)>
<oo> e.g. BC <coot> coat \(=\) StE <oa>
<u> e.g. Bm <’um> home, <gu> go, <dun’t> don’t;  
BC/ Bm <wum> home; BC <su> so \(=\) StE <oC(e)>

There is also some written evidence for variable [ɔː]-type realisations in Bm/ BC <grawt>/<grort> groat(s) (cf. grawty/grorty dick), but also <gawty/greaty pudding>.

Heath (1980: 87) has [ɔʊ > ɔʊ] for Cannock.
GOOSE

The BCDP data indicate that as in South-East England, there is a definite tendency towards diphthongisation, typically [əu]; compare FLEECE. Also as in the South-East, there is some tendency towards fronting, particularly among younger people. In the subset NEW, it appears that Black Country speakers (at least) typically have older [iU] rather than [ju:].

Wells (1982: 359, 363) notes that Northern accents usually have [u: ~ uu], but [u: ~ əu] is characteristic of Bm and some other urban dialects. Some speakers retain contrastive [iU] in words of the NEW subset, like blue, suit, although this appears to be quite sharply recessive against the RP-type [u: ~ ju:], so that there is a tendency to lose the historical distinction between threw and through. Traditional-dialect possibilities include [eu] in parts of Staffordshire and Derbyshire, although Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [eu].

Mathisen (1999: 109) notes [u:] generally, but diphthongised variants for older Sandwell speakers, while Painter (1963: 30) has BC /ui/, realised as [ui], alternating with /ou/, realised as [uo], with sporadic [u ~ əwɔ] or (rare) [i Confirmation]

There is written evidence for an [æi]-type realisation in Bm <chaw> ‘chew’ (compare, for example, US dialects; OE cewan), for an [ei]-type realisation in WM <mardy> (if this = moody; compare other dialects, e.g. Yorkshire <mardy>), and for early shortening to [u] in Bm <goss> (OE gós).

A typical feature of the WM dialect is that of markedly diphthongal realisations in (stressed) you-forms. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 85) characterise a Walsall speaker as having [jau], while Chinn and Thorne (2001: 168) claim that, typically, Bm has <yo> ([jɔu]) and BC has <yow> ([jau]). For BC, you-forms – including e.g. you’d, you’ve, you’m (the latter being the contracted form of dialectal you am) – are often conventionally represented as <yow/yoe/yo>, <yer>, <ya>. Analysis of usage in Bm/BC dialect writing suggests that <yow/yoe/yo> represent stressed forms like [jɔu], [jɔu], while <yer>/<ya> represents unstressed forms like [jɔ]. Biddulph (1986: 12) suggests that written forms such as <yow> should be taken to represent [jæw] or [jæw w].


PRICE

The BCDP evidence suggests that WM PRICE is typically [ɔI] but approaches [aI] in more formal registers.

Wells (1982: 358, 363) notes that the Midlands rang from most typical [ɔI] to [ɔI ~ ɔI]. PRICE-CHOICE merger may be possible because the [ɔI ~ ɔI] opposition is apparently variably neutralisable, often as [ɔI] (see CHOICE).

Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [si], while Chinn and Thorne (2001: 22) maintain that speakers with broad Bm accents barely differentiate the vowel sounds in five and noise. Mathisen (1999: 109) claims [si] occurs “occasional[ly]”
in Sandwell, allowing potential merger with CHOICE, while Painter (1963: 30–31) has BC /ɑːl/, realised as [ʊː], with sporadic unstressed [ɾː].

Heath (1980: 87) has Cannock [ʊi].

**CHOICE**

As noted above, PRICE-CHOICE confusion may occur in the WM dialect due to merger under [ʊː]. However, there is also written evidence for PRICE-CHOICE confusion as [ɑː], in Bm <chice> choice, <nineter> ‘mischievous or disobedient boy’ (according to Chinn and Thorne [2001: 126] apparently from anointer, cf. <nineted> anointed (by the devil?)); also BC <biled> boiled, <spile(‘t)> spoil(‘t).

Heath (1980: 87) has Cannock [ʊi].

**MOUTH**

The BCDP data suggest that as in South-East England, MOUTH is typically [æu] > [ɛu], approaching [æʊ] in more formal styles. Wells (1982: 359) notes that MOUTH is generally of the [æʊ]-type in the Midlands, although there is quite a lot of phonetic variation. Bm typically has [æu > æʊ], although realisations like [ɛu] are not as common as in the South.

Mathisen (1999: 109–110) notes that Sandwell speakers usually have [æu ~ ɛu], with an occasional [ɛu] among working-class males. She adds that MOUTH-GOOSE merger may be possible. Painter (1963: 30) has BC /ɛʊ/, realised as [ɛʊ], with sporadic [ɛʊ ~ ɛː ~ ɛʊ ~ ɔː].

There is written evidence for:

1. monophthongal realisations in Bm/BC <dahn>/<darn> down; Bm <rahnd> round, <abaht/abart> about, <tha> thou; BC <ar> our;

2. raised onsets (of [æu ~ ɛu]-type) in Bm <deawn> down, <geawnd> gown; BC <aer> our;

3. reduction to schwa when unstressed, in BC <broo ’us> brew-house, <glass ’us> glass-house.

Heath (1980: 87) has [âʊ] for Cannock.

**NEAR**

The BCDP data indicate typical [iɑ ~ iɔ]. Wells (1982: 361) notes that the more conservative Northern accents have disyllabic (but recessive) [iːɑ].

Mathisen (1999: 110) notes [iɔ] for all Sandwell speakers, also /iː/ with linking /r/, while Painter (1963: 30–31) has BC /iɑ/, realised as [iɑ], evidencing a (potential) NEAR-SQUARE merger. There is written evidence for an /eɔ/-type realisation in <nayer> near.

Heath (1980: 87) has [iːɔ] for Cannock.
SQUARE
The BCDP data indicate that SQUARE typically has [ɛə > eː ~ œː]. According to Wells (1982: 361), merger with NURSE may variably occur in the WM dialect (probably as [əː]). Where there is no merger, Northern speakers often have monophthongal [ɛː]. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [œː], evidencing NEAR-SQUARE merger.

Mathisen (1999: 110) holds that most speakers have a monophthong, although some older speakers may have [ɛə], while Painter (1963: 30) has BC /əː/, realised as [ə], but alternating with /ɛə/, realised as [ɛə ~ ɛə]. Again, these can be interpreted as instances of NEAR-SQUARE merger. A similar phenomenon can be observed for onset raising (apparently yielding [iə]) in Bm/BC <theer>/<thee’er> there, <w(h)eer> where, for which there is written evidence.

Heath (1980: 87) has [ɛː] for Cannock.

START
The BCDP data indicate typical [ɑː]. Wells (1982: 360) notes that this is typical of the Midland cities. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) also have WM [ɑː], but Painter (1963: 30) has BC /aː/, realised as [a], apparently alternating with /ɑː/, realised as [ɑː].


NORTH
The BCDP data indicate typical [ɔː], although some speakers may retain a NORTH-FORCE distinction (see FORCE). However, Wells (1982: 360) notes that Northern speakers typically have [ɔː], which is being extended to the FORCE set. Painter (1963: 30) has BC /oː/, realised as [ɔː], alternating with /oə/, realised as [ʊə], while Heath (1980: 87) has Cannock [ɔː].

FORCE
The BCDP data indicate typical [ɔː]. As noted, some speakers may retain a NORTH-FORCE distinction, with FORCE having [ʌʊə] instead. Older speakers of the WM dialect may retain [ʊə ~ oə]. Mathisen (1999: 108) has Sandwell [jau] your (see <yow>-forms under GOOSE above) while Painter (1963: 30) has BC /oə/, realised as [ʊə]. There is written evidence for:

(1) an [ʌʊə]-type realisation in Bm <fower> four (OE feower), BC <yower/ yoer/yo’re> your (versus unstressed <yer/ya>);

(2) raising (to [uː]) in BC <cootin’> courting.

Heath (1980: 87) has Cannock [ɔːː].

CURE
The BCDP data indicate that [ɔː] is typical (especially for younger speakers); [uə] is common for older speakers. Indeed, Wells (1982: 361) notes that the more con-
servative Northern accents have [uːə] or even [uŋə], although these are receding in the face of the RP-type [ɔː].

Chinn and Thorne (2001: 22) maintain that Bm speakers’ realisation here is typically “similar to ‘ooa’” ([uːə]), e.g. in cure, endure, lure, mature, poor, pure, sure, tour. For Mathisen (1999: 110), potential Black Country variants include [juːə ~ jɔː ~ ɔːəə ~ ʊə ~ ɔ], although Painter (1963: 30–31) has BC /uə/, realised as [uə], with sporadic [wə].

happy
The BCDP data suggest that this is typically tense and with diphthongisation, i.e. [i: > i:]. Wells (1982: 362) notes [iː] in the peripheral North (including Birmingham), and Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) also note WM [iː]. However, Painter (1963: 30–31) has BC /ɔi/, realised as [ɔi], with sporadic unstressed [i ~ ɛi]; similarly, Chinn and Thorne (2001: 21) maintain that Bm speakers’ realisation here is typically “close to ‘ay’” ([ɔi ~ ɛi]), e.g. in pretty, family, money, gulley.

letter
The BCDP data suggest that this is typically [ə], with a marked tendency towards lowering to [a]; /ɛ/ usually reappears in linking positions.

Chinn and Thorne (2001: 20–21) maintain that Bm speakers’ realisation here is typically “a”-like ([a]), e.g. in mother, computer, water, Christopher, mitre, doctor, razor, sugar, pillar, picture, mixture, sulphur, colour, amateur. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [ə], but for Mathisen (1999: 110) this vowel is often /ɛ/. Painter (1963: 30–31) has BC /a/, realised as [ŋ ~ ə] (following close/half-close vowel versus open/half-open vowel respectively).

horses
Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 55) have WM [ɔz].

comma
The BCDP data indicate that this is typically [ə], with a marked tendency towards lowering to [a]. Painter (1963: 30–31) has BC /a/, realised as [ŋ ~ ə] (following close/half-close vowel versus open/half-open vowel respectively), while Chinn and Thorne (2001: 20–24) maintain that Bm speakers’ realisation here is typically “a”-like ([a]), e.g. in China, dogma.

3. Consonants

Regarding the Black Country, Painter (1963: 31–2) maintains that:

(1) consonants are slightly labialised before stressed THOUGHT, NORTH, FORCE, LOT and GOAT;
consonants are slightly palatalised before stressed FLEECE or GOOSE;

voiced initial and final consonants are usually fully voiced;

final voiceless stops are ejective;

final voiced stops are fully exploded and fully voiced;

in the case of the -ing suffix, BC phrase-final [-n] contrasts with Bm [-ŋ];

intervocalic /r/ = [ɾ];

“linking” /r/ is common;

[i] is rare;

BC often evidences the “T-to-R” rule (with /t/ realised as [ɾ] especially in intervocalic environments).

Biddulph (1986: 2, 17–18) claims WM accents have so-called doubled or emphatic consonants (apparently geminate obstruents in medial position) – although so far no instances of such a phenomenon have been noted in the research literature or fieldwork data – as well as some aspiration on final plosives for Bm speakers (see D below). He claims the emphatic consonants are more prevalent in Birmingham than in the Black Country.

There is written evidence for the potential realisation of /n/ as [d] in <chimdy> chimney.

As noted above, the NG variable provides one major distinguishing factor as regards the WM dialect. As Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 63) explain, most varieties do not, in informal speech, have [ŋ] in <-ing>, but rather [n]. However, in a West-Central area of England (including Birmingham, Coventry, Stoke, Manchester, Liverpool and Sheffield, as well as rural counties including Staffordshire and parts of Warwickshire) there is a form [ŋ] for cases showing <ng> in the spelling. Thus, as Wells (1982: 365–366) notes, while most accents of English have a three-term system of nasals, the West Midlands and parts of the (southern) North-West have a two-term system whereby [ŋ] is merely an allophone of /n/. Wells calls this phenomenon velar nasal plus. Most accents (including RP) have [ŋ] in words like song, hang, wrong; but some Northern accents are non-NG-coalescing and so disallow final [ŋ] (at least after stressed vowels).

Chinn and Thorne (2001: 22) go so far as to suggest that while [ŋ] frequently occurs in the speech of younger Birmingham speakers, this pattern may actually be
a recent development, as it is “not altogether true” of older speakers. Wells notes that [ŋŋ] occurs well up the social scale; Heath (1980) found it in all social classes in Cannock, while in the BC [ŋ] has been reported as occurring in unstressed word-final syllables (thus [ˈmɔːnɪŋ] vs. [ˈsɪŋɡ]). Indeed, although NG is stereotypically realised as [ŋŋ] in the WM dialect, analysis of the BCDP data makes it clear that there is variation (particularly among younger speakers) between [ŋŋ] and [n] and [ŋ].

Similarly, for Sandwell, Mathisen (1999: 111) notes word-final [ŋŋ ~ ŋ] and [ŋŋ] before a word-initial suffix, but comments that it is subject to considerable stylistic variation, with [ŋŋ] favoured by teenage women and for monitored speech.

The potential alternation between [n] and [ŋŋ] in BC is noted also by Biddulph (1986: 12).

PLOSIVES
BCDP data reveal that there may be marked aspiration in syllable-final position for all the plosives.

B, D, G
There is (particularly) written evidence for fortition (following /h/ loss) of the onset of OE ǣ to [j], [d̪j] and especially [dɹ] in BC <yed> head, <ˈyɛd> dead; Bm/BC <jed> dead; BC <jeth> death. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 106) claim that such forms are today found mainly in BC, but were formerly also widely found in Bm.

There is written evidence for exccesent [d] following /n/ in Bm <apron/ap-pund/haprong> apron (from ME naperon), <gownd/geawnd> gown (from ME goune), <sauccepand> saucepan (from ME sauce + OE panne), <drowned> drowned (from (Northern)ME drun(e), droun(e)). But note the legitimate presence of [d] in <lawnd> lawn (from ME laund(e) ‘glade’, ultimately from Celtic), <riband> ribbon (ribbon = variant of riband from ME riband).

There is written evidence for [ð] rather than /d/ in Bm/BC <blather> bladder (compare OE blædre but Old Norse bláðra) and BC <lather> ladder. A change of /d/ to /ð/ before /t/ is attested for local ME dialects by Kristensson (1987: 213).

There is written evidence for affrication before a high front segment in Bm <tagious> tedious (probably [ˈtædʒiəs]).

There is some written evidence for final devoicing in Bm <fount> found, <olt> hold. According to Brook (1972: 69), one of the defining characteristics of the Middle English WM dialect was word-final devoicing of /b d g/ following liquids or nasals, as well as of /d/ in final position in unstressed syllables (e.g. hadet ‘beheaded’).

P
Mathisen (1999: 110) notes that glottalling for P is quite frequent, but less so than for T. There is apparent /p/-voicing in Bm/BC <bibble> pebble.
Mathisen (1999: 110) identifies [t] as the standard realisation, with T-glottalling frequent for younger speakers but infrequent for the elderly. Tap [ɾ] is considered mainly a male variant.

The BCDP data do indicate that many speakers have such a T-to-R rule (tapping of /t/ in intervocalic position), while T-glottalling occurs especially among younger speakers.

As Wells (1982: 261) notes, T-glottalling is widespread in most of the British Isles. Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 62) certify that this is indeed prevalent among younger urban working-class speakers in the UK. It is therefore not surprising to find this feature in the West Midlands. There is written evidence for word-final T-glottalling (or deletion) in Bm <wha’> what, <doan> don’t, <las’ night>, <in’ arf> isn’t half, <ackidock> aqueduct.

However, Chinn and Thorne (2001: 23) maintain that there are “relatively few glottal stops [replacing /t/] in Birmingham speech”, whether occurring medially (e.g. daughter, cutlery, butter) or finally (e.g. feet, that).

There is considerable written evidence for the T-to-R rule (noted also by Biddulph 1986: 12), e.g. in Bm <gerra/gerron/a-gerrin’/gerrout/gerraway> get a/get on/getting/get out/get away, <gorra/gurra/gorrin/gorroll> got a/in/all, <irrin/irrup> it in/up, <marrer/marra> matter, <birra> bit of, <purron> put on; BC <gerroff> get off, <bur ’e> but he, <bur at> but at, <ger ’undred> get hundred.

There is also written evidence for anticipatory realisation of /t/ as [k] between /s/ and syllabic /l/, as in Bm/BC <lickle> little or Bm <orsepickle> hospital. Note apparent hypercorrection in BC <pittle> pickle, <tittle> tickle. Furthermore, there is audio and written evidence for yod-coalescence to /tʃ/ before high front segments, e.g. in Bm <ackchullay> actually.

Mathisen (1999: 110) notes that glottalling of K is quite frequent, but less so than for T. There is written evidence for [tʃ] rather than /k/ in Bm <reechy> reeky ‘smoky’ (from OE rēc,*riec).

There is written evidence for medial and final deletion of /f/ (paralleled for V, see below) in Bm <arter>; BC <airta> after. There is written evidence for [g] rather than /f/ in <durgey> ‘dwarf; small, diminutive’ (note also variation in OE dweorg vs dweorh ‘dwarf’).

As Wells points out (1982: 371; see also Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 85; Chinn and Thorne 2001: 22), /h/-dropping is prevalent in the vernacular accents of the Midlands and Middle North in initial or medial position. /h/ is especially likely to
be canonically deleted in word-initial position (as shown by numerous audio and written examples, and noted also by Biddulph 1986: 3).

The BCDP data suggest that /h/-dropping is near-canonical in the WM dialect, although Mathisen (1999: 110) in Sandwell found it to be typical of teenage and working-class speech.

There is also written evidence for epenthetic (hypercorrect) /h/ in Bm <hpron> apron, and for realisation as [w] initially in BC <wum> home (also <hum>, <’um>).

GH
There is SED and written evidence for cases of ME /x/ –> WM [f] in contexts where RP might have different realisations, e.g. Bm <duff> dough (from OE dāg), <sluff> slough ‘midden pool’ (from OE slōn, slōg), WM <suff> sough ‘drain’ (compare other dialects; RP rough, tough, enough, slough (v.) etc).

V
There is written evidence for deletion of /v/ in medial and final position, possibly in low-stressed or unstressed syllables. This is paralleled for F, see above. Examples include Bm/BC <g’ie> give; Bm <gin> given; WM <ne’er/nare> never, <nerrun> never a one (compare other dialect or archaic forms like nary (a one), ne’er), BC <o’> of, <gimme> give me, <atta> have to.

TH
For Sandwell, Mathisen (1999: 111) notes [θ ~ ð] for adult speakers, but [f ~ v] for a growing number of teenagers, especially males.

There is written evidence for /θ/-deletion in BC <wi’> with, <wie ’er> with her, <wi’outen> without; for /ð/-stopping in BC <furder> further (an archaism, cf. burthen ~ burden; see D), and for rhoticisation of /ð/ (to a tap, [r]) in Bm/BC <Smerrick> Smethwick. A sporadic local change of OE /rD/ to ME /rd/ is noted by Kristensson (1987: 213).

Z
There is written evidence for /z/-deletion (as well as possibly /t/-deletion) in isn’t in Bm <in’ arf> isn’t half.

W
There is written evidence for /w/-deletion in unstressed initial and medial position in Bm <ull> will, <’ud> would, <(big) ’uns> (big) ones, <back’ards> backwards, <forrards> forwards (compare data from the OED: colloquial can’t get any forrader; maritime usage forr’ard), <arse-uppards> arse-upwards ‘topsy-turvy’, <causey> causeway (as in other dialects, e.g. North-Eastern place-name Causey Arch); also BC <ud/ood> would, <udn’t> wouldn’t, <oot> wouldst (thou).
There is also written and anecdotal evidence of cases of failure to round historical /a/ following /w/ (relating to instances of CLOTH and THOUGHT; see above); sometimes this appears to be accompanied by fronting. Thus, Chitham (1972: 171–172) claims that in BC wasp rhymes with clasp (presumably as [wasp]); for wash, Mathisen (1999: 108) has Sandwell [waʃ], for which note also BC <wesh> ([weʃ]). There is also Bm/BC <wairter>/<waerter> water, where presumably raising of historical /aː/ to something like [eː~eː] occurred (see also FACE, NURSE, START, PALM, where the same convention may be used). In the cases of fronting, OE (Mercian) second fronting may have been involved (note the derivations of wash and water in OE wæscan and wæter respectively).

WH
Wells (1982: 371) notes that historical /hw/ has become /w/ in all English urban accents; certainly the BCDP data reveal no /w/ ~ /hw/ distinction. However, there is written evidence for /hw/-simplification to [w] rather than [h] in BC <wool> whole (possibly represents [wuʃ]).

R
WM accents, like those of the South-East, are non-rhotic (Wells 1982: 360), but have both linking and intrusive /r/. While the SED material does show that locations near and within the Black Country (Himley and other areas nearby) were at least partially rhotic until comparatively recently, the current isogloss separating the rhotic South-West from the non-rhotic Midlands (and indeed most of the country) runs some way to the South of the West Midlands conurbation.

Chinn and Thorne (2001: 23) maintain that tapped realisations of /r/ are frequent in Birmingham speech, occurring especially in disyllabic words such as marry, very, sorry, perhaps, all right, but also in monosyllables such as bright, great, cream. They note that tap production varies considerably between speakers and sociolinguistic contexts.

Mathisen (1999: 110) explains that Sandwell usually has [ɾ], but there are some instances of prevocalic [ɾ]. Linking-R is categorical and intrusive R very frequent.

Y
The West Midlands has some degree of yod-dropping, as the BCDP data reveal (e.g. new [nóʊ]). Mathisen (1999: 111) also found some instances of yod-dropping in Sandwell, especially with teenagers and especially with new. Yod-dropping is also evidenced in Bm <dook> duke, <dooks> dukes ‘fists’, BC <noo> new, possibly <tews> tunes; also in BC <’ears> years. Note also written evidence for (hypercorrect?) yod-insertion in BC <unkyoothe> uncouth.
L

There is written evidence for medial preconsonantal L-vocalisation or loss in Bm <mawkin> malkin ‘scarecrow’ (from pet-name for Matilda); Bm/BC <fode> fold ‘backyard’, <ode> old; BC <tode> told, <code> cold, <sode> sold, <onny> any, <bawk> ba(u)lk.

4. Morphophonological processes

The Black Country is noted for its highly contracted negative modal forms, evidenced where possible using Painter’s (1963: 32–33) transcriptions, as well as respelling conventions, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
[aɪ] & <ay/ai’> & \text{ain’t ‘am not/isn’t/aren’t, hasn’t/haven’t’} \\
[bæɪ] & <bay/bey> & \text{bain’t ‘am not/isn’t/aren’t’} \\
 & <in’> & \text{isn’t} \\
 & <wor(e)> & \text{wasn’t/weren’t} \\
 & <dœ/doh/dow> & \text{doesn’t/don’t} \\
[dœ̃snt] & <dursn’?> & \text{don’t} \\
 & <day> & \text{didn’t} \\
[wœu] & <woh/wo’/woa> & \text{won’t} \\
[ʃo] & <share> & \text{shan’t} \\
[kɔ:] & <cor(e)/caw> & \text{can’t} \\
[mɔ:] & <mo> & \text{mustn’t}
\end{align*}
\]

Note also Mathisen (1999: 108) [kɔ:] can’t, [kɔv ævɪt] can’t have it.

Written evidence from Chinn and Thorne (2001: 74, 121) suggests that similar phonological processes may operate in Birmingham (at least in traditional working-class dialect), e.g. <dain’t>/<dain> didn’t. Chinn and Thorne (2001: 121) cite a form <mon’t> mustn’t. This could perhaps be a contraction of mustn’t, or derived from earlier (ME) maun ‘must’ + -n’t (Bm <mun>).

There is evidence for the retention of the reflex of the OE form axian ‘to ask’ (rather than OE ascian) in <aks> ask.

5. Current issues

The English West Midlands dialect is an under-researched area in all its linguistic aspects, which is surprising given its continued widespread use in both speech...
and writing. Mathisen (1999) found that in Sandwell the exogenous factor T-glottalling was spreading, but the local identity marker [ŋ] was robust and not significantly eroded. Changes seem to be largely brought about by females within the speech community.

Research in progress includes work on language change in the Black Country, attitudes to the Black Country and Birmingham accents, and the relationship between language and identity.

* Project leader, Black Country Dialect Project, University of Wolverhampton. Phonological analysis undertaken with the assistance of Peter Finn, research assistant, BCDP.
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The dialect of East Anglia: phonology

Peter Trudgill

1. Introduction

1.1. East Anglia

As a modern topographical and cultural term, *East Anglia* refers to an area with no official status. Like similar terms such as “The Midlands” or “The Midwest”, the term is widely understood but stands for an area which has no clear boundaries. Most people would agree that the English counties of Norfolk and Suffolk are prototypically East Anglian, although even here the status of the Fenland areas of western Norfolk and northwestern Suffolk is ambiguous: the Fens were for the most part uninhabited until the 17th century, and the cultural orientations of this area are therefore less clear. The main issue, however, has to do with the extent to which the neighbouring counties, notably Cambridgeshire and Essex, are East Anglian or not.

Historically, the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of East Anglia was bordered in the south by the river Stour, and in the west by the Ouse, the Lark and the Kennett, thus leaving the Newmarket and Haverhill areas of Suffolk, from a modern perspective, on the ‘wrong’ side of the border. The Kingdom later expanded further west, however, up to the River Cam; Anglo-Saxon East Anglia at its greatest extent therefore consisted of the habitable parts of Norfolk and Suffolk plus eastern Cambridgeshire.

East Anglian English has probably always been a distinctive area. Fisiak (2001) discusses its distinctive character in Old English and Middle English times. It has also played an important role in the history of the language. If it is accepted that the English language came into being when West Germanic groups first started to settle in Britain, then East Anglia – just across the North Sea from the coastline of the original West Germanic-speaking area – has a serious claim to be the first place in the world where English was ever spoken. Subsequently, East Anglian English played an important role in the formation of Standard English. East Anglia was one of the most densely populated areas of England for many centuries, and until the Industrial Revolution Norwich was one of the three largest provincial cities in the country. Together with the proximity of East Anglia to London and large-scale migration from the area to London, this meant that a number of features that came to be part of Standard English had their origins in East Anglia. East Anglia also played an important role in the development of colonial Englishes, notably the American English of New Eng-
land. The New England short o clearly has its origins in East Anglian pronunciations such as home /həm/; and yod-dropping (see below) and ‘conjunction do’ (see Trudgill, other volume) were also transmitted to the USA from this area. East Anglian English also formed part of the input for the formation of the Englishes of Australia and New Zealand (see Trudgill 1986; Trudgill et al. 2000). More recently, however, East Anglia, particularly the northern area, has become much more isolated, and its English has retained a number of conservative features.

As a distinctive linguistic area, East Anglia is clearly smaller today than it was two hundred years ago: it has shrunk over the past many decades under the influence of English from the London area. In the 19th century, it would probably have been reasonable to consider parts of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire as linguistically East Anglian; now it would no longer be so (see Trudgill 1999a). On the other hand, there are still parts of Essex which are linguistically very similar to Norfolk and Suffolk.

Modern linguistic East Anglia consists of a core area together with surrounding transition zones. The core area, as defined by Trudgill (2001), consists of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, except for the Fenland areas of western Norfolk and northwestern Suffolk, plus northeastern Essex. The transition zones consist of the Norfolk and Suffolk Fens, together with eastern Cambridgeshire, central Essex, and a small area of northeastern Hertfordshire (see Map 1).

This definition of linguistic East Anglia is based on traditional dialect features (see Wells 1982) as presented in the Survey of English Dialects (SED). As far as Modern Dialects are concerned (see Trudgill 1999b), the transition zones of northeastern Hertfordshire, central Essex and southern Cambridgeshire can no longer be considered East Anglian. Within the core region, urban areas such as Norwich, the largest urban centre in the region, and Ipswich are still solidly East Anglian. Colchester, however, shows much southeastern influence; and the East Anglian character of King’s Lynn and Thetford has been somewhat weakened by considerable in-migration from London and elsewhere.

1.2. Phonology

Within the core area of East Anglia, the biggest regional differentiation phonologically is between the north and the south. As indicated in Map 1, the northern area includes Norfolk, with the exception of some of the Fens, as well as the northeastern part of Suffolk as far south, approximately, as Southwold. The southern area includes the rest of Suffolk, and those areas of northeastern Essex which are still East Anglian-speaking. King’s Lynn, Norwich, Yarmouth and Lowestoft are thus in the northern area, Ipswich and Colchester in the southern.
2. Vowels

2.1. Short vowels

The system of short, checked vowels in modern East Anglia is the normal south-of-England six vowel system involving the lexical sets of: KIT, DRESS, TRAP, FOOT, STRUT, LOT.

KIT

The phonetic realisation of this vowel in the modern dialect is the same as in RP. Older speakers, however, have a closer realisation nearer to, but not as close as [i].

One of the most interesting features of the older East Anglian dialect short vowel system was that, unlike most other varieties, /i/ did not occur at all in unstressed syllables. Unstressed /ə/ continues to be the norm to this day in words such as wanted, horses, David, naked, hundred. More striking, however, is the fact that
/ə/ was the only vowel which could occur in any unstressed syllable. This was true not only in the case of word-final syllables in words such as water, butter, which of course also have /ə/ in RP, and in words such as window, barrow, which are pronounced /wɪndə, bærə/ in very many other forms of English, but also in items such as very, money, city which were /vɛrə, mənə, sɪtə/. In the modern dialect, dedialectalisation has taken place in that words from the very set are now pronounced with final /i/ by older speakers and /ɪ/ by younger speakers, as is now usual throughout southern England.

The KIT vowel occurred not only in items such as pit, bid in the older dialect but also in a number of other words, such as get, yet, head, again. There is little predictability as to which items have or had the raised vowel, but in all the words concerned the vowel was followed by /n/, /t/ or /d/.

DRESS
The vowel /ɛ/ in the older dialect was a rather close vowel approaching [ɛ]. During the course of this century, it has gradually opened until it is now much closer to [ɛ]. In Norwich, it is now also very retracted before /l/ and in the most modern accents has merged with /ʌ/ in this context, i.e. hell and hull are identical (Trudgill 1988).

In older forms of the dialect, /ɛ/ occurred not only in the expected bet, help, bed, etc., but also in a number of items which elsewhere have /æ/, such as catch, have/hav/had.

In the traditional dialect of northern Norfolk, /ɛ/ has become /æ/ before /v/ and /ð/: never /nævə/, together /təgædə/. In the older dialect, shed is /ʃʌd/.

TRAP
The vowel /æ/ appears to have undergone a certain amount of phonetic change. For older speakers for whom /ɛ/ was [ɛ], /æ/ was closer to [ɛ], while in the modern dialect it is a good deal more open. In the urban dialect of Norwich it has now also undergone a further change involving diphthongisation in some phonological environments: back [bæk] (see further Trudgill 1974).

FOOT
The FOOT vowel /ʌ/ was rather more frequent in the older East Anglian dialect than in General English (Wells 1982). Middle English /ɔ:/ and /ou/ remain distinct in the northern dialects e.g. road /ruːd/, rowed /rʌdə/ (see further below). However, there has been a strong tendency in East Anglia for the /u:/ descended from Middle English /ɔ:/ to be shortened to /ʊ/ in closed syllables. Thus road can rhyme with good, and we find pronunciations such as in toad, home, stone, coat /tɔd, hʌm, stʌn, kʊt/. This shortening does not normally occur before /l/, so coal is /kʊl/. The shortening process has clearly been a productive one. Norwich, for example, until the 1960s had a theatre known as The Hippodrome /hɪpɔdrʌm/, and trade names
such as Kodachrome can be heard with pronunciations such as /kodəkrəm/. The feature thus survives quite well in modern speech, but a number of words appear to have been changed permanently to the /u:/ set as a result of lexical transfer (see below). Trudgill (1974) showed that 29 different lexemes from this set occurred with /u:/.

The vowel /u/ also occurs in roof, proof, hoof and their plurals, e.g. /rʌfs/. It also occurs in middle-class sociolects in room, broom; working-class sociolects tend to have the GOOSE vowel in these items.

In the older dialect, a number of FOOT words derived from Middle English /oː/ plus shortening followed the same route as blood and flood and had /ʌ/: soot, roof /sʌt, rʌf/.

STRUT
There have been clear phonetic developments over the past century in the phonetic realisation of this vowel. It has moved forward from an earlier fully back [ʌ] to a more recent low-central [ə], as in much of the south of England. The movement has not been nearly so extensive, however, as the actual fronting which has taken place in London (see Wells 1982: 305). This movement (see Trudgill 1986) started in the south of East Anglia and has gradually spread north, so that the vowel is backer in Norwich than in Ipswich, and backer in Ipswich than in Colchester. The Kings Lynn area has a distinctive closer quality to this vowel around [ə].

LOT
In the southern area, rounded [ɒ] is usual. In the older accents of the northern area unrounded [a] is the norm, but this is gradually being replaced by the rounded vowel in the speech of younger people.

The lexical set associated with this vowel was formerly rather smaller in that, as in most of southern England, the lengthened vowel /ɔː/ was found before the front voiceless fricatives, as in off, cloth, lost. This feature survives to a certain extent, but mostly in working-class speech, and particularly in the word off. The word dog is also typically /dɔːɡ/. On the other hand, traditional dialect speakers also have LOT in un- and under rather than STRUT. Nothing also has LOT: /nʌθn/.

NURSE
Older forms of the dialect have an additional vowel in this sub-system. If we examine representations of words from the NURSE set in twentieth-century dialect literature, we find the following (for details of the dialect literature involved, see Trudgill 1996):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Dialect Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>her</td>
<td>har</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heard</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nerves</td>
<td>narves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herself</td>
<td>harself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td>sarvice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earn</td>
<td>arn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>arly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern</td>
<td>consarn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sir</td>
<td>sar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fur</td>
<td>far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daren’t</td>
<td>dussent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>fust, fasst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worse</td>
<td>wuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church</td>
<td>chuch, chatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>pappus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turnip</td>
<td>tannip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further</td>
<td>futher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurl</td>
<td>hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turkey</td>
<td>takkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turn</td>
<td>tann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurting</td>
<td>hatten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nightshirt</td>
<td>niteshat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shirts</td>
<td>shats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girl</td>
<td>gal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the subject of words such as these in East Anglian dialects, Forby (1830: 92) wrote:

To the syllable *ur* (and consequently to *ir* and *or*, which have often the same sound) we give a pronunciation certainly our own.

**Ex.**  *Third word burn curse*

*Bird curd dirt worse*

It is one which can be neither intelligibly described, nor represented by other letters. It must be heard. Of all legitimate English sounds, it seems to come nearest to open *a* [the vowel of *balm*], or rather to the rapid utterance of the *a* in the word *arrow*, supposing it to be caught before it light on the *r*... *Bahd* has been used to convey our sound of *bird*. Certainly this gets rid of the danger of *r*; but the *h* must as certainly be understood to lengthen the sound of *a*; which is quite inconsistent with our snap-short utterance of the syllable. In short it must be heard.
My own observations of speakers this century suggest that earlier forms of East Anglian English had a checked vowel system consisting of seven vowels. The additional vocalic item, which I represent as /æ/, was a vowel somewhat more open than half-open, and slightly front of central, which occurred in the lexical set of church, first. Dialect literature, as we have seen, generally spells words from the lexical set of first, church as either as <fust> or <chatch>. The reason for this vacillation between <u> and <a> was that the vowel was in fact phonetically intermediate between /ʌ/ and /æ/. This additional vowel occurred in items descended from Middle English ur, or and ir in closed syllables. Words ending in open syllables, such as sir and fur, had /a:/, as did items descended from ME er, such as earth and her (as well as items descended from ar such as part, cart, of course). The vowel /ɔ:/ did not exist in the dialect until relatively recently.

During the last fifty years, the /æ/ vowel has more or less disappeared. In my 1968 study of Norwich (Trudgill 1974), /æ/ was recorded a number of times, but the overwhelming majority of words from the relevant lexical set had the originally alien vowel /œ/. Only in lower working class speech was /æ/ at all common in 1968, and then only 25 percent of potential occurrences had the short vowel even in informal speech. The vowel did not occur at all in my 1983 corpus (Trudgill 1988).

The older checked stressed vowel system of East Anglian English was thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
/\mathbf{u}/ & \text{ kit, get} \quad /\mathbf{u}/ & \text{ foot, home, roof} \\
/\mathbf{e}/ & \text{ dress, catch} \quad /\mathbf{e}/ & \text{ strut} \\
/\mathbf{e}/ & \text{ trap} \quad /\mathbf{a} \sim / & \text{ top, under} \\
/\mathbf{v}/ & \text{ church}
\end{align*}
\]

The newer short vowel system looks as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
/\mathbf{u}/ & \text{ kit} \quad /\mathbf{u}/ & \text{ foot, home, roof} \\
/\mathbf{e}/ & \text{ dress, get} \quad /\mathbf{v}/ & \text{ strut, under} \\
/\mathbf{æ}/ & \text{ trap, catch} \quad /\mathbf{a} \sim / & \text{ top, off}
\end{align*}
\]

2.2. Upgliding diphthongs

Characteristic of all of the upgliding diphthongs, of which there is one more than in most accents of English (see below), is the phonetic characteristic that, unlike in other south-of-England varieties, the second element is most usually a fully close vowel, e.g. the FACE vowel is typically [æi] rather than [æi].

FLEECE
The /i:/ vowel is an upgliding diphthong of the type [ii], noticeably different from London [ɔi]. The modern accent demonstrates happy-tensing, and this vowel therefore also occurs in the modern dialects in the lexical set of money, city, etc.
Unstressed they has /i:/ Are they coming? /aːdʒiːkʌmən/ (see also Trudgill, other volume). In the traditional dialect, mice was /miːs/, and deaf could be /diːf/. 

**FACE**

In the traditional dialects of East Anglia, the Long Mid Mergers have not taken place (Wells 1982: 192–194). The vowel /æi/ in these lects occurs only in items descended from ME /ai/, while items descended from ME /æː/ have /eː/ = [eː ~ eː]. Thus pairs such as days-daze, maid-made are not homophonous. (The /eː/ vowel also occurred in the older dialect in a number of words descended from ME /æː/ such as *beans, creature* [kaːs]eː?eː].) This distinction, which now survives only in the northern area, is currently being lost through a process of transfer of lexical items from /eː/ to /æi/ (Trudgill and Foxcroft 1978). The most local modern pronunciation of /æi/ is [æi], but qualities intermediate between this and RP [eː] occur in middle-class speech (see Trudgill 1974).

**PRICE**

There is considerable variation in the articulation of the /æi/ vowel, as described in detail for Norwich in Trudgill (1974, 1988). The most typical realisation is [uːi], but younger speakers are increasingly favouring a variant approaching [ɔi] (see further below).

**CHOICE**

It is still possible to hear from older speakers certain words from this set, notably boil, with the PRICE vowel, although this is now very recessive. The vowel /oi/ itself ranges from the most local variant [ʊi] to a less local variant [ɔi], with a whole range of phonetically intermediate variants.

**GOOSE**

The vowel /uː/ is a central diphthong [ʊu] with more lip-rounding on the second element than on the first. Since northern East Anglia demonstrates total yod-dropping (see below), there is in this part of the area complete homophony between pairs of words which have this vowel, such as *dew* = *do, Hugh* = *who, cute* = *coot*. In northern East Anglia, many words in this set may also occur with the vowel /uː/ (see below).

**GOAT**

As we saw above, the Long Mid Mergers have not taken place in East Anglia. There are therefore two vowels at this point in the East Anglian vowel system. Paralleling the vestigial distinction in the front vowel system between the sets of *made and maid*, corresponding to the distinction between the ME monophthong and diphthong, there is a similar distinction in the back vowel system which, however, is by no means vestigial in the northern part of the area. The distinction is between /uː/ = [ʊu], de-
scended from ME /ɔː/, and /ʌu/ = [ʁu], descended from ME /ou/. Thus pairs such as moan ≠ mown, road ≠ rowed, nose ≠ knows, sole ≠ soul are not homophonous.

ME /ɔː/ plus /l/ also gives /ʌ̃/, as in hold. Words such as bowl and shoulder have /au/ in the older dialect, however.

One further complication is that, in modern speech, adverbial no has /uː/ while the negative particle no has /ʌu/: No, that’s no good /nʌu/, δæs nu: gud/.

There are two additional complications. One is that, as we have already seen, words descended from the ME monophthong may also have /uː/, i.e. road can be either/rʊd/ or /ruːd/.

Secondly, as was mentioned briefly above, many words from the set of GOOSE which are descended from ME /oː/ may have /uː/ rather than /ʊː/. That is, words such as boot may be pronounced either /bʊt/ or /bʊtː/. In the latter case, they are of course then homophonous with words such as boat. Therefore rood may be homophous either with rude or with road which, however, will not be homophonous with rowed.

It is probable that this alternation in the GOOSE set is the result of lexical transfer, perhaps under the influence of earlier forms of RP, from /ʊː/ to /uː/. Forms in /uː/ are more typical of middle-class than of working-class speech; and phonological environment can also have some effect: /uː/ before /l/ as in school has much lower social status than it does before other consonants. Words which in my own lower-middle class Norwich speech have /uː/ rather than /ʊː/ include: who, whose, do, soon, to, too, two, hoot, loot, root, toot, soup, choose, lose, loose, through, shoe. I have no explanation at all for why, for example, soon and moon do not rhyme in my speech. There is also considerable individual variation: my mother has /uː/ in chose and root, for instance, and my late father had /uː/ in who. Note that this alternation never occurs in the case of those items such as rule, tune, new etc. which have historical sources other than ME/oː/; these words always have /ʊː/. For very many speakers, then, rule and school do not rhyme.

In summary:
rowed /ʌu/
road /uː/ ~ /ʊː/
rude /uː/
rood /uː/ ~ /ʊː/

Two modern developments should also be noted. First, the phonetic realisation of /uː/ in the northern area is currently undergoing a rather noticeable change (see below), with younger speakers favouring a fronter first element [ʊu] (see Trudgill 1988; Labov 1994). This is more advanced in Lowestoft, Gorleston and Yarmouth than in Norwich. Secondly, in the southern zone, the moan: mown distinction is now very recessive, so that for most speakers /ʌu/ is used in both lexical sets and
/u:/ has disappeared. As a consequence, GOOSE words can no longer alternate in their pronunciation.

MOUTH
The most typical realisation of the /æu/ vowel in the northern area is [æu], although there is some variation in the quality of the first element, e.g. qualities such as [əu] can also be heard. In the south a more typical realisation is [εu].

2.3. Long monophthongs

NEAR/SQUARE
These two lexical sets are not distinct in northern East Anglian English. The most usual realisation of this single vowel, which I symbolise as /æ/, is [ε ~ ε:]. It is possible that some speakers thus pronounce items such as fierce and face identically. In the southern area, NEAR is [ισ], SQUARE is [ε:].

THOUGHT/NORTH/FORCE
The /ɔ:/ vowel has a realisation which is approximately [ɔː] without, however, very much lip-rounding. It occurs in items such as poor, pore, paw. As is typical of more conservative south-of-England varieties, it also occurs frequently in the lexical set of CLOTH.

START/BATH/PALM
In its most local realisation the vowel /a:/ is a very front vowel approaching [aː], but in more middle-class speech more central variants occur. Typical London and RP back variants around [aː] are not found. As we saw above, in the older dialect this vowel also occurs in sir, fur, earth, her.

NURSE/CURE
It was pointed out before that the vowel /ɔ:/ is a relative newcomer into East Anglian English. Its phonetic realisation is perhaps a little closer than in RP [ɔː]. It occurs in all items from the set of NURSE, but it also occurs in words from the CURE set that are descended from ME /iu/ or /eu/ before r, so that sure rhymes with her (see also below on ‘smoothing’). Note also that, because of yod-dropping (see section 3), the following are homophones in northern East Anglia: pure = purr, cure = cur, fury = furry.

2.4. Smoothing

We have already noted that earlier ingliding diphthongs have become monophthongs: /iə/ > /ɛ:/ in near, /εə/ > /ɛ:/ in square. This is also true of /uə/ > /ɔ:/ in
poor, /ɔː/ > /ɔː/ in pore, and (presumably) /uə/ > /ɜː/ in pure. This development has also occurred in original triphthongs, giving tower /təː/ and fire /faː/ in working-class speech – the vowel /əː/ occurs only as a result of smoothing. In middle class speech, however, in which /æː/ is more central, /əː/ does not occur, and tar and tower are homophonous.

This historical process involving lowering before /ə/ and then loss of /ə/ is paralleled by a synchronic phonological process which carries across morpheme and word boundaries, and extends to additional vowels. (In examining the following examples, recall that East Anglia has /ə/ in most unstressed syllables where many other accents have /ʌ/.) The full facts can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel + /ə/</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/iː/</td>
<td>seeing</td>
<td>/sɛːn/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æi/</td>
<td>playing</td>
<td>/plæːn/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ai/</td>
<td>trying</td>
<td>/træːn ~ trəːn/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/oi/</td>
<td>annoying</td>
<td>/ɒnəːn/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/uː/</td>
<td>do it</td>
<td>/dʒət/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʊː/</td>
<td>going</td>
<td>/gən/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ou/</td>
<td>know it</td>
<td>/nət/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/æu/</td>
<td>allow it</td>
<td>/ələt/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, do it is homophonous with dirt and going rhymes with lawn. The vowels /æː/, /əː/, /uː/ occur only as a result of smoothing. Interestingly, some speakers in Norwich pronounce towel as /təːl/. Smoothing is most typical of the northern zone of East Anglia, but is currently spreading southwards (Trudgill 1986).

3. Consonants

/p, t, k/

Intervocalic and word-final /p, k/ are most usually glottalised. This is most noticeable in intervocalic position where there is simultaneous oral and glottal closure, with the oral closure then being released inaudibly prior to the audible release of the glottal closure, thus paper [pæipʰ], baker [bækʰ].

This also occurs in the case of /t/, as in later [læitʰ], but more frequently, especially in the speech of younger people, glottaling occurs: [læiʔ]. East Anglia (see Trudgill 1974) appears to have been one of the centres from which glottaling has diffused geographically in modern English English. Trudgill (1988) showed for Norwich that [ʔ] is the usual realisation of intervocalic and word-final /t/ in casual speech, and that it is now also increasingly diffusing into more formal styles. There is an interesting constraint on the use of [ʔ] and [tʔ] in East Anglian English
in that these allophones cannot occur before [ə] if another instance follows. Thus lit it has to be [lɪtə] rather than *[lɪʔə].

In /nt/ clusters, the /n/ is frequently deleted if (and only if) the /t/ is realised as glottal stop: twenty [twɛʔi], plenty [pleʔi], going to [gɔːʔə].

/d/
Northeastern Norfolk Traditional Dialects had word-final /d/ merged with /t/ in unstressed syllables, e.g. hundred /hʌndrət/, David /deːvət/.

/kl, gl/
In the older dialect, these clusters could be pronounced /tl, dl/: clock [tlækʔi], glove [dlʌv].

/θr, ðr/
The older East Anglian dialect had /tr/ from original /θr/ and /sθr/ from original /ʃr/. Thus thread was pronounced /trɪd/, threshold /θraʃl/; and shriek /sriːk/. My own surname appears to be an East Anglian form of Threadgold. /tw/ could also occur for original /θw/, as in the placename Thwaite /twæit/.

/h/
Traditional Dialects in East Anglia did not have h-dropping. Norwich and Ipswich, however, have had h-dropping for many generations. Trudgill (1974) showed that in Norwich in 1968 levels of h-dropping correlated with social class and style, ranging from 0 percent for the Middle Middle Class (the highest social class group) in formal speech to 61 percent for Lower Working Class informants in casual speech. It is interesting that these levels are much lower than in other parts of the country, and that hypercorrect forms do not occur.

/v/
The present-tense verb-form have is normally pronounced /hæ ~ hɛ ~ ha ~ ə/, i.e. without a final /v/, unless the next word begins with a vowel: Have you done it? /hɛ jo dʌn ət/. This has the consequence that, because of smoothing (see above), some forms involving to have and to be are homophonic: we’re coming /weː kʌmɪŋ/, we’ve done it /weː dʌn ət/.

In many of the local varieties spoken in the southeast of England in the 18th and 19th centuries, prevocalic /v/ in items like village was replaced by /w/. Most reports focus on word-initial /w/ in items such as village, victuals, vegetables, vermin. It would seem than that [v] occurred only in non-prevocalic position, i.e. in items such as love, with the consequence that [w] and [v] were in complementary distribution and /w/ and /v/ were no longer distinct. Ellis (1889) describes the southeast of 19th century England as the “land of wee” and Wright (1905: 227) says that “initial and medial v has become w in mid-Buckinghamshire, Norfolk, Suffolk,
Essex, Kent, east Sussex”. Wakelin (1981: 95–96) writes that the SED materials show that: “In parts of southern England, notably East Anglia and the south-east, initial and medial [v] may appear as [w], cf. V.7.19 vinegar, IV.9.4 viper (under adder), V.8.2 victuals (under food). […] The use of [w] for [v] was a well-known Cockney feature up to the last century.”

Wakelin (1984: 79) also says that “Old East Anglian and south-eastern dialect is noted for its pronunciation of initial /v/ as /w/ in, e.g., vinegar, viper; a very old feature, which was preserved in Cockney up to the last century”. The SED materials show spontaneous responses to VIII.3.2 with very with initial /w/ in Grimston, North Elmham, Ludham, Reedham, and Pulham St Mary, Norfolk. Norfolk is one of the areas in which this merger lasted longest. The merger is ‘remembered’ by the local community decades after its actual disappearance: most local people in the area over a certain age ‘know’ that village used to be pronounced willage and that very used to be pronounced werra, but discussions with older Norfolk people suggest that it was in widespread normal unselfconscious use only until the 1920s. We can assume that it died out in the southern part of the East Anglian area even earlier. The fact that modern dialect writers still use the feature is therefore highly noteworthy. For example, Michael Brindred in his local dialect column in the Norwich-based Eastern Daily Press of August 26th, 1998 writes anniversary <anniversary>.

/l/
l/ was traditionally clear in all positions in northern rural East Anglian dialects, and this can still be heard from speakers born before 1920, but modern speech now has the same distribution of clear and dark allophones as RP. Vocalisation of /l/ does not occur in the north but is increasingly common in the south of the region.

/r/
East Anglian English is non-rhotic, although the SED did record a few rhotic tokens on the Essex peninsulas.

Intrusive /r/ is the norm in East Anglia. It occurs invariably where the vowels /ɛː; æː; ɔː/ occur before another vowel both across word and morpheme boundaries: drawing /draːriŋ/, draw it /draːrit/. Because of the high level of reduction of unstressed vowels to /ɔ/ (see above), intrusive /r/ occurs in positions where it would be unusual in other accents: e.g. Give it to Anne /gi:v ɔt tɔr æn/. Linking /r/ is essentially the same phenomenon and occurs additionally after /ɔː/.

/j/
The northern zone (as well as adjacent areas of Cambridgeshire, Lincolnshire and even parts of Leicestershire and Bedfordshire, see Trudgill 1999a) demonstrates total yod-dropping (Wells 1982). That is, earlier /j/ has gone missing before /u:/ not only after /r/, as in rule, as in all accents of English; and not only after /l, s, n,
t, d, θ/, as in lute, sue, news, tune, duke, enthuse, as in many accents of English; but after all consonants. Pronunciations without /j/ are usual in items such as music, pew, beauty, few, view, cue, hew. The word ewe now begins with /j/, although this was formerly not the case, and education is now /ɛdʒəkæʃn/ although it was formerly /ɛdɵkeʃn/. The southern part of East Anglia does not have yod-dropping but typically has /ʌ/ rather than /jʊ/ in such words.

4. **Rhythm and intonation**

East Anglian English has a distinctive rhythm. This is due to the fact that stressed syllables tend to be longer than in RP, and unstressed syllables correspondingly shorter. The reduction of unstressed vowels to schwa appears to be part of this same pattern. Indeed, unstressed syllables consisting of schwa may disappear altogether in non-utterance final position, e.g. forty two [fɔːtuː]; what are you on holiday? [waʔ jaːn hæːldə]; half past eight [haːpəs æʔt]; have you got any coats? [hæjə gəʔnə kuʔs]; shall I? [ʃæl].

Intonation in yes-no questions is also distinctive. Such questions begin on a low level tone followed by high-level tone on the stressed syllable and subsequent syllables:

[waʔ jaːn hæːldə]  
— —

What are you on holiday?
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1. Introduction

From a dialectological point of view, the South of England falls into three main dialect areas: the Southeast, centred on the Home Counties area; the Southwest of England, which covers the area known as the “West Country”; and East Anglia, which comprises Norfolk and Suffolk, together with adjacent parts of Essex and Cambridgeshire. This article will focus on two of these three areas: the Southeast and the Southwest.

2. North and South

According to Trudgill in his *The Dialects of England* (1999), the major dialect boundary in England today is the line separating the North from the South. This line also has an acknowledged folk-linguistic status since it is used “informally to divide ‘southerners’ from ‘northerners’” (Trudgill 1999: 80; see also Wales 2002). In linguistic terms, it consists of two major isoglosses marking the northern limit of two historical developments which are referred to by Wells (1982) as the FOOT-STRUT split and as BATH broadening. The FOOT-STRUT split is a sound change by which the Middle English short vowel u underwent a split resulting in phonemic contrast between [ʊ] and [ʌ] in words such as *put* and *putt*. The term BATH broadening refers to a historical process by which /a/ preceding a voiceless fricative, a nasal + /s, t/, or syllable-final /r/, was lengthened (e.g. from [baθ] to [baːθ]) in the late 17th century, and then later retracted to [aː] (giving [baːθ]) sometime in the 19th century. These changes mark the vowel systems of the South but are absent from the North. Local accents in the South therefore tend to have separate phonemes for the vowels in FOOT and STRUT and a long (in popular terminology “broad”) vowel /aː/ in BATH (although the situation is more complicated in the Southwest; see section 5.5.). Their northern counterparts have the same vowel – /u/ – in both FOOT and STRUT, and a short front (“flat”) /a/ vowel in BATH. According to the *Survey of English Dialects* (SED) (see e.g. Chambers and Trudgill 1998, Fig. 8-1; here: Map 1), the FOOT-STRUT isogloss runs from the Severn estuary in the West to the Wash in the East. The BATH isogloss follows a similar path, but at its western
end starts somewhat further south, crossing the FOOT-STRUT line in Herefordshire, then continuing to run north of it up to the Wash.

Map 1: England, showing the southern limit of [u] in some (solid line) and the short vowel [a] in chaff (broken line)

3. Southeast and Southwest

The major subdivision of southern accents into Southeastern and Southwestern accents is based on the pronunciation of post-vocalic /r/ in syllable-final pre-pausal and pre-consonantal position, as in far or farmer. In these positions /r/ is preserved in local accents of the Southwest, whereas it is absent or rapidly disappearing from
accents in the Southeast. In the Southeast, rhoticity used to be a characteristic of rural accents in Kent, Sussex and Surrey where it has been recessive for quite a while (see Trudgill 1999: 27, Map 5 and 1999: 55, Map 12; here: Map 2 and Map 3). According to Wells (1982: 341), “traces of variable rhoticity may be found” in Reading, formerly in Berkshire. As Trudgill (1999: 54) puts it, “[e]very year the r-pronouncing area gets smaller”.

Map 2.  Arm; r = [r] pronounced in arm etc.; (r) = some [rs] pronounced
4. The Southeast

4.1. The Home Counties Modern Dialect area

The Southeast of England is here loosely equated with the Home Counties, these being the counties adjacent to London: Kent, Surrey, East and West Sussex, Essex, Hertfordshire, Hampshire, Buckinghamshire, Berkshire, and Bedfordshire. In the past, however, the accents of the Home Counties used to belong to very differ-
ent dialect areas. Trudgill (1999: 44–47) labels these traditional dialect areas the Southeast (Berkshire, north-eastern Hampshire, Sussex, Kent, Surrey), the Central East (parts of Northamptonshire, Cambridgeshire, non-metropolitan Hertfordshire and Essex) and the Eastern Counties (Norfolk, Suffolk, north-eastern Essex) plus London, which was considered a “separate branch of the Eastern dialects” (Trudgill 1999: 46). Note that the Eastern Counties are also referred to as East Anglia (see Wells 1982: 335), an area treated separately in this handbook.

The accents of these areas have been undergoing extensive dialect levelling in recent decades (see e.g. Kerswill 2002). As a result, a considerable part of these different dialect areas are now joined together to form one large modern dialect area, called by Trudgill the “Home Counties Modern Dialect area” (see Trudgill 1999: 65, Map 18; here: Map 4).

[...] the non-traditional dialect area of London has now expanded enormously to swallow up the old Southeast area, part of East Anglia, most of the eastern Southwest, and most of the Central East, of which now only the South Midlands remain. The new London-based area we call the Home Counties Modern Dialect area. (Trudgill 1999: 80)

The exact degree of linguistic uniformity within this area is still unclear. Research on urban accents in the Southeast (see e.g. Williams and Kerswill 1999; Altendorf 2003) indeed points to an increase in homogeneity, in particular with regard to middle-class accents. However, local and regional accent differences also persist (see also section 4.2.).

4.2. Dialect levelling in the Southeast

The restructuring of the Southeastern dialect area is in large part due to processes of linguistic convergence (e.g. Williams and Kerswill 1999; Kerswill 2002). These processes have, it is argued, been promoted by an increase in geographical mobility in the second half of the 20th century. Mobility and migration have taken place in three different directions:

(1) Trend I: Centrifugal migration:
Londoners have been moving out of the capital since the Second World War, during which time London was the most heavily bombed city in Britain. The Blitz forced millions of families out of their London homes into the country. After the war, and for less dramatic reasons, around one million overspill Londoners were re-housed in municipal re-housing schemes designed to decentralize the metropolitan population. For this purpose, a number of new towns, among them Milton Keynes, Stevenage, Hemel Hempstead, Bracknell and Basildon, were founded within an eighty-kilometre radius of London. In more recent years, young families and old-age pensioners have also often moved out of the city. Young families have been moving into the London
suburbs or the neighbouring Home Counties to bring up their children in a safer and more pleasant environment. Old-age pensioners have been moving away to realize, where feasible, the English dream of buying a house by the seaside or a cottage in the country, or for less idealistic motives such as unaffordable London rents and living costs, spiralling crime and alienation. Lately, the increased necessity and willingness to commute has further enhanced the interchange between London and elsewhere.
(2) Trend II: Centripetal migration (Moving to the Southeast and the “North-South divide”):
Since the economic revival of the Thatcher era, employment growth in Southeastern England has outstripped that in the rest of the United Kingdom. The media regularly report on the “North-South divide”, a term used to imply stronger economic growth and higher living standards in the South of England than in the North. This economic prosperity has attracted many (work) migrants, mostly to Southeastern areas outside London. The population in these areas has therefore grown at a faster rate than in the rest of the country. Today, about one third of the population of the United Kingdom lives in Southeast England.

(3) Trend III: Internal migration within the Southeast:
As people resident in the Southeast now tend to change their place of work more often than they used to, there has been a resultant increase in the levels of admixture of the population within the region. These processes of mobility have increased face-to-face interaction among speakers of different accents. This kind of communicative situation tends to bring about short-term accommodation among the interlocutors, which in turn can then lead to long-term accommodation, accent convergence and change, providing that attitudinal factors are favourable. In addition, mobility has been shown to weaken network ties and to promote the diffusion of “new” variants. In the Southeast, these processes have been dominated by the “London element”. Faced with a choice between a London variant and one associated with a rural or provincial accent, most young speakers have tended to opt for the former. This is likely to be particularly true for those young professionals who have been moving to the Southeast from other parts of Britain. To employ a term coined in the 1980s, a metropolitan accent is higher on “street cred” than a provincial one. This does not mean, however, that local accent features have been completely lost. The dialect survey by Williams and Kerswill (1999), for instance, has shown that there are still qualitative and quantitative differences between the accents of adolescents in the two Southeastern towns of Milton Keynes and Reading.

4.3. London as “innovator”
An important aspect in the linguistic development and folk-linguistic perception of the Southeast is the presence of the capital London within this area. London has a long tradition as a source of linguistic innovation for accents of the surrounding area as well as for RP itself. In recent years, a number of London working-class variants have not only been spreading to areas outside London but also to higher social classes, including the RP-speaking upper and upper middle classes. Wells
describes this trend in a series of articles, in one of which he states that “some of the changes … can reasonably be attributed to influence from Cockney – often overtly despised, but covertly imitated” (Wells 1994: 205). This development is currently exciting a high degree of public attention.

Another phenomenon connected with the Southeast of England which is attracting much public attention is the occurrence of variants associated with London English in urban accents as distant from Southeast England as Hull (in east Yorkshire) and Glasgow (in central Scotland). These variants are, in particular, T-glottalling, TH-fronting and labio-dental [v] (for a more detailed discussion of these variants, see section 4.6.). The British media have had a tendency to attribute, in a very simplistic way, the presence of these features in the speech of younger speakers of these accents to the direct influence of metropolitan London English. This, some media observers believe, is linked closely to the popularity throughout the United Kingdom of the London-based television soap opera EastEnders, which has for nearly two decades been one of Britain’s most popular television programmes.

A product of this alleged connection is the label Jockney – a blend of Jock (a nickname for a Scotsman) and Cockney – which has been used by some journalists to describe a new form of Glaswegian dialect borrowing from the television series EastEnders. However, in view of (a) the substantial body of evidence which points to the crucial role of face-to-face interaction in the transmission of changes in pronunciation, and (b) the continuing absence of any compelling evidence of the adoption of innovative forms as a direct consequence of television viewing, it is problematic to attribute the occurrence of these variants in accents outside Southeast England to the dissemination of London English in public broadcasting. Furthermore, it does not seem very likely that attitudes toward London English among speakers in cities like Hull and Glasgow are generally favourable (for more detailed discussion, see Foulkes and Docherty 1999: 11; Williams and Kerswill 1999: 161–162). In any case, many of the so-called London variants have long existed in the accents of areas surrounding cities such as Glasgow and Norwich, and appear more likely to have originated from accents of the immediate vicinity than to have spread from London (see e.g. Trudgill [1999]) on the antiquity of T-glottalling in geographically dispersed regions of the British Isles).

4.4. “Estuary English”

The changes described above are often referred to as being characteristic of Estuary English, a term coined by David Rosewarne in 1984. He defines it as follows:

‘Estuary English’ is a variety of modified regional speech. It is a mixture of non-regional and local Southeastern English pronunciation and intonation. If one imagines a continuum with RP and London speech at either end, ‘Estuary English’ speakers are to be found grouped in the middle ground (Rosewarne 1984: 29).
Since the appearance of Rosewarne’s article, Estuary English has been discussed among laypeople and linguists with increasing frequency and unreduced controversy, although linguists have tended to adopt the term as shorthand rather more sceptically than have the general public (see e.g. Przedlacka 2002; Altendorf 2003). Journalists and literary authors make frequent use of the term to label a number of different and divergent trends. For example:

(1) socio-phonetic changes within the accents of Southeastern England in the direction of a supra-local regional accent (see also section 4.1.).

(2) the social spread of London working-class variants into higher social classes, including the advanced version of RP (see also section 4.3.).

(3) the situation-related use of London working-class variants by speakers who are otherwise speakers of RP.

(4) the retention of Southeastern regional accent features by speakers who would otherwise have been expected to become speakers of adoptive RP.

(5) the occurrence of variants which are (rightly or wrongly) associated with the Southeastern England in accents in which they were not used before (see also section 4.3.).

The existence of these developments, with the exception of (5), is not disputed by linguists; what they dispute is the practice (a) of subsuming all these developments under the same name, (b) of choosing a new name to describe them, and (c) of choosing the particular name ‘Estuary English’. With regard to the choice of name, Trudgill (1999) remarks:

This [Estuary English] is an inappropriate term which [...] has become widely accepted. It is inappropriate because it suggests that we are talking about a new variety, which we are not; and because it suggests that this is a variety of English confined to the banks of the Thames Estuary, which it is not. (Trudgill (1999: 80)

With regard to choosing a new name, Wells (1997) remarks:

Estuary English is a new name. But it is not a new phenomenon. It is the continuation of a trend that has been going on for five hundred years or more – the tendency for features of popular London speech to spread out geographically (to other parts of the country) and socially (to higher social classes). (Wells 1997: 47)

Here, Wells touches on one of the central aspects of the Estuary English controversy. To the layperson, the situation has changed in such a way (and/or is brought to his/her attention in such a way) that it is perceived as a new phenomenon requiring a new name. For the linguist, on the other hand, the current linguistic situation is just another phase within a longer historical process which does not merit a distinct designation, at least no more so than any other phase in the development of any particular accent.
4.5. Southeastern phonology: vowels and diphthongs

Table 1 shows the inventory of London vowels and diphthongs on the basis of Wells (1982: 304). For the purposes of comparison, Table 2 gives an overview of the variants used by adolescent speakers from the Southeast of England, including London, in the late 1990s. The forms for Milton Keynes and Reading are taken from Williams and Kerswill (1999: 143), those for London from Tollfree (1999: 165) and, in individual cases, from Altendorf (2003). Altendorf’s study covers fewer variables and will only be cited when results do not tally with those reported by Tollfree.

Table 1. London vowels – summary

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>NEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>αi</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>α:</td>
<td>START</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>ɑ</td>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>ɔ, ɔ̃</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>ʌ</td>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>ʌ̃</td>
<td>FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>ʊ̃</td>
<td>CURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>ɑː</td>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>ʌ̃</td>
<td>happY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td>ɒ</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>ɑi</td>
<td>lettER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>ɔi</td>
<td>commA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>æu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

happY

Accents in the South of England have undergone happY tensing, a term coined by Wells (1982: 257–258) to describe a historical process by which the short final [i] in happY has been replaced by a closer vowel of the [i(ː)] type. There is still uncertainty about the exact phonetic quality of [i(ː)] but the general consensus is that it patterns with FLEECE rather than KIT. In addition, London and South-eastern accents have diphthongal happY variants. With regard to these variants, the general socio-phonetic principle is: the more central the starting-point, the more basilectal the variant. The most basilectal variant is [ai] with a fully central starting-point. Suburban working-class speakers and middle-class speakers use a variant with a less central starting point, which we have chosen to transcribe as [ˈi].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD LEXICAL SET</th>
<th>London (middle class)</th>
<th>Milton Keynes (middle class and working class)</th>
<th>Reading (middle class and working class)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>i ~ i</td>
<td>i &gt; i ~ i</td>
<td>i &gt; i ~ e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>e ~ ɨ</td>
<td>ɨ &gt; ɨ</td>
<td>ɨ &gt; ɨ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>a ~ a</td>
<td>a ~ a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>ə ~ ɨ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ ~ ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>æ ~ ä</td>
<td>ä &gt; ä ~ æ</td>
<td>ä &gt; ä ~ æ ~ ã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>u ~ ɨ (Tollfree)</td>
<td>θ ~ θ ~ ø ~ ɨ ~ ɣ ~ ɤ ~ γ</td>
<td>θ ~ θ ~ ø ~ ɨ ~ ɣ ~ γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>æː ~ æː ~ æː</td>
<td>æː &gt; æː ~ æː</td>
<td>æː &gt; æː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td>æ ~ ɨ</td>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭ ~ ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>æ ~ ə</td>
<td>ṭ:</td>
<td>ṭ:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td>iː ~ iː (Tollfree)</td>
<td>iː ~ iː</td>
<td>iː ~ iː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>ei ~ ei ~ ɨi</td>
<td>ei &gt; æi ~ ɨi ~ ɨi</td>
<td>ei &gt; æi ~ ɨi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>æ ~ æ</td>
<td>æː &gt; æː ~ æː</td>
<td>æː &gt; æː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>æ ~ ø</td>
<td>ø:</td>
<td>ø:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>æu(ː) ~ æu ~ æu ~ æu (Tollfree)</td>
<td>ɵu ~ ʉ ~ æu &gt; ʉu (Altendorf)</td>
<td>ɵu ~ ʉ ~ æu ~ æu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>æu(ː) ~ æu ~ æu (Tollfree)</td>
<td>æu &gt; æu</td>
<td>æu &gt; æu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>u(ː) : æu ~ æu (Tollfree)</td>
<td>æu ~ æu &gt; æu</td>
<td>æu &gt; æu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>æi ~ æi ~ æi</td>
<td>æi &gt; æi ~ æi ~ æi</td>
<td>æi &gt; æi ~ æi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>æi ~ æi</td>
<td>æi ~ æi</td>
<td>æi ~ æi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>æu ~ æu (Tollfree)</td>
<td>æu &gt; æu ~ æu</td>
<td>æu &gt; æu ~ æu ~ æu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR</td>
<td>æ ~ ɨ</td>
<td>æ ~ ɨ</td>
<td>æ ~ ɨ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>æ(ː) ~ æ(ː)</td>
<td>æ ~ æ</td>
<td>æ ~ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START</td>
<td>æː &gt; æː ~ æ</td>
<td>æː &gt; æː ~ æ</td>
<td>æː &gt; æː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>æ ~ œ</td>
<td>œ:</td>
<td>œ:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (continued) The vowels of London, Milton Keynes and Reading – summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD LEXICAL SET</th>
<th><strong>London</strong> (middle class)</th>
<th><strong>Milton Keynes</strong> (middle class and working class)</th>
<th><strong>Reading</strong> (middle class and working class)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FORCE</td>
<td>ɔː ~ ɒː</td>
<td>ɔː &gt; ɒu</td>
<td>ɔ &gt; ɒu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
<td>jʌə ~ jʊə ~ jɜː</td>
<td>jʊː</td>
<td>jʊː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happY</td>
<td>i(ː) (Tollfree)</td>
<td>i(ː) &gt; ɪ(Altendorf)</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lettER</td>
<td>ə ~ ɛ</td>
<td>ɛː ~ ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ ~ ɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horsES</td>
<td>ɪ ~ ɪ</td>
<td>ɪ</td>
<td>ɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commA</td>
<td>ə ~ ɛ</td>
<td>ɛː ~ ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ ~ ɛ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLEECE, FACE, PRICE, CHOICE, GOOSE, GOAT, MOUTH

If described with reference to traditional RP, London and Southeastern long vowels and diphthongs are involved in a diphthong shift which Labov (1994: 170) describes as “the closest replication of the Great Vowel Shift that can take place under the present conditions”. In addition, there is social variation within the Southeastern system with working-class variants being even more advanced than their middle-class counterparts (see Table 3).

Note that Wells (1982: 302–303) defines Popular London (PL) as the accent of suburban working-class speakers and Cockney as the accent of the inner-London working class.

Table 3. London Diphthong Shift (adapted from Wells 1982: 308, 310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RP:</th>
<th>iː</th>
<th>eɪ</th>
<th>aɪ</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>əː</th>
<th>ə</th>
<th>ʌː</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PL: | jɪ | ɪɛ | ɪə | ɪɛ | əʊ | ʌ | əʊ | ə | ʌ | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | ə | 89

FLEECE

The London and Southeastern FLEECE variant is a diphthong. The general sociophonetic principle is again: the more central the starting-point, the more basilectal the variant. The most basilectal variant is [ˈi] with a full central starting-point. Suburban working-class speakers and middle-class speakers use a variant with a less central starting-point, which we transcribe as [ˈi].
GOOSE
London and Southeastern English have monophthongal and diphthongal GOOSE variants. The occurrence of the monophthongal variants is favoured by preceding /j/ and disfavoured by following dark [ɻ].

In the 1980s, the most common Mainstream RP variant was reported to be a “slight glide” (Gimson 1984: 192) of the [uː] type or a more central monophthong of the [y] kind. If the first element of the diphthong was further centralized or the monophthong further fronted, Gimson did not regard the resulting variants as representative of RP but as characteristic of Southeastern English. This principle still applies in the case of the diphthongal GOOSE variants. The general socio-phonetic principle is the same as for happy and fleece: the more centralized the first element of the diphthong, the more basilectal the variant. The most basilectal variant is [ɔu] with a full central starting-point. Suburban working-class and middle-class speakers tend to use a diphthong with a less central starting-point, which we transcribe as [œu].

In the case of the monophthongal GOOSE variants, a new set of variants has emerged. These variants represent the continuation of an already existing trend. The process of fronting has been taken a step further, producing variants ranging between the central variant [uː] described above, and a mid-front variant [vː], which is, incidentally, also a characteristic of rural Southwestern accents (see section 5.5.). Variation between these two variants is continuous rather than discrete. The same development can be noted in the case of the central unrounded variant [iː]. Here fronting can also be more advanced, leading to alternation between [iː] and [iː]. These variants were found by Altendorf (2003) in London, Colchester and Canterbury and by Williams and Kerswill (1999) in Milton Keynes and Reading. Williams and Kerswill (1999: 144–145) can trace a change in apparent time. For both towns, they report that elderly speakers still have [uː], whereas younger speakers have [γː], or even more front [γː] in palatal environments.

GOAT-GOAL split and GOAT
London English and other Southeastern accents are subject to a phoneme split whereby oppositions such as goal [gʊɻ] and goat [gəʊt] have developed (see Wells 1982: 312–313). Interaction of this alternation with L vocalization has led to the emergence of further contrasts between pairs like sole-soul [sʊɻ] and so-sew [səʊ] (see section 4.6.).

In London and Southeastern varieties the GOAT vowel is diphthongal. The basic socio-phonetic principle is: the more front and open the starting-point, the more basilectal the variant. The most basilectal form is a variant approaching [au] with a full front and open starting-point. Suburban working-class and middle-class speakers use a variant with a less open starting-point in the area of [ɛ ~ ə]. Recently, an additional new set of variants has emerged. The first element is similar to the old mesolectal London GOAT variant [u], but the endpoint is different. This
element has been considerably advanced and has variable lip rounding resulting in alternation between [ʌu] and [ʊi]. These new variants were found by Alten-dorf (2003) in London, Colchester and Canterbury and by Williams and Kerswill (1999) in Milton Keynes and Reading. Williams and Kerswill (1999: 143) report even further fronting of the second element resulting in variants of the [ʊə ~ ʊi] type. In addition, they have found an extra set of variants in Reading. The Reading adolescents have variants with a more central onset of the [əʊ ~ əi] type which they use alongside with the Milton Keynes set.

MOUTH
In London English, MOUTH has diphthongal and monophthongal variants. For the social stratification of London English the general principle is: the weaker the endpoint, the more basilectal the variant. According to Wells (1982: 309), the MOUTH vowel monophthong is a “touchstone for distinguishing between ‘true Cockney’ and popular London”. Only “true Cockney” working-class speakers have a long monophthong of the [æː ~ əː] kind or alternatively a diphthong with a weak second element of the [æə ~ æɤ] type. Suburban working-class speakers and middle-class speakers have a closing diphthong of the [æu] type.

According to the Survey of English Dialects (SED), the prevalent variant in most Southeastern accents used to be a variant of the [ɛu] type. In the speech of younger speakers, this “provincial” variant was neither found by Altendorf (2003) in Colchester and Canterbury nor by Williams and Kerswill (1999) in Milton Keynes. Adolescent speakers in these towns use “metropolitan” [æu] rather than the older “provincial” form [ɛu]. In Milton Keynes and Reading, they even prefer [əu]. Williams and Kerswill (1999: 152) comment that this is a case in which levelling in the Southeast has led to a compromise on the RP form rather than the intermediate London variant.

FOOT
Another recent trend in London and Southeastern accents is FOOT fronting. In the 1980s, Gimson (1984: 119) and Wells (1982: 133) agreed that the FOOT vowel showed little variability. The only variability they conceded consisted in the occasional occurrence of “more centralized and/or unrounded” variants (Wells 1982: 133). Wells (1982: 133) described them as characteristic of “innovative or urban speech” in England, Wales and Ireland. In the meantime, this innovative tendency has led to further fronting of the FOOT vowel resulting in variants of the [ʊ ~ ə] type.

Tollfree (1999) has found such variants in London and Altendorf (2003) in Lon-don, Colchester and Canterbury. Williams and Kerswill (1999) have found even more front variants of the [ʊ ~ ɤ] type in Milton Keynes and Reading, these variants being particularly favoured by middle-class speakers. Torgersen (2002) reports on patterns of FOOT fronting in Southeastern English, which reveal effects
for speaker age and speaking style, as well as effects for phonological context and lexical item.

4.6. Southeastern phonology: consonants

H
London and Southeastern accents have sociolinguistically variable H dropping (see Tollfree 1999: 172–174). The zero form tends to be avoided by middle-class speakers, except in contexts in which H dropping is “licensed” in virtually all British accents (in unstressed pronouns and verbs such as *his*, *her*, *him*, *have*, *had*, etc.).

TH
London and Southeastern accents have sociolinguistically variable TH fronting (i.e. the use of [f] and [v] for /θ/ and /ð/, respectively). In these accents, TH fronting can apply to /θ/ in all positions (e.g. *think*, *something*, *mouth*) and to /ð/ in non-initial position (e.g. *brother*, *with*). In the case of /ð/ in initial position, /d/ (or /ɒ, as in [ɒnæ?] for *and that*) are more likely alternatives (see e.g. Wells 1982: 328; Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 71).

The labio-dental variants have traditionally been socially stigmatized, and therefore tend to be avoided by middle-class speakers. Neither Altendorf (2003) nor Tollfree (1999) found them in the speech of their middle-class informants. However, there are reports that TH fronting is now on the verge of spreading into Southeastern middle-class accents (see e.g. Williams and Kerswill 1999; Kerswill 2002). Williams and Kerswill (1999: 160, Table 8.8) have found instances of TH fronting in male and female middle-class speech in Milton Keynes and male middle-class speech in Reading. In both towns, TH fronting affects sexes and classes in the following order: working-class boys > working-class girls > middle-class boys > middle-class girls. In terms of change in apparent time, this pattern is indicative of a “change from below” in the social sense of the term (see e.g. Trudgill 1974: 95). It has started in male working-class speech and is now working its way “upwards” to female middle-class speakers. At the moment, this development is still at an early stage. Accordingly, labio-dental fricatives in the speech of female middle-class speakers in Milton Keynes (14.3%) and Reading (0%) are infrequent or altogether absent. This could also explain why they do not occur in the London surveys by Altendorf (2003) and Tollfree (1999).

P, T, K
Pre-glottalization and glottal replacement of syllable-final /t/ and (to a lesser extent) /p/ and /k/ are very common in London and the Southeast. Despite its wide geographical dissemination, T glottalling has a tradition of being regarded as a
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stereotype of London English. Its current spread (at least in the Southeast) is equally ascribed to the “influence of London English, where it is indeed very common” (Wells 1982: 323). In recent years, glottalling – and in particular T glottalling – has increased dramatically in all social classes, styles and phonetic contexts. Social differentiation is, however, retained by differences in frequency and distribution of the glottal variant in different phonetic contexts. The result of this interplay can be seen in Figures 1 and 2, taken from Altendorf (2003). These data show the frequency of T glottaling in two styles of speech produced by schoolchildren drawn from three school types (comprehensive, grammar, and public) and demonstrate marked contextual effects for some speaker groups.

Phonetic constraints affect the occurrence and frequency of the glottal variant in the following order: pre-consonantal position (Scotland, quite nice) > pre-vocalic across word boundaries (quite easy) and pre-pausal position (Quite!) > word-internal pre-lateral position (bottle) > word-internal intervocalic position (butter). Their effect is further enhanced by social and stylistic factors:

1) Middle-class speakers differ from working-class speakers by avoiding the glottal variant in socially sensitive positions when speaking in more formal styles. They reduce the frequency of the glottal variant in pre-pausal and pre-vocalic positions (as in Quite! and quite easy), and avoid it completely in the most stigmatized word-internal intervocalic position (as in butter).

2) Upper-middle-class speakers differ from all other social classes in that they avoid the glottal variant in these socially sensitive positions in both styles. They have a markedly lower frequency of pre-pausal and pre-vocalic T glottaling in the most informal style and avoid it almost completely in the more formal reading style. T glottaling in the most stigmatized positions, in pre-lateral and intervocalic position (as in bottle and butter), does not occur at all for these speakers.

The results for the London upper middle class reported by Altendorf (2003) confirm those of Fabricius (2000). In the results for her young RP speakers, there is no intervocalic T glottaling in any style, and no pre-pausal or pre-vocalic T glottaling in the more formal style. Fabricius also shows that the effect of phonetic context and style is highly significant.

Examination of the result for environment using the Newman Keuls test for pairwise comparison showed that the consonantal environment was significantly different from the pre-vocalic and the pre-pausal environments (p<0.02). The prevocalic and prepausal results were not significantly different from each other. (Fabricius 2000: 140)

It is also interesting to note that T glottaling displays regional variation within Fabricius’ group of RP speakers.
Pre-consonantal glottalling can reasonably be regarded as the ‘first wave’ of glottalling. The ‘second wave’ seems to be the prepausal category, which shows a significant difference between the Southeastern category and the ‘rest of England’ category. As we have seen, London and the Home Counties pattern together on this feature, while the rest
of England lags behind. The ‘newest’ wave of glottalling is evident in the pre-vocalic category, where the London-raised public school speakers use pre-vocalic t-glottalling at a significantly higher rate than speakers from other parts of England in less formal styles of speech. (Fabricius 2000: 134)

R

/r/ is generally realised in Southeastern accents as an alveolar or post-alveolar approximant, [ɹ]. Southeastern accents are non-rhotic, but /r/ is pronounced in post-vocalic position if the following word begins with a vowel (so-called linking /r/, thus [kʰaːɹələm] car alarm, but [kʰaː[pʰək] car park). Intrusive /r/ is used in sequences in which an epenthetic /r/ is inserted in contexts which do not historically contain /r/: either, like linking /r/, across word-boundaries (as in pizza [ɹ] and pasta), or word-internally (as in [sɔːɹin] sawing; cf. the hypercorrections found in Southwestern accents, discussed in section 5.6.). The latter habit is stigmatised to some degree, especially where it occurs in word-internal positions. Post-vocalic rhoticity appears to have vanished altogether from the relic area (Reading and Berkshire) mentioned by Wells (1982: 341), and appears to be advancing westward at a fairly rapid pace. In terms of the phonetic quality of /r/ in pre-vocalic positions, there is plentiful evidence of a dramatic rise in the frequency of the labiodental approximant [ʋ] in southern England, and indeed also in parts of the North. This feature, formerly regarded as an affectation, a speech defect, or an infantilism, is now heard very frequently in the accents of a wide range of English cities, and appears generally to be more favoured by young working-class speakers than by middle-class ones. Kerswill (1996: 189) suggests that the increased usage of [ʋ] (and [f, v] for /θ, ð/) among younger speakers represents a failure to eradicate immature pronunciations as a result of an attrition of the stigma attached to these forms.

L

London and Southeastern accents have variable L vocalization in post-vocalic positions (as in mill, milk), but instances of vocalization of /l/ in pre-vocalic position across word boundaries (as in roll up, peel it) have been reported by, for example, Wells (1982: 313) and Kerswill (1996: 199) in the local accents of London and Reading respectively.

The phonetic quality of the resulting pronunciation is variable and phonetic representations of it vary a great deal. Gimson (1984: 202), for instance, transcribes the resulting vocoid as alternating between [ö] and [ɤ], while Wells (1995: 263) indicates a range between [γ], [o], [u] and [u].

Another intricacy of the process of vocalization is its impact on the preceding vowel. One of the most common allophonic effects is neutralization. The vowels in meal and pool, for example, are lowered to such an extent that they become (almost) homophonous with mill and pull. Whether they can still be distinguished by length is a matter of some uncertainty. The precise workings of these processes are rather complex (for a more detailed discussion, see Wells 1982: 314–317).
Another consequence of the process of vocalization might be the rise of new diphthongs consisting of the preceding vowel and the resulting vocalized variant. Like R dropping, L vocalization may lead to a re-organization of the vowel system. According to Wells (1982: 259), it “offers the prospect of eventual phonemic status for new diphthongs such as /iu/ (milk), /eu/ (shelf), etc.”.

Like T glottaling, L vocalization is spreading regionally, so far mostly within the Southeast, and socially to higher social classes. In London, Kent and Essex (see Altendorf 2003), it is already very frequent, almost categorical, in the accents of young middle-class speakers.

YOD

London and Southeastern English accents have variable Yod dropping and Yod coalescence. These processes affect initial consonant clusters in stressed syllables consisting of the alveolar stops /t/ and /d/ and a following palatal glide /j/, as in tune, duke. In addition, Yod dropping can affect syllable initial /n/ plus /j/ (as in [n uz] news). Yod coalescence involves the “merging” of /tj/ and /dj/ to [t$] and [d$] respectively, such that dune and June, for instance, may be homophonous. In the 1980s, Wells (1982: 331) had already observed that in working-class London English the “older” phenomenon of Yod dropping was faced with competition from Yod coalescence. Whether the same is true for other Southeastern accents has not yet been reported.

5. The Southwest

5.1. The West Country

The West Country is a region with imprecise boundaries. According to Wells (1982: 335–336), three main areas can be identified: The centre of the region is formed by the “cider counties” of Gloucestershire, the former county of Avon, Somerset and Devon. To the East and nearer to London lies “the transitional area of Wessex” (Wells 1982: 335), which comprises Dorset, Wiltshire and Hampshire and parts of Oxfordshire. To the far West, “Cornwall stands somewhat apart” (Wells 1982: 335). This area differs from the two other areas with regard to its distinctive Celtic background and its Cornish language. Cornish became extinct in the late 18th century but has been revived to a small degree in recent decades.

Trudgill (1999: 76–77) agrees with Wells (1982) in dividing the Southwest into three dialect areas. He differs from Wells with regard to the (northern) extension of this area and its internal structure. Trudgill’s centre, the Central Southwest, comprises most of the central and eastern regions identified by Wells, i.e. Somerset, the former county of Avon, and parts of Gloucestershire, together with parts of the more eastern counties of Wells’ transitional area, i.e. Dorset and Wiltshire, and western districts of Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Hampshire. In
addition, Trudgill distinguishes between the Upper and Lower Southwest. The Upper Southwest covers much of Gloucestshire and Worcestershire as well as areas as far north as Herefordshire and Shropshire up to Shrewsbury. The Lower Southwest is formed by Devon and Cornwall.

Another attempt to establish dialect areas in the Southwest has been proposed by Klemola (1994). Klemola’s study is based on cluster analysis making use of SED material for 80 variables (25 phonological, 30 morphosyntactic and 25 lexical) in nine Southwestern counties. The results of this study do not coincide completely with the structures proposed by Wells and by Trudgill but show interesting parallels. Klemola (1994: 373) has found a very stable cluster in a region comprising Eastern Cornwall and Devon (cf. Trudgill’s Lower Southwest). Typical phonological features of this area at the time of the SED fieldwork are initial fricative voicing, */v(t)/ in GOOSE and */d/ in butter (see sections 5.5. and 5.6.). The second relatively stable cluster is formed at the eastern end of the region comprising Berkshire, Oxfordshire and eastern parts of Gloucestshire and Hampshire (cf. Wells’ transitional area). Typical phonological features of this area are the absence of initial fricative voicing, */u(t)/ in GOOSE and */t/ in butter.

The internal structure of the “central” areas identified by Klemola is more variable.

5.2. The influence of the Home Counties Modern Dialect Area

The internal structure of the Southwestern group of dialects does not seem to have changed to the same extent as that of the Southeastern group (see sections 4.1. and 4.2.). More recently, however, it has also been reported that parts of the Southwest are changing more markedly and are, moreover, doing so under the influence of the expanding Home Counties Modern Dialect Area. Trudgill (1999: 76) claims that this is true for coastal cities such as Southampton, Portsmouth and Bournemouth. From a geographical point of view, these cities are part of the Central Southwest. From a dialectological point of view, they may not belong to this area any longer. Similar developments can also be observed in the more easterly regions of Oxfordshire and Berkshire.

5.3. The West Country “burr”

Southwestern accents are characterized by post-vocalic rhoticity, a feature known informally as the “West Country burr”. Post-vocalic */r/ is retroflex in many Southwestern accents (see section 5.6.). This feature is perceived as particularly pleasing by many speakers from outside the area, but is at the same time one of the major stereotypes responsible for the impression of rusticity also often associated with Southwestern accents. McArthur (1992) describes this image:
Two particular shibboleths are associated with ‘yokels’ leaning on gates and sucking straws: a strong West Country burr, as in *Arr, that it be* ‘Yes, that’s so’; voiced initial fricatives, as in *The varmer zeez thik dhreevurrow plough* ‘The farmer sees that three-furrow plough’. (McArthur 1992: 1112)

Initial fricative voicing (see section 5.6.) appears to have been stereotyped for several hundred years: it is a feature of the stage accent “Mummerset”, a form of which is used by the disguised Edgar in Shakespeare’s *King Lear* (see e.g. McArthur 1992: 1112). It is now recessive, and virtually extinct in urban areas and in the speech of the young.

5.4. Bristol /l/

Another stereotype of Southwestern English is Bristol /l/. This term refers to the presence of epenthetic /l/ following word-final /s/ in words of the lexical set commA (e.g. *America*) and in words that in RP end in [ɔu], such as *window*. Thus *America* is pronounced [ˈæmlɪkəl] and *Eva* becomes homophonous with *evil* (Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 78). Bristol /l/ is a stereotype which has become the butt of many jokes (for examples, see Wells 1982: 344; Trudgill 1999: 76). It is, however, confined to the Bristol area, and is not as common as its folk-linguistic status might suggest.

5.5. Southwestern phonology: vowels and diphthongs

Table 4 shows the inventory of Bristol vowels and diphthongs, based on Wells (1982: 348–349).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>ɑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>ɔr [ɔ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>ɛɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>ɔʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>ʊ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>ɑɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>ɔɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>ɑʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR</td>
<td>ɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>ɛr [ɛɪ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START</td>
<td>ɑr [ɑɻ ~ aʃ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>ɔr [ɔɻ ~ ɔʃ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE</td>
<td>ɔr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
<td>ur ~ ɔr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happY</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letterER</td>
<td>ɛr [ɛɻ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commA</td>
<td>ɔ ~ əl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*see also GOOSE below

Vowel Length:
Short vowels in Southwestern accents tend to be lengthened somewhat relative to their counterparts in other English accents. This applies in particular to vowels
in monosyllabic lexical items when they occur in phrase-final or in intonationally prominent position: e.g. *trap* [tæp], *did* [dɪd], *top* [təp] (see Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 78).

STRUT
There is some uncertainty about the phonetic quality of the STRUT vowel in South-western accents (see Wells 1982: 48). Wakelin (1986: 23) cites [ɔ] and [u] for Bristol, [ɪ] in words such as *dozen* and *brother* in some accents of Devon and Cornwall, a range of rounded variants including [ʊ] and [ʌ] in certain areas, and even some diphthongal pronunciations such as [au] and [ɔʌ] in *dust* and *sludge*.

TRAP
In many Southwestern accents the TRAP vowel is realized as [a]. This realization is typical of rural accents in the region, but it also occurs in urban accents. Bristol and Southampton, however, are reported to have [æ] rather than [a] (Wells 1982: 345; Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 57, 77), as are Somerset and West Cornwall. (Wakelin 1986: 21)

BATH, PALM
The phonetic qualities of the BATH and PALM vowels depend on their phonetic environments, and vary in different areas and localities. The exact phonetic quality and distribution of the Southwestern variants is not fully understood. Wells (1982: 345–346) and Hughes and Trudgill (1996: 57) suggest the following description:

(1) In the standard lexical set of BATH, two vowels are possible: (a) [a] and (b) [æ:]. In those accents which have BATH [a] and (lengthened) TRAP [a:], phonemic contrast is absent or variable. However, neither TRAP [a:] nor the TRAP-BATH merger are categorical. According to Wells (1982: 346), Bristol and Southampton, for instance, retain an opposition between TRAP and BATH as in “gas [ɡæs] vs. grass [ɡræ:s ~ græs]”.

(2) The situation becomes yet more complex when we consider the vowel of the lexical set PALM. Wells (1982: 346) suggests the following rule of thumb: If historical /l/ in words such as *palm* and *calm* is retained, which is the case in some parts of the Southwest, the vowel is probably a back unrounded [a], such that *palm* is pronounced as [pəlм]. PALM words without historical /l/, such as *father*, *bra*, *spa*, *tomato*, *banana*, etc., have the same vowel as that found in BATH items.

FACE and GOAT
Traditional rural accents in Devon and Cornwall have the monophthongal FACE and GOAT variants [e:] and [ɔ:] (see e.g. Wakelin 1986: 27). Wakelin also reports some instances of centring and opening diphthongs (e.g. [eə], [ɪə], [jə]) which appear to be rather like those used in north-eastern England. These pronunciations
and the close-mid monophthongs [eː] and [oː] are, however, recessive and appear to be giving way to (closing) diphthongal variants resembling those used in South- eastern England. Such diphthongal variants have fairly open starting points in the vicinity of [ɛ] and [ɔ]. (see Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 64, 109)

PRICE
The quality of the vowel in words of this set is often quite close to that of CHOICE in accents such as RP, although Wells (1982: 347) contends that a PRICE-CHOICE opposition is usually (but not always) maintained by Southwestern speakers. This feature is nonetheless stereotyped to the extent that pseudo-phonetic spellings like roit (right) and Vroiday (Friday) are commonly found in attempts to render West Country accents orthographically (see e.g. McArthur 1992: 674). Wakelin describes the first element of the diphthong as being heavily centralized in the eastern part of the region, but as one proceeds westward [æ] becomes increasingly common. He also cites monophthongal pronunciations as [æː ~ æ] for Devon (Wakelin 1986: 27–28).

MOUTH
According to Wells (1982: 347–348), typical Southwestern qualities of MOUTH are “perhaps [æʊ] and [ɔʊ]” and [ɛt ~ ət] in Southwestern areas nearer to London. This vowel and PRICE exhibit what Wells terms “crossover” (1982: 310, 347), whereby the first elements of the diphthongs are the opposite in front-back terms from those found in RP.

GOOSE and FOOT
Rural accents in Devon and parts of Somerset and Cornwall have GOOSE and FOOT fronting (see section 4.5.). Wells (1982: 347) quotes the Linguistic Atlas of England (LAE) variants [Yː] for GOOSE and [Y] or [ØY] for FOOT.

LOT
The LOT vowel is frequently [ɒ], but also [ɑ], as in varieties of US English. Conservative pronunciations featuring [ɔː] in items like off, cross and broth are cited by Wakelin (1986: 23) on the basis of SED responses.

Gradation
In some words, vowels in unstressed syllables retain full vowel quality. Goodness, for instance, can be pronounced as ['ɡʊdnɛs]. (Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 79)

5.6. Southwestern phonology: consonants

Rhoticity:
Most Southwestern accents preserve post-vocalic /ɾ/, which is frequently retroflex in quality (i.e. [ɾ]). Wells (1982: 342), quoting LAE results, reports that the iso-
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gloss separating retroflex from post-alveolar /r/ runs from Bristol to Portsmouth. The retroflex areas are thus Hampshire, Wiltshire, Dorset, Somerset, Devon and Cornwall. Full rhoticity occurs in a wide range of social and local accents ranging from the working to the middle class and from rural to urban accents. According to Wells (1982: 341), rhoticity can be found in Bristol, Exeter and (to a lesser extent) in Southampton, but not in Plymouth and Bournemouth.

The exact workings of rhoticity in the Southwest of England are complex and not yet fully understood. According to Wells (1982: 342), rhoticity in the Southwest means R colouring of the preceding vowel. In words of the lexical sets NURSE and lettER, the entire vowel receives R colouring, but for words of the START, NORTH, FORCE, NEAR, SQUARE and CURE sets, it is either the whole vowel or just the endpoint of the diphthong/triphthong which receives R colouring. As with L vocalization, R colouring affects the phonetic quality of the preceding vowel and has led to the rise of new monophthongs and diphthongs. These processes and the theoretical problems that they pose are discussed in Wells (1982: 342–343).

Southwestern middle-class speakers sometimes have a pronunciation where post-vocalic /r/ is not phonetically realized but the effects of rhoticity are still preserved. These speakers have, for instance, a centring diphthong in START words, [stɑːt], but not in words such as spa, [spɑː] ~ [spaː] (Wells 1982: 343).

Hyper-rhoticity can also occur, especially in commA words, which then end in /r/. It can also be sporadically heard in items such as khaki [ˈkaːki] for which, presumably, Southwestern speakers have mistakenly reconstructed a post-vocalic /r/ on the basis of productions they have heard produced by speakers of non-rhotic accents such as RP (see Wells 1982: 343). Wakelin (1986: 31) lists path, nought, idea, yellow and window as items recorded with hyper-rhotic pronunciations, and also cites post-vocalic /r/ in words in which metathesis may take place (e.g. ‘purty’ for pretty, ‘gurt’ for great, etc.).

H

As with the Southeastern accents discussed above, Southwestern accents have sociolinguistically variable H dropping. According to Upton, Sanderson, and Widdowson (1987: 104), H dropping occurs in house in Cornwall, Devon, western Somerset, northern Wiltshire, and southern Dorset, but does not occur in other areas of the Southwest. According to Wakelin (1986: 31), aspiration may occur before /r/ in word-initial clusters (i.e. /hrV/) in southern Somerset, while in West Somerset and North Devon the aforementioned metathesis of a syllable onset /r/ and its following vowel may result in the pronunciation /hɔːrd/ red.

F, TH, S, SH

Southwestern accents traditionally featured initial fricative voicing, a process by which the otherwise voiceless fricatives /f, θ, s, ʃ/ are voiced to [v, δ, z, ʒ] respectively. This feature, which Wakelin (1986: 29) dubs “the [Southwestern] feature
par excellence”, has long been a stereotype of rural West Country accents (see section 5.3.); yet it is highly recessive today.

TH
Southwestern accents, like those of Southeastern England, have sociolinguistically variable TH fronting (for Bristol, see Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 78). Wake lin (1986: 29) reports [f] for /θ/ in think, through and mouth for Bristol, as well as stopped pronunciations of /θ/ and /ð/ as [d] in e.g. three, thistle, the, and then (see also Wells 1982: 343). There is, however, something of a lack of recent published research on this variable in accents of the Southwest.

T
Southwestern accents have variable T glottaling in syllable-final pre-pausal and intervocalic position (for Bristol, see Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 78). Wells (1982: 344) gives [‘dɔ:ʒi ’wɔ:ʒi] dirty water as an example of the sort of glottalled pronunciation frequently found in Bristol, and cites a study in which it is stated that glottalling of /k/ renders lot and lock homophonous at [lɔ?] In intervocalic position, a widespread alternative to T glottaling is T voicing (see [d] in butter in section 5.1.). Wells (1982: 344) reports tapping of /r/ to be “certainly very common” in butter, beautiful, hospital in urban areas of the Southwest. voicing of intervocalic /p/ and /k/ is also said to occur. (see Wells 1982: 344)

Syllabic consonants
Word-final vowel + nasal sequences (as in button) are often pronounced as such, rather than as syllabic consonants. In these circumstances, happen would be [‘hapən] rather than [‘hapn]. (Hughes and Trudgill 1996: 790)
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Channel Island English: phonology*

Heinrich Ramisch

1. Introduction

The Channel Islands (Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney and Sark) are regarded as a French-speaking area in traditional dialectology, as can be seen in J. Gilliéron and E. Edmont’s *Atlas Linguistique de la France* (1902–1920), and also in the regional dialect atlas for Normandy, *Atlas Linguistique et Ethnographique Normand* (Brasseur 1980–1997). This is certainly justified, because the original language in the islands is a form of Norman French that has been spoken there for centuries. But there can be no doubt that English is the dominant language in the islands today. The number of speakers of Norman French is relatively small and constantly decreasing. Over the last 200 years, English has gained more and more influence and has gradually replaced the local Norman French dialects. Indeed, there are clear indications that they will become extinct within the foreseeable future. A detailed account of the past and present sociolinguistic situation in the Channel Islands can be found in Ramisch (1989: 5–62) and Jones (2001); for the general history of the Channel Islands see in particular Lemprière (1974), Guillot (1975: 24–55) and Syvret and Stevens (1998).

A brief look at Map 1 shows that the Channel Islands are much closer to France than to England. Alderney is just 9 miles away from Cap de la Hague in France, while Jersey is only about 15 miles from the French coast but 90 miles south of England. Therefore, it comes as no real surprise that the native language in the Channel Islands is Norman French rather than English. From a political point of view, however, the islands have been connected with England for a long time. Originally, the islands were part of the Duchy of Normandy, but after the Battle of Hastings in 1066 Duke William II of Normandy (William the Conqueror) became King of England, and the Duchy of Normandy was united with England under one ruler. Thus, 1066 is the date that first associates the Channel Islands with England and the English Crown, and this association has existed ever since. 1066 also provides the background for a longstanding joke. When asking local people whether they think that the Channel Islands belong to England they will tell you that just the opposite is true. They will point out that after all they were on the winning side in the Battle of Hastings and it was they who conquered England. The exceptional political situation of the Channel Islands really arose after the year 1204, when
King John (Lackland) lost all his territories on the Continent to King Philippe Auguste of France, but the Channel Islands were not conquered by the French. As a result, they became the only part of the former Duchy of Normandy to remain in the possession of the English king, who continued to reign in the islands in his function as Duke of Normandy.

Because of their strategic importance the French repeatedly tried to capture the Channel Islands during the following centuries, but never succeeded. The islands stayed loyal to the English Crown which in turn granted them special privileges and a high degree of autonomy; to this day the islands do not belong to the United Kingdom and are not directly subject to the British Government. They have their own legislative assemblies (called States), and their own legal and tax systems, which is in fact the reason why they have become a tax haven and international centres of banking and finance.

After the separation of the Channel Islands from the Norman mainland in 1204, their political links with England at first had no far-reaching consequences (see Guillot 1975: 31–32 and Le Patourel 1937: 35). The native inhabitants, their culture and their language were Norman, keeping them in close contact with their neighbours on the Norman mainland. At a time when distances played a far greater role than today, trade with the outside world mainly took place with Normandy. On the whole, it seems that English influence in the Channel Islands during the Middle Ages was rather limited. However, the situation began to change in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, when larger military units from England were brought to the islands to defend them against the French. It was above all the tradespeople and the inhabitants of the capital towns St. Helier (in Jersey) and St. Peter Port (in Guernsey) who first came into contact with English through the soldiers stationed in the area. Furthermore, English merchants had also settled in these towns, which had developed into international trade centres.

But during the first half of the 19th century the islands were still largely French-speaking. There is an interesting comment from the 1830s by the English travel writer Henry Inglis. He writes in a guidebook:

[...] there are certain points of interest attached to the Channel Islands, peculiarly their own [...] their native civilized inhabitants, their vicinity to the coast of France, and the general use of the French language. (Inglis 1844: 2)

Talking about Jersey, he makes clear what he means by “French language”:
“The universal language is still a barbarous dialect.” (Inglis 1844: 72)

But Inglis also reports on the beginnings of a process of anglicization:

Children are now universally taught English; and amongst the young, there is an evident preference of English. The constant intercourse of the tradespeople with the English residents; and the considerable sprinkling of English residents in Jersey society, have also their effect. (Inglis 1844: 73)
Map 1. The Channel Islands
English influence really started to grow after the Napoleonic wars (1815), when a larger number of English immigrants came to live in the Channel Islands. Immigration from Britain continued throughout the 19th century. The census figures of 1891 (Census of the Channel Islands 1891: 4) reveal, for instance, that 5,844 people (or 15.5%) of the inhabitants of Guernsey and 8,626 people (or 15.8%) of the inhabitants of Jersey were immigrants from England, Wales, Scotland or Ireland. At the same time, immigration from France was much lower, namely only 2.92% in Guernsey and 10.22% in Jersey. Other factors that contributed to an increased influence of English are to be seen in the growing trade relations with England, the emergence of tourism, and improvements in communication and traffic links. For example, the introduction of steamboats played an important role. From 1824 onwards a regular service between England and the islands was established, which offered new opportunities for commerce and made it much more convenient for British tourists to visit the islands (cf. Tupper 1876: 403). Towards the end of the 19th century a historian comments:

During the present century the English language has made vast strides both in Guernsey and Jersey, so that it is difficult now to find a native even in the country parishes who cannot converse fairly well in that tongue. (Nicolle 1893: 387)

The influence of English continued to rise during the 20th century. The mass media, such as radio and television, brought English into practically every home. Tourism greatly increased and became a major industry. Moreover, immigration from Britain has been very strong. A high proportion of the present population of the Channel Islands are non-natives. The 2001 census figures show that 33.5% of the resident population of Jersey (total: 87,186) were born in the UK and 2.3% in the Republic of Ireland. In Guernsey 27.4% of the population (total: 59,807) originally came from the UK and 0.7% from Ireland.

The decline of the Norman French dialects has rapidly progressed over the last 100 years, and it seems certain that they will not survive as a living language. In Alderney, Norman French has already disappeared. The number of dialect speakers on the other islands has constantly decreased. The results of the 2001 census show that only 3.3% (2,874 people) of the population in Jersey still claim to be active speakers of Jersey French (see Table 1). About two-thirds of these speakers are in fact aged 60 and above. In Guernsey 1,327 people (2.2% of the total population) stated that they “speak Guernsey French fluently”. But most of them (934 or 70.4%) are 65 or older. A further 3,438 people (5.7% of the total population) reported that they “speak Guernsey French a little” (Census of Guernsey 2001: 109). As for Sark (total population: 550) local estimates assume that 50 people still speak Sark French.

All present speakers of Norman French are bilingual, i.e. they are also speakers of English. They are local people who live mainly in the rural areas, where they typically work as farmers, growers, fishermen or craftsmen. Moreover, the use of
the Norman French dialect is limited to family members, friends and neighbours of whom the speaker knows that they are able to understand the language. It is particularly in the case of older couples where both husband and wife are dialect speakers that Norman French is still the daily language at home.

Probably the most important reason for the decline of the dialects has been their low social prestige. They have generally been regarded as an uneducated, inferior tongue spoken by ordinary people in the country and, what is more, as a corrupt form of Standard French, which is commonly called “good French” in the Channel Islands. It is revealing that before the arrival of English it was not Norman French but Standard French which was preferred in public and official domains such as in the debates of the local parliaments (States), in the courts, in newspapers or in church.

2. Phonological features

As far as the phonological variation of English in the Channel Islands is concerned, the following three major aspects should be taken into account. (For a detailed description of phonological features to be found in Channel Island English, see Ramisch 1989: 164–178.) First of all, due to the language contact between English and the local Norman French dialects, one may expect to find features in English which can be attributed to an influence from Norman French. In this context it is of particular interest to verify whether such features only occur with speakers of Norman French or whether they are also used by monolingual speakers of English. Secondly, Channel Island English is likely to include non-standard features that equally occur in other varieties of British English. These features may easily have arrived in the Channel Islands with the large number of immigrants from Britain. Thirdly, Channel Island English may be characterised, at least theoretically, by independent phonological developments with no influence from either Norman French or other varieties of English.
2.1. Vowels

Table 2. Vowel realisations in Channel Island English – summary

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>i ~ ï</td>
<td>FLEECE</td>
<td>i: ~ ï</td>
<td>NEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>ë ~ ë</td>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>ëi ~ ë</td>
<td>SQUARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>æ: ~ ã</td>
<td>START</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>ð ~ ð</td>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>ð: ~ ð</td>
<td>NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>ð ~ ð</td>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>ðο ~ ðο</td>
<td>FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>ù</td>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>ùο ~ ùο</td>
<td>CURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>ð: ~ ð</td>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>ð: ~ ð</td>
<td>happY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td>ð ~ ð</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>ði ~ ði ~ ði</td>
<td>lettER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>ð: ~ ð</td>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>ði ~ ði</td>
<td>horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>ðο</td>
<td>commA</td>
<td>ðο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 lists the typical vowel realisations in Channel Island English. Two prominent features will be discussed here in more detail, namely the realisations of the PRICE diphthong and the STRUT vowel.

PRICE

The starting point of the PRICE diphthong tends to be further back than in RP. Words such as fight or buy are pronounced [fɔt] and [bɔɪ]. Additionally, the first element of the glide may be rounded, resulting in [fʊt] and [bʊɪ]. The realisation of the PRICE diphthong as [æɪ] or [ɛɪ] is certainly not restricted to the Channel Islands, but commonly found in many other accents of English. It is particularly typical of the Cockney accent (London) and of urban areas in the south of England in general (cf. Wells 1982: 149, 308). Certain varieties of Irish English equally have [æɪ] or [ɛɪ] for the PRICE glide, which has led to the stereotype view in the United States that speakers of Irish English pronounce nice time as ‘noice toime’ (cf. Wells 1982: 425–426).

The question of whether the variable pronunciation of the PRICE diphthong in the Channel Islands may also be due to an influence from Norman French cannot be resolved conclusively. It cannot be a case of phone substitution, since the diphthong [æɪ] does exist in Channel Island French. But it is noteworthy that the diphthong [æɪ] is a typical and frequently occurring sound in the local French dialects. Verbs which end in -er in Standard French have the diphthong [æɪ] in the same position in Guernsey French, for example: [dʊnæɪ] (Standard French donner ‘give’). Similarly, the ending [æɪ] is used in the second person plural of the present
tense [vu dunə] (Standard French vous donnez), in the imperative plural [dunə] (Standard French donnez!) and in the past participle forms of verbs [dunə] (Standard French donné).

Table 3. Realisation of the PRICE diphthong as [ɔɪ] or [ɒɪ] in Guernsey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>informant group</th>
<th>percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the results for the PRICE diphthong among 40 informants in Guernsey, divided into 4 different groups: MO = older (60+) male informants and speakers of Guernsey French; FO = older (60+) female informants and speakers of Guernsey French; MY = younger (19–32) male informants and monolingual speakers of English; FY = younger (19–32) female informants and monolingual speakers of English. The feature occurred most frequently with group MO. In slightly more than a third of all cases the glide was realized as [ɔɪ] or [ɒɪ]. The feature was quite common with the younger men (group MY) as well. Their percentage value is still above that of group FO. The younger women (group FY) clearly came closest to RP in their pronunciation of the PRICE glide.

STRUT

The STRUT vowel may be pronounced as [ɔ] in Channel Island English. Words such as sun or duck are locally realised as [sɔn] and [dɔk]. In comparison to the RP vowel [ɔ] is further back and above all, the vowel is rounded. Parallels to this feature in other varieties are rather difficult to find. In the data of the Survey of English Dialects (SED; Orton 1962–1971), [ɔ] is very occasionally used for the STRUT vowel. In the responses to question IV.6.14 (‘ducks’), [ɔ] occurs three times in Kent, once in Essex and once in Hampshire. In question IX.2.3 (‘sun’), [ɔ] was recorded twice in Kent, once in Wiltshire and once in the Isle of Man. An influence from Norman French seems more likely in this case. Channel Island French does not have a vowel sound comparable to English /ʌ/. One can therefore assume that a phone substitution takes place in English, replacing /ʌ/ by [ɔ]. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that the same phone substitution occurs in English loanwords in Channel Island French. Thus, the word bus is pronounced [la bɔs] in the local French dialects.
Table 4. Realisation of the STRUT vowel as [ɔ] in Guernsey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>informant group</th>
<th>percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for the STRUT vowel among the same 40 informants in Guernsey equally lend support to the hypothesis. The quantitative analysis of the variable shows a generational difference. The older informants (and speakers of Guernsey French) scored about 10% higher than the younger informants (monolingual speakers of English).

2.2. Consonants

R (non-prevocalic /r/)

Channel Island English is variably rhotic, but only to a lesser degree. Thus, non-prevocalic /r/ may be pronounced in preconsonantal (e.g. farm) or in absolute final positions (e.g. far). The typical local realisation is a retroflex approximant, e.g. [ɾɻm], [ɾɻ]. The pronunciation of non-prevocalic /r/ in accents of British English is of a complex nature, involving both regional and social factors. In the traditional rural accents of England, three areas can generally be described as still preserving non-prevocalic /r/: Northumberland, Lancashire and a larger area in the south-west, ranging from Kent to Cornwall in the west and to Shropshire in the West Midlands (see Upton and Widdowson 1996: 30–31). In recent times, the rhotic areas have definitely become smaller.

The realization of non-prevocalic /r/ in the Channel Islands can certainly be attributed to an influence from other varieties of English. But on the other hand, an influence from Channel Island French seems equally possible. Speakers of the Norman French dialects are accustomed to pronouncing [ɾ] (normally an apical type of r, pronounced with different degrees of vibration) both in preconsonantal (e.g. [par], Standard French parti ‘gone’) and in absolute-final position (e.g. [vɛɾ] Standard French vert ‘green’). Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that Norman French speakers of earlier periods who learnt English only at school tended to realize non-prevocalic /r/ under the influence of English orthography; in other words, their pronunciation of non-prevocalic /r/ would be based on a spelling pronunciation.

A clear indication that the realization of non-prevocalic /r/ is indeed influenced by Norman French becomes apparent in the ending -er in Guernsey English,
which can be pronounced as [œr] (recall Table 2 above). Thus, the pronunciation of words such as better or youngster is ['betœr] and ['jœnstœr]. There is evidently an influence from Norman French here, the same ending [œr] also being used in Guernsey French as in [lœ ʒɔ̃tœr] (Standard French le porteur ‘carrier’). Another argument for the English ending -er being identified with the ending [œr] of Guernsey French is the fact that the latter is also found in English loan-words used in Guernsey French. In this way, the English words shutter and mourner have become [lœ ʃɔ̃tœr] and [lœ môrœr] in Guernsey French (Tomlinson 1981: 265, 325). The realisation of non-prevocalic /r/ was not very widespread among the 40 informants in Guernsey. The feature was mostly found in group MO at a rate of 9.2%. With the younger informants, it occurred only very occasionally, and solely in group MY. One can conclude, therefore, that the pronunciation of non-prevocalic /r/ is becoming increasingly rare in the Channel Islands as well.

H
H-dropping or the non-realisation of /h/ in initial position in stressed syllables before vowels (e.g. in happy [‘æpi] or hedge [ɛd3]) is one of the best-known non-standard features of British English. It has achieved a high level of public awareness, is clearly stigmatized and commonly regarded as uneducated. For Wells (1982: 254) H-dropping is even “the single most powerful pronunciation shibboleth in England”. Its presence in Channel Island English is hardly surprising. Moreover, there are individual items in which the initial position of /h/ is filled by a semivowel [j], as for example in hear [jɪə(ʊ)] or head [jɛd], parallels of which can be found in English dialects, too (see SED questions VI.4.2 ‘hear’, VI.1.1 ‘head’). It is an intriguing question to ask whether there possibly is an influence from Channel Island French on H-dropping. Nearly all varieties of French, including Standard French, do not realise initial /h/. But the Norman French dialects of the Channel Islands belong to the few varieties of French that have indeed preserved initial Germanic /h/, as e.g. in [haʃ] (Standard French hache ‘axe’) or [humar] (Standard French homard ‘lobster’). Consequently, initial /h/ is a familiar sound for speakers of Norman French and should not lead to H-dropping in English. However, it has to be pointed out that the realisation of initial /h/ in Channel Island French is by no means categorical. Individual speakers may vary considerably in their use of initial /h/ and it appears likely that this variability has some effect on H-dropping in English.

NG
As in many other varieties of English, the pronunciation of the ending -ing in words such as working or fishing varies between velar [ɛn] and alveolar [ɛn], the latter form being more informal and possessing less social prestige than the former. There are
no indications that an influence from Channel Island French has ever played a role in the realisation of -ing. The variable is well established and can be regarded as a general non-standard feature that has also found its way into Channel Island English.

2.3. Suprasegmentals

Channel Island English is characterised by features on the suprasegmental level (stress, intonation) which sound ‘foreign’ and which are either caused by an influence from Norman French or can at least be explained originally in terms of non-natives using English. Such features are most common with older people who are still regular speakers of Norman French. One may come across unusual stress patterns as for example in Guernseyman [ˈɡɜːNZɪmæn], educated [ˈedjuˈkɛtd] or grandfather [ˈɡrændfəˈdæ]. Alternatively, the difference between stressed and unstressed syllables may be less marked, with the use of secondary stresses on normally unstressed syllables as in potatoes [ˈpə,tjətəʊz], tomatoes [ˈtoʊ,təʊtəʊz], English [ˈɛŋgl].

3. The particle eh

This feature is strictly speaking a syntactic one, but it amply illustrates the interrelationship of different influences on Channel Island English also becoming apparent on the phonological level. Eh is a high-frequency particle in the Channel Islands (cf. Ramisch 1989: 103–113). Its normal phonological realisation is a diphthong [ei], but it can also be pronounced as a short [ɛ]. Three different modes of usage can be distinguished.

(1) eh is used as a request to repeat an utterance that the listener has not heard properly (rising tone on eh):
Interviewer: What sort of trouble did you have there?
Informant: Eh?

(2) eh is employed as a tag that is added to a statement to induce the listener to express his/her opinion on what is said by the speaker (rising tone on eh):
You grow your own stuff, eh - eh?

(3) eh is used as a phatic element which serves to establish or to maintain the contact between speaker and listener. It can occur repeatedly at relatively short intervals within one speech cycle, without giving the listener a real opportunity to voice his/her opinion. The aim of the speaker is merely to secure the listener’s attention. The length of articulation of eh is often reduced, and the rising intonation which is typical of (1) and (2) is frequently omitted:
In the old days, you see, when we were children, there was no television eh, we had no electric [sic] anyway eh – yes a gramophone eh, that’s all what we had you see, music eh, there was no wireless eh.

Eh has indeed the status of a stereotype in the Channel Islands. People refer to it when they are asked about typical features of their local variety of English. It is certainly true that eh generally occurs in present-day English as an invariant tag question that invites the listener’s response to a preceding statement (see e.g. Quirk et al. 1985: 814). But the question remains why eh occurs with such a high frequency in the Channel Islands. An influence from Norman French immediately suggests itself, because eh is equally common in the local French dialects and is employed in the same way as in English. Moreover, there is a tendency among older speakers to use a short [ɛ] for eh both in Norman French and in English.

4. Conclusion

Channel Island English is a variety that is characterised by a unique blend of features originating from different sources. On the one hand, one encounters non-standard features of British English that have arrived in the Channel Islands as a result of the close connections with Britain and because of the many British immigrants. This influence has existed for a long time and continues to be effective today. One can observe, for example, features such as T-glottalisation (the glottaling of intervocalic and word-final [t]) or TH-fronting (the use of [f] and [v] instead of [ð] and [θ]), especially in the speech of younger people in St. Helier (Jersey) and St. Peter Port (Guernsey). These features clearly are recent takeovers from British English. Yet on the other hand, Channel Island English comprises features that have their origin in Channel Island French. It is of particular relevance that they occur not only with speakers of Norman French but also with (younger) people who are monolingual speakers of English. Consequently, features of this type are not just transitional phenomena in the process of acquiring English. Some of the features have become an integral part of the local language variety and continue to exist even if the speakers themselves are no longer bilingual.

Our discussion of various phonological features has shown that in quite a number of cases the analysis is rather complex because both a Norman French influence and an influence from other varieties of English seem plausible. It can be confirmed that the same holds true for morphological and syntactic features (cf. Ramisch 1989: 91–163). If there is more than one explanation for a particular feature, these explanations should not necessarily be regarded as mutually exclusive; rather, it is reasonable to assume that there is a convergence of different sources of influence, reinforcing and complementing each other.
* I would like to thank my informants in the Channel Islands for their helpfulness and hospitality. The fieldwork in Guernsey and Jersey has always been a unique personal experience to me. I am particularly grateful to Michèle, Neil and Ross Tucker for their constant support and friendship over the years.
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1. Finding a model

Early in the twentieth century Daniel Jones described the model accent presented in *An English Pronouncing Dictionary* as

that most usually heard in everyday speech in the families of Southern English persons whose men-folk have been educated at the great public [in the English sense of the word, i.e. private fee-paying] boarding-schools. This pronunciation is also used by a considerable proportion of those who do not come from the South of England, but who have been educated at these schools. The pronunciation may also be heard, to an extent which is considerable though difficult to specify, from persons of education in the South of England who have not been educated at these schools. It is probably accurate to say that a majority of those members of London society who have had a university education, use either this pronunciation or a pronunciation not differing very greatly from it. (Jones 1917: viii)

Jones’s location of his model accent reflects social considerations of his time, with its reference to “men-folk” (then overwhelmingly the products of the public-school system) and the socially and economically dominant “London society”, and emphasis on the normalizing force of *public school* education: indeed, so crucial is this element to his divination of his model that Jones initially calls it Public School Pronunciation, or PSP. Although non-Southerners might acquire the accent through privileged schooling, its possession is much more likely amongst educated Southerners.

Living in a hierarchical, south-east-focused and male-dominated world, Jones’s stance on a model accent was understandable, and might be expected to have passed unquestioned in his day. Early twentieth-century assumptions are not necessarily ours, however: education is now more democratic in respect of both gender and class, and Southern England no longer holds a grip on linguistic prestige which it had on Britain a century ago. And to be fair to Jones, he himself was not completely locked into a narrow description of the accent. Despite the time-bound socio-cultural assumptions apparent in his description of his model, as the century progressed, although the essential prescription remained “public school” turned to “boarding school”, “London society” became “Londoners”, and by 1926 his label had become “Received Pronunciation” or RP (a term first used, though not as a specific label, by A.J. Ellis [1869: 23]). Further, he shows himself to be prepared to keep the boundaries of the accent and its speaker-base fuzzy, from the first not-
ing “the delusion under which many lexicographers appear to have laboured, viz. that all educated speakers pronounce alike” (Jones 1917: viii).

If Jones could be open-minded about his model and its speakers, it is now time for us to be still more relaxed about the RP we acknowledge. The accent that has for a long time been regarded as a model in dictionaries and language-teaching texts is becoming much more widely based than it once was. There will always be a rearguard that deprecates changes in the accent, as it will language change of any kind, and even some linguists out of touch with developments in England might misunderstand, but we should not on their behalf make the model too precious or confine its speaker-base to an elite.

Gimson makes the case for the acknowledgement of ongoing developments in the accent when, having outlined tendencies being shown by the accent in 1984, he writes:

[I]f a different set of criteria for defining RP […] is adopted, together with a range of acceptable tolerances within the model, which will result in a somewhat diluted form of the traditional standard, the re-defined RP may be expected to fulfil a new and more extensive role in present-day British society. (Gimson 1984: 53)

That new role can most prominently be observed in the use of RP as the scarcely remarked-upon ‘background’ accent of the media newsreader. But despite Gimson’s counsel, a commonly-held view persists that RP is a very narrow class-based and region-based variety of English pronunciation. This is in part the result of a peculiarly British attitude towards accent variety:

The British are today particularly sensitive to variations in the pronunciation of their language. […] Such extreme sensitivity is apparently not paralleled in any other country or even in other parts of the English-speaking world. (Cruttenden 1994: 76)

Britons are indeed remarkably judgemental about all accents. That RP, when judged in the abstract, tends to be considered remote from the speech of most Britons suggests that a rarified version of the accent remains the target of people’s perceptions, unsurprising if one considers the transcriptions which are frequently offered up, where the model lags behind Gimson’s expectations.

The RP model with which native speakers and learners alike continue to be confronted is ultimately, of course, a matter of sounds: that is, phonetic realization of the phonemes of Received Pronunciation dictates the variety. But creating no little problem for the model is the choice of symbols by which those phonemes are described. The phonemic inventory of RP is often represented by a symbol set that was entirely appropriate when Jones began its description. Such have been the developments in the accent, however, that another transcription might now be thought more appropriate for some phonemes. Yet still the old description persists, a tradition of transcription being retained that fully supports Wells’s description of the accent as “characteristic of the upper class and (to an extent) the upper-middle
class” (Wells 1982: 10). The result is a situation in which traditionalists feel justified in insisting on the sounds transcribed, as if the symbols were phonetic rather than phonemic representations (while pragmatic users reproduce whatever sounds seem appropriate to them when they see the symbols).

Important to this chapter are transcription conventions first deployed in The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (1993) and subsequently in all the larger native-speaker dictionaries of Oxford University Press, and, alongside North American transcriptions, in The Oxford Dictionary of Pronunciation for Current English (Upton, Kretzschmar and Konopka 2001). These transcriptions are different in some small but significant particulars from those that might be encountered elsewhere in descriptions of Received Pronunciation, most notably as regards the TRAP, PRICE, and SQUARE vowels. They are descriptive of the reality of the kind of modern, “diluted” Received Pronunciation called for by Gimson twenty years ago.

2. RP and its lesser forms

There are, of course, various kinds of Received Pronunciation. A well-known classification aimed at making sense of this range is that devised by Wells (1982). There we find an upper-class accent labelled “U-RP”, and a less marked form, taken in 1982 to be the most usual and unexceptionable variety, designated “mainstream RP”. To these are added in close company “adoptive RP”, “Near-RP”, and “quasi-RP”.

Simplification is sought in this chapter, with concentration on an accent that will not be the object of comment as regards elevated upbringing or social pretension. Furthermore, it is not to be associated with any one geographical region in England. This accent is simply labelled ‘RP’. One stage removed from this is a variety that Ramsaran (1990: 179) calls “traditional” (here trad-RP). In most respects RP and trad-RP are identical. But they are different in important particulars that, since they are apparent to native British English speakers, should generally be made known to the speaker-learner who wishes to avoid being judged old-fashioned or affected. To trad-RP are consigned a range of sounds that many Britons are still wont to consider what is meant by “RP”, leading them to think of it as “posh” (its almost universal pejorative label). Even further back in time and still more restricted socially than trad-RP is a version that does nevertheless continue to be heard as the accent of a few older speakers and as the affectation of some others. It also exists as a folk-memory in British society generally. Outmoded and, when heard (typically in old movies and newsreel commentaries), attracting amused comment, this is Cruttenden’s “Refined RP” (1994: 80). The literature also abounds with speculation on possible innovations manifesting themselves in the speech of the young. Neither Refined RP nor speculative RP are treated spe-
cifically here, not because they are not interesting to debate, but because they do not belong in a purely descriptive setting, and for reasons of space.

3. The vowels of RP

There is an extensive literature in which a good deal of agreement, if not absolute unanimity, can be seen in the discussion of changes in RP. There is also, however, some disagreement about precisely how the accent is to be represented, because some commentators are more inclined to hold the line on the older transcriptional and realizational forms than others. (See for example Ramsaran’s [1990: 180] critique of Bauer.) Given the fact of language change, there comes a time when certain sounds, conventionally labelled in a previous time, alter to such an extent that different symbols represent them more accurately: the phonetic symbols being absolutes, their interpretation cannot be altered to suit the new development, so that if anything is to change in the interests of accuracy and clarity it must be the label that is applied to the sound. This is especially important since transcriptions in dictionaries and English language teaching texts are invariably broadly phonemic, and if their users are to be properly served they need to be provided with transcriptions that correspond as honestly as possible to the sounds of the modern accent. The RP vowel inventory incorporates some judicious relabelling from that which is often to be seen. It contains nineteen stressed vowels, /ɪ, ɛ, a, ʌ, ə, ʊ, eː, iː, ɑː, ɔː, øː, ɔɪ, ʌɪ, əʊ, əʊ, ɒ, ɒ/ and two unstressed vowels, /i/ and /ə/.

RP and trad-RP share the same phonemic structure but differ in realizational (and hence labelling) particulars, and differ also occasionally in the lexical distribution of phonemes. Table 1 combines the accents in most of the lexical sets. Where there are differences, these are shown in separate columns.

It will be evident from Table 1 that RP and trad-RP coincide on KIT, LOT, STRUT, FOOT, FLEECE, FACE, PALM, THOUGHT, GOOSE, CHOICE, MOUTH, NEAR, START, NORTH, FORCE, happy, letter, and comma. NURSE shows only a slight difference, in which the RP transcription is indicative of a less restrictive rendering of the typical sound than is the trad-RP transcription. The BATH vowel coincides on [aː] in both varieties, with the addition of a further [a] variant in RP. CLOTH similarly coincides, though with a short vowel, in both varieties, with a long-vowel alternative in trad-RP. Both accents share [əʊ] in GOAT, with trad-RP having alternative [ou], and both share [ʊə] in CURE, with RP having alternative [ɔː]. Most significant developments have taken place, and so distinguish RP from trad-RP, in DRESS, TRAP, PRICE, and SQUARE.
Table 1. The vowels of RP and trad-RP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>shared RP/trad-RP</th>
<th>trad-RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIT</td>
<td>ɪ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESS</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP</td>
<td>ɑ</td>
<td>ɑ ː</td>
<td>æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOT</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUT</td>
<td>ʌ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOT</td>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>ɑː ~ ɑ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ɑː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTH</td>
<td>ɒ</td>
<td>ɒ ~ ɔː</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE</td>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td></td>
<td>ɔː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEECe</td>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>ɛɪ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM</td>
<td>ɑː</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOUGHT</td>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAT</td>
<td>ɔʊ</td>
<td>ɔʊ ~ ʊʊ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOSE</td>
<td>ʊː</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>ʌɪ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ʌɪ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>ɔɪ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUTH</td>
<td>ɑʊ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR</td>
<td>ɪə</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUARE</td>
<td>ɛː</td>
<td></td>
<td>ɛ ː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START</td>
<td>ɑː</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE</td>
<td>ɔː</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
<td>ʊə ~ ɔː</td>
<td></td>
<td>ʊə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happY</td>
<td>ɪ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lettER</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comma</td>
<td>ə</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KIT
This is generally realized as half-close and retracted; one might expect a somewhat closer variant in some older speakers, although this is not a particular feature of trad-RP. The vowel is the norm in unstressed position in the morphemes -ed, -es,
as in *hunted, faces*, and in such words as *minutes, David*. Elsewhere in unstressed syllables, reduction to [ə] is variably to be expected: vowel reduction is less likely in words where stressed [i] is in the preceding syllable, as in *significant*, than when it is not, as in *horrible, happily*. Gimson (1984: 50–53) closely examines many of the details of this phenomenon.

**DRESS**
The RP vowel is half open front spread. Trad-RP has a raised variety that is best represented as /e/, although it does not typically reach the height of a half-closed vowel.

Recent change in this vowel is apparently part of a general lowering of the short front vowels, involving KIT and, most markedly, TRAP.

**TRAP**
Associated with the general tendency of the modern RP front vowels to lower articulation (see also KIT and DRESS), the movement by younger speakers from trad-RP [æ] to RP [a] is arguably one of the most striking changes that has taken place in the accent group in recent years. (This “classical” chain shift, it should be noted, is being recognized in the accents of some non-standard dialects too, as in Ashford, Kent, by Kerswill [2002: 201].) It is also undoubtedly a most controversial matter. This is seemingly at least in part because the newer form corresponds with what is perceived by many to be a ‘Northern’ sound (sometimes described rather curiously as “flat a”), on which see the discussion of the BATH vowel below.

Beyond this simple issue of regional prejudice, [a] is also a problematic sound for some Southern speakers, since, as Wells (1982: 291–292) explains, it is little different from a fronted version of their /ə/ (‘their’ since Northern accents do not possess this phoneme): with [a] and [ʌ] falling (close) together (see STRUT), distinctions between *fan* and *fun* blur or disappear in the perception of those used to the more obvious distinction between [æ] and [ʌ].

Although an issue for some, this trad-RP to RP change is a matter of which British English native-speakers are aware (mimicking trad-RP *bet* for *bat* and so on). It is also coming to be remarked upon in the usually conservative English Language Teaching field (Weiner and Upton 2000).

**LOT**
This is realized as a fully open to slightly raised rounded back vowel, whatever the variety of RP.

**STRUT**
The vowel is pronounced by many RP and by trad-RP speakers as a centralized and slightly lowered [ʌ]. For many speakers /ʌ/ is raised centralized [a]: the more
central and lowered the vowel is, the more likelihood there is for confusion over RP [a] (see TRAP). There is an increasing appearance, however, of an innovation in which [ʌ] is raised and retracted from the centralized, towards (though not to) a half-close advanced position.

Variation in the STRUT vowel is a most prominent feature of north-south distinction in British English accents, and the recent RP raising development might be seen as a ‘fudge’ (Chambers and Trudgill 1998: 110–113) between the Northern [u] and Southern [ʌ]. Interestingly, this feature was noted as the most usual form in the speech of mid-twentieth century traditional dialect speakers in the South and south Midlands (Orton 1962–1971; Upton 1995).

FOOT
Quite uncontroversially, this is realized as a half-close and advanced rounded vowel in all types of RP. The set gives rise to some of the most obvious and frequently-remarked hypercorrections amongst Northern STRUT [u]-speakers striving to acquire RP when, aware that RP STRUT is invariably [ʌ], not [u], they consciously change their FOOT vowel to [ʌ], producing [pʌt] put, [bʌʃə] butcher.

BATH
The Received Pronunciation vowel is characteristically described as exclusively a long back spread vowel, its position being advanced from full retracted. This is undoubtedly a correct description for the vowel of very many speakers. Two matters must be taken into account for a proper description of RP, however. Firstly, the long vowel is becoming both increasingly centralized and more shortened, while the more retracted sound is perceived by most native speakers now to be worthy of Refined RP caricature as being unacceptably ‘plummy’. It would seem that the forward movement is being led by those words in the set where the vowel has a following nasal, as chance, sample.

This development might be connected with a second, the inclusion in the model adopted here of ‘Northern short a’ in the RP inventory. Many RP speakers, whose accent corresponds with that of other speakers on all other features, diverge particularly on this one variable, and might themselves use both [ʌ] and [a] variants interchangeably. (The other widespread Northern feature characterizing difference from the South, [u] in the STRUT vowel, is, unlike this BATH-vowel feature, usually attended by other markers of northernness, such as long monophthongal FACE or GOAT vowels.) The use of BATH-[a] will essentially be because the RP speaker has Northern or north Midland origins, in the regional accents of which areas there is no TRAP/BATH distinction; the use of [ʌ] will either be because the speaker has Southern or south Midland origins, and so comes from an area with vernacular TRAP/BATH distinction, or because their speech is conditioned by trad-RP.
Wells’s classification (1982: 297) of features as “Near-RP” on grounds of their not conforming to “phonemic oppositions found in RP” (of which [his] /æ ~ əː/ here is one) makes an assumption about RP structure supportable if one remains wedded to a south-centric view of the accent. Inclusion of BATH-vowel [a] in RP is on grounds already claimed: the accent is not to be thought of as an exclusively southern-British phenomenon (Upton, Kretzschmar and Konopka 2001: xii), and the inclusion of “a different set of criteria” resulting in “a somewhat diluted form of the traditional standard” (Gimson 1984: 53) is a description which well suits this move.

CLOTH
This vowel is in RP short, fully open, fully retracted and rounded. Trad-RP [ɔː] (a feature now more associated with Refined RP) is invariably judged risible by native British English speakers, RP and non-RP alike.

NURSE
There is some considerable variation in the realization of this central vowel, from half open to half close or slightly higher for some RP speakers. [ɔː] is chosen as the transcription here, reflecting the considerable variation apparent amongst speakers: it subsumes the more restrictive [ɔː] used by many transcribers of RP (also reducing by one the number of symbols in the transcription set).

FLEECE
In both varieties this is a long high front vowel, articulated with lips spread. The tongue is typically slightly lowered from the fully close position. Some slight gliding from the KIT-vowel position is usual, with [iː] being more usual than [iː].

FACE
This short upgliding diphthong shows little if any variability. Its startpoint is at or slightly below half-close front, from where movement is to the KIT vowel. Trad-RP speakers are likely to begin the diphthong high, at rather than below the half open position.

PALM
For both RP and trad-RP speakers, realization is as a fully open, advanced or centralized long spread vowel. The more retracted the form, the nearer it approaches that of Refined RP.

THOUGHT
This is [ɔː]. Compare this in all words in the set with the sounds applying at NORTH/FORCE below.
GOAT
Starting at a central position, this glide moves to or in the direction of RP /ʌ/, giving [ʌo]. Trad-RP has variant [ou], with a somewhat centralized startpoint, though by no means all speakers of that accent are characterized by its use.

GOOSE
In all forms this is a long high back vowel with lip rounding. The characteristic point of RP articulation is slightly relaxed from fully raised, and also somewhat advanced, with fronting becoming evident among many speakers, especially the young. A fully retracted form might be heard before [l], as in pool, rule, in all varieties (and in all positions in Refined RP). A short diphthong, [ou], is often to be heard word-finally, in such words as sue, who.

PRICE
RP starts this diphthong at a low central point, and moves in the direction of the KIT vowel /i/. The startpoint is conventionally set at [a]. However, as the RP start-vowel can in fact be at any point from centralized front to centralized back, and is raised from the fully open position, [ʌ] is most usefully to be identified for its description (see STRUT above). The RP transcription /ʌi/ was first used for the PRICE-vowel by MacCarthy (1978), and the [ʌ] startpoint is acknowledged as likely by Cruttenden (1994: 122). [aɪ], with just a slightly retracted startpoint, can be heard from some trad-RP speakers.

CHOICE
RP and trad-RP have a startpoint at a fully back half open position, the tongue moving in the direction of KIT.

MOUTH
The RP diphthong begins near the front open position, lips spread: some retraction is to be expected, although this is not considerable. The glide then proceeds towards, though not completely to, FOOT. Trad-RP sees a startpoint that is centralized rather than only retracted, and may encompass [ou] as well as [au]. (The most retracted forms, accompanied by lengthening of the first element of the diphthong, are typical of Refined RP.)

NEAR
Beginning at KIT, the RP and trad-RP diphthong glides to a mid- to low-central position. (Refined RP characteristically places prominence on the second element, which might typically be rendered as [ɔi] or [ɑi]: these, and especially the latter, are, like [eu] for GOAT, likely to be singled out as features worthy of caricature.)
SQUARE
In RP this is a long monophthong at a front half-open position, articulated with lips spread: there might or might not be some slight off-gliding present, giving [ɛə] ~ [ɛː], but the dominant effect is of a single sound here. Trad-RP SQUARE is characterized by a centring diphthong [ɛə]. The monophthong-diphthong distinction between RP and trad-RP is, with TRAP-variation, one of the clearest that can be identified between the most modern and more dated varieties of the accent.

START
This vowel is essentially the same as that for BATH for those speakers who have a long vowel there. RP speakers with the short-vowel BATH variant have a long START vowel, but are likely to be among the speakers who have the most fronted versions.

NORTH/FORCE
RP and trad-RP vowels here are identical to that for THOUGHT, namely the half-open lip-rounded back vowel [ɔː].

CURE
A frequent realization of this phoneme is [ʊə], the centring diphthong starting at FOOT and gliding to a mid to open central position. This sound is to be heard from trad-RP speakers, and from many speakers of RP of the middle and older generations especially.

Increasingly occurring as a feature of RP, however, is long monophthongal [ɔː], explained by Cruttenden (1994: 134) as a stage further than the [ɔə] made possible for CURE by the loss of that sound as a feature of FORCE, where it was formerly heard: hence Shaw, sure, shore, formerly likely to be rendered in RP as /ʃɔː, suə, sɔə/ fall together for many present-day RP speakers as /ʃɔː/.

FIRE, POWER
These are most usually realized as triphthongs in RP, [ʌɪə] and [aʊə] respectively. “Smoothing” (Wells 1982: 286, 288, 292–293) of these to diphthongs [ʌə], [aə ~ əə] or to monophthongs [ʌː], [aː ~ əː] can readily be heard from all speakers in rapid speech (and especially from speakers of Refined RP in words in isolation).

happy
RP has a tense [i] for this unstressed vowel, where trad-RP has [ɪ]. RP [i] is sometimes attended by some, though not by full, length.

letter
The mid-vowel [ə] is the realization for this in all RP varieties. Rhoticity is never a feature of RP, so that in final position no [r] is pronounced. However, [r] is used