Homogeneity, convergence, mega-trends, and stuff like that.
Derek Denis and Alexandra D'Arcy

Canadian English (CanE) presents the textbook example of dialectological homogeneity (Chambers 2006), with attribution for its undifferentiated urban structure going to the Loyalists (Bloomfield 1975; Avis 1973). That is, CanE homogeneity is argued to derive from source input (cf. Zelinsky's 1992 *First Effective Settlement*; Mufwene's 1995 *Founder Principle*), and not from subsequent leveling or convergence. The emphasis on the founding population is well-motivated by Canadian historical demographics; the Loyalists drove westward expansion. At the same time, recent sociolinguistic research indicates (1) that the social evaluation of dialect features may 'over-rule' input forms, effectively changing the overall character of local language (e.g. Philadelphia; Labov et al. 2013), and (2) that homogeneity itself might be one such sociolinguistic motive (Chambers 2012). Since the development of the Loyalist hypothesis, which relies in large part on 40-year-old synchronic research (e.g., Avis 1973; Scargill & Warkentyne 1972), large diachronic corpora of regional CanE varieties have been constructed, enabling direct testing of founder effects.

We operationalize a well-studied discourse-pragmatic variable known to be undergoing change—*general extenders* (GEs)*,* as in (1)—to contrast two geographically disparate regions of Canada with similar input and overtly Anglo-English roots. With its multitude of variants, the GE system is a dialectologically optimal candidate for regional variation to have developed (cf. Tagliamonte 2012 on intensifiers). We therefore examine the trajectory of GE variants over the *longue durée* in an attempt to untangle their evolution in CanE.

(1) a. I can remember learning how to use a lathe *and stuff like that*.
     b. They would fly in fresh meat *and so on like that*.
     c. Draft horses *and whatnot*. Dairy cows *and things*.

Our data represent 120 years of language use in two regions of Canada: Southern Ontario (ONT) (Denis 2014; Tagliamonte 2006) in the east and Greater Victoria, British Columbia (VIC) (D'Arcy 2014) in the west. We follow the methodology of Cheshire (2007) (among others); nearly 5000 GE tokens from 163 speakers are considered.

The broad trend is regional parallelism. In both ONT and VIC, *and stuff (like that)* rises across the twentieth century, becoming the dominant variant. However, there are three critical points of contrast. First, *stuff* arrives later in VIC (c. 1920) than ONT (c. 1880). Second, in ONT *stuff* enters a system rife with many low frequency variants. In VIC, the innovative variant enters a more restricted system. Third, shorter *and stuff* leads the way in VIC, while in ONT longer *and stuff like that* does.

These results suggest historically different starting points and different paths of change that ultimately converge on a similar synchronic state. In this case, convergence, not input, is responsible for homogeneity. Notably, the rise of *stuff* may be part of a broader, global trend (cf. Cheshire 2007; Pichler & Levey 2011). Although regional linguistic differences are known to evolve within homogeneous dialects (Schneider 2007; Trudgill 2004), our results suggest that the future of CanE will be defined by the competing motivations of homogeneity, regionalism, and the seemingly unavoidable spread of 'mega-trends' (Rodríguez Louro et al. 2014).

References:

Avis, W. S. (1973). The English language in Canada. In Sebeok, T. A., editor, *Current Trends in Linguistics 10: Linguistics in North America*. Mouton, The Hague.

Bloomfield, M. W. (1975). Canadian English and its relation to eighteenth century American speech. In Chambers, J. K., editor, *Canadian English: Origins and Structures*. Methuen, Toronto.

Chambers, J. K. (2006). The development of Canadian English. In Bolton, K. and Kachru, B. B., editors, *World Englishes: Critical Concepts in Linguistics.* Routledge, London.

Chambers, J. K. (2012). Homogeneity as a sociolinguistic motive. *World Englishes*. 31(4): 467–477.

D'Arcy, A. (2014). Victoria's linguistic legacy. Plenary presented at *Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States*. University of British Columbia.

Denis, D. (2014). The development of pragmatic markers in Canadian English. Forthcoming Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto.

Cheshire, J. (2007). Discourse variation, grammaticalisation and stuff like that. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(2):155–193.

Labov, W., et al. (2013). One hundred years of sound change in Philadelphia: Linear incrementation, reversal, and reanalysis. *Language*, 89(1):30–65.

Mufwene, S. (1995). The founder principle in creole genesis. *Diachronica*, 13:83–134.

Pichler, H. and S. Levey. (2011). In search of grammaticalization in synchronic dialect data: general extenders in northeast England. *English Language and Linguistics*, 5(3):441–471.

Rodríguez Louro, C. et al. (2013). Global perspectives on linguistic innovation. Paper presented at *New Ways of Analyzing Variation 42*. University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.

Scargill, M. H. and Warkentyne, H. J. (1972). The Survey of Canadian English: A report. *English Quarterly*, 5(3):47–104.

Schneider, E. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tagliamonte, S. A. (2006b). "So cool, right?": Canadian English entering the 21st century.*Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 51(2/3):309–331.

Trudgill, P. (2004). *New-Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York.

Zelinsky, W. (1992). *The Cultural Geography of the United States. A Revised Edition.* Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.