

1 The study of dialect convergence and divergence: conceptual and methodological considerations

Frans Hinskens, Peter Auer, and Paul Kerswill

1 Introduction

Dialect change can have several different manifestations. Among these, dialect convergence (dc) and dialect divergence (dd) noticeably affect the relationships between related dialects. Dc and dd have probably been present for as long as dialects have existed. Various historical developments, including the ‘modernisation’ of society, have left their mark on the very nature of dialects and have partly changed the dynamics of dc and dd; moreover, they have broadened them to dialect – standard language convergence.

This chapter sets the stage for the various aspects of the study of dc and dd presented in this book, in that it both provides a general introduction and constitutes a springboard for the discussion of the themes and approaches which play a role in the individual chapters. As an introduction, the chapter presents the central terminology (section 2), provides the background information necessary for the interested non-specialist (section 3), sketches what we see as the main research methods (section 4), and binds together the issues featured in the various chapters (section 5).

2 Definitions of the Key Concepts

We will use the notion of ‘dialect’ to refer to a language variety which is used in a geographically limited part of a language area in which it is ‘roofed’ by a structurally related standard variety; a dialect typically displays structural peculiarities in several language components (cf. Chambers and Trudgill 1998: 5), though some of the authors in this book deal mainly with phonetic (or ‘accent’) features. Usually dialects have relatively little overt prestige and are mainly used orally. Lacking in this definition is the fact that the dialects of a certain language area (including the standard variety) maintain very specific historical relationships (cf. Agard 1971: 21–24).

The notions of dc and dd can be defined, respectively, as the increase and decrease in similarity between dialects. Whereas dc involves the linguistic unification, focusing (*sensu* Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985), and homogenisation

2 Dialect Change

of the linguistic repertoire, including the traditional dialects,¹ dd amounts to linguistic diversification, growing diffuseness and heterogenisation – although divergence may lead to focusing in a repertoire, making the varieties which survive the process more distinct from each other. Weinreich (1954: 395) defines convergence as ‘partial similarities increasing at the expense of differences’ (though, in his view, divergence is the main subject matter of diachronic dialectology). As should be clear from these definitions, convergence and divergence are relational notions, referring to either processes or the results of processes.

Dialect convergence may lead to simplification (Trudgill 1986) and to the reduction of intrasystemic, especially ‘quantitative’, variation. However, in most studies of dialect convergence or divergence, attention is only paid to the question of how processes of linguistic change affect intersystemic variation, i.e. differences between dialects. These differences can pertain to either categorical or quantitatively variable features.

Sometimes dc and dd are two sides of the same coin. Gilles (1998b), for instance, shows that the dc of Letzebuergesch towards the central Luxemburg variety implies its giving up of east Luxemburg features and, hence, a divergence from Mosel Franconian dialects of German. Ó Curnáin (1998) demonstrated how, in the same West Galway vernacular of Irish, in the segmental phonology dc and dd can coexist. Pedersen (1998) showed how, in the course of the nineteenth century in Copenhagen and Stockholm, the convergence of the *stylistically* marked differences between urban dialect and the spoken standard and divergence of the *socially* marked differences between both systems occurred simultaneously.

Dc and dd can change the relationships between the dialects involved and may, hence, necessitate the reclassification of the dialects involved (cf. Samuels 1972: 92).

3 Background and Conceptual Frameworks

To bring the concepts of dc and dd more clearly into focus, we will now present a rough overview of the historiography of the study of dc and dd (section 3.1) as well as a short discussion of related concepts in contemporary approaches to dialectology, in two branches of sociolinguistics, and in the study of language contact (section 3.2).

¹ Mattheier (1996) separates convergence from advergence, the latter referring to unilateral manifestations of the process. For convergence in bilingual societies, Hock (1991: 492) proposes a similar distinction; ‘the convergence between different languages may be mutual (between adstratal languages) or unidirectional (in an unequal prestige relationship)’.

3.1 *Historiographical sketch*

Here, we briefly discuss some of the main models, theories, proposals, findings, and individual observations which are relevant to, and can sometimes retrospectively be seen as precursors of, much of the present-day study of dc and dd. We will largely concentrate on the areas of historical linguistics and traditional dialectology.

The manifestations of dialect divergence are most visible in language history. The long-lasting process of the diversification of Proto-Indo-European into (what are retrospectively referred to as) language families, and of language families into languages, etc., largely took place in linguistic prehistory. The results of divergence are represented visually in the branching lines in the family tree diagrams of historical linguistics.

Undoubtedly, the most influential school of historical linguistics is that of the Neogrammarians, one of the main spokesmen being Hermann Paul. Applying a partial analogy from nature, Paul recognises only the language of the individual, the idiolect, which is the product of ontogenesis and phylogenesis. ‘Dialect split means, simply, the increase of individual differences beyond a certain measure’ (Paul 1920: section 22; our translation). He asks the question of why it is that ‘a greater or lesser amount of agreement is maintained in this group of individuals which is constituted in this or that way’. The reason is that language habits (*‘Sprachusus’*) are determined by human interaction (*‘Verkehr’*), which has either a levelling or a differentiating effect (Paul 1920: section 23). ‘Each change in language use is the product of the spontaneous behaviour of single individuals on the one hand, and the nature of interaction on the other. If instances of spontaneous behaviour are very differently distributed in the various districts, then the levelling (to the extent that it is necessary) taking place in districts which are remote from each other and have no mutual interaction must necessarily lead to different results’ (Paul 1920: sections 22–25, our translation).

The Neogrammarians distinguished between language change in the strict sense and borrowing. Language change has language-internal origins. Formal (rather than semantic) change can take the form of either sound change, which is achieved spontaneously, or analogical change. When a change is not achieved autonomously, that is, when it does not have an internal origin, it can either stem from another language or ‘from within the same speech area’, as stated by Bloomfield (1933: 444), who referred to the latter type as ‘dialect borrowing’. Sound change was claimed by the Neogrammarians to be lexically exceptionless, hence the designation ‘sound laws’.

Only a few historically attested instances of sound change appear to be completely exceptionless, however. The fact that, in the grammar and lexicon of individual dialects, regular and exceptional (‘residual’) forms can often be found

4 Dialect Change

to exist side by side has led many scholars to subscribe to the idea that ‘sound laws’, especially, tend to operate sporadically, which leads some, including Schuchardt, to conclude that sound laws do not exist.

A process of language change that has not come to completion in some respect leaves behind language variation, either intrasystemically (as in, for example, lexically diffuse sound change) or between closely related language varieties (e.g. dialects or style levels). In traditional dialectology much attention is paid to intersystemic variation. Natural and man-made borders were typically looked upon as explanations of the location of dialect boundaries as the outcomes of dialect divergence (or, rather, non-convergence).

Apart from divergence, lexical dialect mixing (*Mischung*) and the levelling of variation (differences) between dialects (*Ausgleich*)² were thought to be the key mechanisms that destroy regularity and the alleged exceptionlessness of the ‘sound laws’ and thus made it impossible to reconstruct historical developments from the geographical distribution of particular forms, the original aim of nineteenth-century historical linguistics and dialectology (Dauzat 1922: 22). The insight developed that the forces constituting individual dialects and dialect landscapes are not only the human linguistic ‘hardware’ (to use a modern expression), such as the articulatory organs (the possibilities and limitations of which were held responsible for ‘sound laws’) and the ‘software’ located in the brain (cognition being held responsible for analogy), but also social interaction, social networks, contact between places, etc., leading to all types of what the Neogrammarians labelled dialect borrowing. ‘The maps showed . . . that local dialects do not exist in a state of isolation from one another’ (Bynon 1983: 185).

As early as 1870 Schuchardt, who, after the publication in 1885 of his *Über die Lautgesetze, gegen die Junggrammatiker*, was the first leader of the opposition against the Neogrammarian views, distinguished between two opposite forces working on language. What he labelled ‘centrifugal force’ (*Zentrifugalkraft*) leads to the differentiation of language, whereas ‘centripetal force’ (*Zentripetalkraft*) aims at unity. Centripetal force exerts its influence through such institutions as the school, the church, and the state. In Schuchardt’s later writings, these notions occur under the headings of *Spaltung* (split) or *Divergenz* (divergence) and *Ausgleich* (levelling) or *Konvergenz* (convergence), respectively.³ Reflecting on the mutual influence between the standard variety and a dialect (*‘langue littéraire et idiome local’*), one of the founding fathers of modern linguistics, de Saussure, writes that language history is a continuous struggle between *‘la force d’intercourse et l’esprit de clocher’*, i.e. between the tendencies towards unification and those towards particularism and cultural

² Terminology as used by Wrede (1919) as well as other German dialectologists such as Haag (1929–1930).

³ Cf. Hagen 1982: 242–243.

fragmentation.⁴ German dialectologists coined the notion of *Abbau* to refer to levelling in the dialect-standard language dimension.

Applying these insights to historical dialectology, Frings (1936) accounted for the emergence of a German *Gemeinsprache* (common language) as a consequence of the convergence of the Middle German settlers' dialects in what was to become the Upper-Saxonian area. Migration as a force for levelling will be a recurring theme in this volume. Historical dialectology provides evidence for divergence, too. Goossens (1970) points to the following trends, which led to the divergence of the dialects of Dutch and German:

1. specific linguistic elements or structures in the German 'dialect cluster' underwent changes that did not occur in the Dutch cluster;
2. the Dutch cluster underwent changes that the German one did not undergo;
3. both clusters underwent different changes.

Little by little the dialect-geographical investigation of dialect boundaries was given up in favour of the study of the history of individual words, leading to extreme positions such as the one expressed in the famous dictum '*chaque mot a son histoire*'. In the eyes of many linguists, traditional dialect geography is characterised by atomism and, in the worst cases, complete abstinence from theoretical reflection. That this extreme position was perhaps rare is indicated by the fact that most dialect atlases contain maps based on phonological parameters, implying that there is a general rule behind the change in the phonological shape of the words.

3.2 *Fencing off dialect convergence and divergence from related concepts*

In this section, dc and dd will be compared to closely related notions from sociolinguistics, especially the social psychology of language; from both traditional and more modern approaches to dialectology, including levelling and koineisation; from pidgin and creole studies; and, finally, from the study of 'mixed languages'.

3.2.1 Accommodation and variation Convergence and divergence both have short-term and long-term manifestations. Their short-term manifestations are often discussed under the heading of *accommodation*, and, in Giles' *et al.*'s (1987) model, are the opposite of non-accommodation, though more usually (e.g. Trudgill 1986) accommodation is associated just with convergence. Short-term convergence is exemplified by the observation that in babies' utterances F_0 often has lower values when the infant is interacting with the father than during interactions with the mother (Giles and Powesland after Daan *et al.* 1985: 72; see Kerswill 2002a for further examples and discussion). In

⁴ In part IV ch. 2 and part III, ch. 4 of his *Cours de linguistique générale*.

6 Dialect Change

adults, short-term convergence can be either ‘upwards’, i.e. from a geographical or a social dialect towards the standard language (although there is usually an upper boundary that cannot be transgressed without sanctions) or ‘downwards’ (as when members of the local elite speak dialect (Daan *et al.* 1985: 76; Voortman 1994), a phenomenon for which there are such telling labels as ‘*magistratenplat*’ (‘magistrate’s dialect’).⁵ Of course, Giles’ description presupposes a neatly hierarchically structured society in which dialect and standard can be related in a straightforward way to social position, but this may not be the general pattern. A demonstration of short-term accommodation is Coupland’s (1984) account of a Cardiff travel agent’s response to her clients. Coupland argues that the accommodation on various phonetics variables is not a mechanistic matching of frequencies, but rather an attempt at ‘identity projection’. (See Kerswill 2002a; and AUER AND HINSKENS.)

Motivations for short-term divergence may range between strictly situational (the desire to distance oneself from one’s conversational partner) or more general (the need to develop, maintain, or stress social or personal identity, or to demarcate the ingroup from the relevant outgroup). In the longer term, language can thus become the symbol of an entire minority group (as in the case of Welsh, Basque, Catalan, Frisian, and maybe also in the case of Letzebuergesch).⁶ The divergence of African American Vernacular English (Labov and Harris 1986) from white dialects, which resulted from the fact that the AAVE speakers have not participated in any of the sound shifts characteristic of the white vernaculars, may originally also have had this motivation.

Both short-term convergence and short-term divergence can take place psychologically and/or linguistically. Psychological accommodation (convergence or divergence) has to do with the communicative intentions and attitudes of a speaker towards his interlocutor or audience, and may not result in actual linguistic accommodation. While linguistic convergence can be described as the linguistic manifestation of speakers adapting ‘to the speech of others to reduce differences’ (Siegel 1985: 367), divergence is the exploitation of differences, for example by using different features more often and thus making them more salient. In sum, ‘according to this theory, people may adjust their speech with

⁵ Short-term convergence can even be exploited as a sociolinguistic research strategy. Peterson (1996) discusses the several types of short-term convergence of an interviewer towards his black interlocutors, responsively as well as initiatively. He did this with ‘the specific goal of promoting natural conversation in each of the interviews. The most appropriate strategy [he adopted] for accomplishing this task was to establish himself as a member of an AAVE vernacular speaking community’ (168). Something similar holds for Trudgill (1974), who established empirically that as an interviewer he himself glottalised his ts in concert with his various informants from Norwich. In this case, the interviewer actually *was* a member of the speech community.

⁶ According to Giles (1977: 35) ‘non-convergent language can be used by ethnic groups as a symbolic tactic for maintaining their identity and cultural distinctiveness’.

others either to reduce or to accentuate linguistic (and hence social) differences between them' (Siegel 1987: 240).

While Labovian sociolinguistics associates language use primarily with social structures and social behaviour, research on linguistic accommodation is grounded in theories of 'social action' (how social meaning is produced from interaction), more specifically 'rational action' (Turner 1996). Linguistic accommodation is analysed as the outcome of more or less conscious choices on the part of rational social actors, the choices being tailored to expectations about their extralinguistic consequences. If the boundaries between linguistically distinct groups are permeable (Mummendey 1999), the speaker may benefit by moving closer to the other group by converging linguistically, either by the avoidance of salient features of the speaker's own dialect or by the adoption of features of the interlocutor's dialect. This can affect the interlocutor's attitudes and behaviour in positive ways. As in Giles' theory, accommodation by Trudgill's (1986) more restricted definition of linguistic convergence may take the form of the reduction of differences or the adoption of features from the dialect spoken by the interlocutor.

Some of Gilles' (1998a: 73) findings show that psychological convergence (or divergence, for that matter) is not necessarily expressed in linguistic convergence (or divergence, respectively). Gilles' findings do not provide any evidence for short-term, interactional convergence between speakers of different dialects of Lëtzebuergesch: 'We are dealing with a process of convergence which can be located solely in the speakers' mind, but has no effect on their actual verbal behaviour' (73).⁷ Blom and Gumperz's (1972) finding that students from Hemnesberget (a village in Norway) who had been living in the city claimed to speak the local dialect yet had adapted their speech to one of the standard varieties, shows how psychological non-accommodation can go hand in hand with long-term objective linguistic divergence.

In the case of Serbian/Croatian, psychological divergence between several ethnic and religious groups seems to be leading to growing structural divergence between the respective dialect groups (cf. Janich and Greule 2002; Grčević 2002; Gvozdanović in press). Psychological convergence may be the reason why some linguists (Angelov 2000) have come to regard Macedonian as a dialect of Bulgarian. However, national ideologies probably also play an important part in this judgement.

3.2.2 Dialectology Whereas in connection with the analysis of dialect borrowing the focus is on the overall effects on the 'recipient' dialect, in connection with *geographical diffusion* (or *expansion* or *areal diffusion*),

⁷ AUER AND HINSKENS provide more details of this study.

the focus is on specific dialect features. The German dialectologist Theodor Frings (e.g. Aubin *et al.* 1926) can be called the main protagonist of the ‘expansionist’ approach in dialect geography, which was essentially an elaboration of Johannes Schmidt’s 1872) ‘*Wellentheorie*’ (wave theory). As Bynon (1983: 192–193) points out, Schmidt’s wave model can also account for dc through ‘the elimination of specific isoglosses which previously served to differentiate . . . two dialects through the spread of features from one dialect area over the territory of the other . . . The degree of such convergence will clearly depend both upon the length of time during which they previously underwent separate developments as well as the length of time during which they were subsequently subjected to the influence of a common centre’ such as the growing influence of the standard language. (See Britain 2002a.)

A textbook example of the wave-like areal diffusion of an innovation is Kloeke’s (1927) account of the spread of the diphthongisation of West Germanic /u:/ to /æy/ (via an intermediate /y:/) from the cities in the northwestern Netherlands to the more peripheral parts of the language area in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. With respect to this phoneme, three rather than two ‘clusters’ of dialects resulted from the incomplete spread of the change, leading to dd.

Trudgill (1983) developed his ‘gravity’ formula (which we will sketch in section 5.4 below) in order to model the areal diffusion of innovations. Innovations are supposed to jump from large, influential cities to smaller, less influential ones, in order of decreasing size (the ‘urban hierarchy’). To judge from Trautmann’s (1880) and Trudgill’s (1983) account of the spread of the uvular ‘r’ in northwestern Europe, this can occasionally even have Sprachbund-type effects. Trudgill (1992) compares the (1) dialectological, (2) macrosociolinguistic/geolinguistic, and (3) microlinguistic approaches to diffusion. In connection with (1), he discusses isogloss bundles and transition zones; in connection with (2) corridors of variability; and with respect to (3) linguistic accommodation. He points out that accommodation is usually not perfect. ‘At the micro level, the best-known form of imperfect accommodation is hyperadaptation, and the best-known form of this is hypercorrection’ (78). He illustrates this with data for the so-called Bristol ‘l’, which refers to the addition of /l/ word-finally in words such as *idea* and *Norma*, giving forms homophonous with *ideal* and *normal*. (See also Britain 2002b, 622–627; 2003.)

Bailey *et al.* (1993) introduce quantitative techniques to analyse the areal diffusion of grammatical, phonological, and lexical innovative dialect features of English in Oklahoma. Their findings led them to conclude that ‘different patterns of diffusion are tied to the different social meanings that linguistic features carry’ (386), and that ‘innovations that diffuse hierarchically represent the encroachment of external norms into an area, whereas features that diffuse in contrahierarchical fashion represent the revitalisation of traditional norms’.

We will return to this issue in section 5.4 below. Kerswill (2003) discusses differences in the rate and extent of diffusion of vowels and consonants, finding that, in Britain, consonantal features spread rapidly across the whole country, while innovations in vowels seem restricted to smaller regions.

In his work on the structural consequences of language contact, Van Coetsem (1988) draws a general distinction between source versus recipient linguistic systems, assuming that either can take the 'agentivity' role. Which linguistic system is proactive as the 'agent' depends on dominance, that is, on the bilingual's relative proficiency in the two languages. In this model, *borrowing* is a matter of recipient-language agentivity, while *imposition*⁸ stems from source language agentivity (2000: 5, 32). Strictly speaking, the notion of dialect borrowing refers to the process of one dialect copying an element or structure from another dialect; a long-term result can be the convergence of the recipient dialect with the source dialect. Kruijsen (1995) discusses examples of phonological (stress patterns) and morphological traits which were imported with French loan words in the Limburg dialects of Dutch spoken in the Belgian region of Haspengouw/Hesbaye near the Dutch–French language border.

A mechanism countering dialect borrowing is sociolinguistic *polarisation*. 'This force can act defensively, by retarding structural borrowing, but also offensively, by engendering developments diametrically opposed to what is found in other dialects or by bringing about something like hypercorrections in reverse' (Hock 1991: 428). The first type of effect comes down to resistance to convergence; the second one results in divergence towards the other dialects through hyperdialectisms. It would seem that a precondition for sociolinguistic polarisation, be it defensive or offensive in nature, is a certain level of awareness of the spreading feature in the consciousness of the speakers of the 'threatened' dialect. This may have played a role in the history of Hiberno-English (cf. Hinskens, Kallen, and Taeldeman 2000: 4). The defensive or offensive reaction may well have sociopsychological motivations, particularly non-integrative attitudes towards the speakers of the 'threatening' dialect. Some effects of polarisation in the creation of hyperdialectisms in the Flemish context are discussed in Taeldeman 2000.

Initially, because of extensive borrowing, dialect contact often leads to abundant variation as a result of *dialect mixing*, the partial merging of the lexicons and grammars of different but related dialects. Logically, the effects are visible only in areas where the original dialects used to be different. An example from historical dialectology is the enormous pool of variation resulting from interdialectal contact in sixteenth-century Judeo-Spanish, after the expulsions of Jewry from the Iberian Peninsula and their migration to the Balkans, Asia Minor, and North Africa (Minervini 1998).

⁸ Often called 'transfer' in the study of second language acquisition.

Whenever dialect mixing leads to the stabilisation of the variants that are typical of the respective 'pure' lects along with additional 'compromise' variants, one usually speaks of *fudging* (cf. Chambers and Trudgill 1998: 110–118; Britain 2002, 2003). A well-known lexically intermediate or compromise form from the Cologne area in the German Rhineland and the dialects in the neighbouring transition area between Ripuarian and East Limburg dialects of Dutch is 'öllich', /ʌlɪç/, or 'öllik', /ʌlɪk/, 'onion', which has been analysed as a fusion (a 'mixed compound', as Singh 1981 has baptised this type of formation) of the lexical variants 'ön' /ʌn/ (< Lat. *unio*), used in the dialects west and southwest of Cologne, and the more northern 'look' /lok/, related to standard German *Lauch* (Aubin *et al.* 1926: 32–33). As is evident from the latter example, convergence (and divergence for that matter) has consequences for the dialect landscape. Dialectal transition zones can result from partial cross-dialectal convergence (cf. Mazur 1996). In his discussion of what he labels *interdialect*, Trudgill (1992: 77–78) presents examples of intermediate forms in the phonological component (vowel quality in certain lexical sets of dialects of East Anglia) and the lexicon. Trudgill goes on to discuss the variation between German dialects in the word for 'potato', viz. *Grundbirne*, lit. 'ground pear', which is used in an area in between the areas with *Erdbirne*, 'earth pear', and *Erdapfel*, 'earth apple', respectively;⁹ a similar, more recent, example from British English, discussed by Trudgill, concerns central and southern *take away*, the northern variant *carry out*, and the intermediate *take out*, which is used in the southern part of northern England.

Phonologically intermediate forms are exemplified by the spread of /oi/ instead of standard German /ai/, replacing the base dialectal form /a/ in the Rheno-Franconian area' (Ziegler, after Auer 1998a: 5). A similar example comes from the dialects of Dutch spoken in the extreme southeast of Limburg. The easternmost dialects have undergone dorsal fricative deletion with compensatory lengthening, yielding forms such as /na:t/, 'night', and /li:ət/, 'light', which do not occur in the dialects spoken west of this area, which have preserved /naxt/ and /lɪçt/ (which are identical with the standard variants). In a subset of the relevant items, the dialects in an intermediate area show vowel lengthening but no dorsal fricative deletion, hence /na:xt/ and /le:çt/ (cf. Hinskens 1992: section 12.2.1; 1998a: 47–48).

Independently of whether fudging occurs, in situations marked by heavy dialect mixing, after a certain period of time a process of selection usually takes place. After all, 'many mundane events suggest that people have a deeply ingrained attraction to linguistic conformity. The stigmatization of certain dialect features appears to be an overt attempt by communities to stamp out

⁹ Cf. *Erdbirne* which is used in an area between the areas with *Erdapfel* and *Grundbirne* (König 2001: 206).

certain variants' (Chambers 1995: 209). This sifting through dialect levelling sometimes, though not necessarily, leads to koineisation, i.e. structural convergence between closely related linguistic systems, eventually leading to the stabilisation of some compromise variety (Hinskens 2001: 200; cf. Kerswill 2002a).

3.2.3 Levelling and koineisation *Dialect levelling*, the process which reduces variation both within and between dialects,¹⁰ is structural *dialect loss*. Functional dialect loss, the gradual giving up of the dialect in favour of another language variety, is often referred to as *dialect shift*. Dialect levelling makes (a) individual dialects more homogeneous; and (b) different dialects more similar and, consequently, diasystems more homogeneous. Thus, our definition does not entirely coincide with Berruto's (1995: 226) usage of the notions *convergenza* and *livellamento dialettale*. Whereas for Berruto convergence is the (vertical) reduction of variation between a dialect and the overarching standard language (German *Abbau*), he defines dialect levelling as the (horizontal) reduction of variation between different dialects (German *Ausgleich* – cf. section 3.1 above).

Complete dialect loss, i.e. the disappearance of a dialect without leaving any traces behind, resembles language death (Craig 1997), though dialect death can be gradual and (to the speakers at least) virtually imperceptible. As it turns out, however, it does not usually come to this, because some of the features of the old dialects will be recycled into new nonstandard varieties such as regiolects and sociolects. Moreover, 'old dialects are being continually wiped out only to make room for new ones' (Sapir 1921: 152).

Unlike dialect levelling, *koineisation* 'involves the mixing of features of . . . different dialects, and leads to a new, compromise dialect'. It results 'from integration or unification of the speakers of the varieties in contact' (Siegel 1985: 365, 369). Koineisation has been defined as the development through dialect mixing, simplification, and reduction of a regional lingua franca which incorporates features of various varieties. Berruto (1995: 226–227) describes a koine as a compromise between different dialects which results from the elimination of their most peculiar and marked features.

Apart from the original koine of Hellenistic Greek, the ancestral Arabic koine is a famous example. The development, in the nineteenth century, of *Nynorsk*, one of the two official standard languages of Norway, may also largely be a matter of (deliberate) koineisation by its creator, Ivar Aasen, since it incorporates features from a number of dialects, as well as being grammatically simpler than most of the 'input' dialects in avoiding the use both of the dative case and separate plural forms of verbs.

¹⁰ Bloomfield 1933: 476ff.; Weinreich 1954: 396.

Siegel (2001) draws a distinction between *immigrant* and *regional* koines. Referring to the former, that is, the results of the koineisation of different dialects after colonisation, Bynon (1983: 193) argues that ‘the outcomes of such convergence is by no means complete uniformity’. As Sobrero (1996) shows for the modern Italian situation, the development of regional koines can be a complicated matter. Sobrero distinguishes three types of koineisation: an active one, concerning the spread of a koine of ‘a strong urban centre into the neighbouring territory’ (e.g. Milanese and Neapolitan); a passive one, which levels out dialectal differences under the pressure of the standard language; and a third type, which concerns ‘the reinforcement and expansion’ of transition zone dialects. This last type ‘can be compared to the “passive” one’ (108). While the social basis of active urban koineisation can, according to Sobrero, be characterised as ‘bourgeois’, the third type is ‘proletarian’ in nature. Regional koines may replace the input varieties, and are thus akin to *regional dialect levelling* or *dialect supralocalisation*, which refer to the loss of distinctiveness at the local level in favour of distinctiveness at the regional level (Torgersen and Kerswill 2004; Kerswill 2002a; Milroy, Milroy, and Hartley 1994; Britain 2002b).

Kerswill and Williams (2000) studied the emergence of a new dialect in the new town of Milton Keynes (which was founded in 1967) from the point of view of koineisation and first language acquisition; for that reason they paid particular attention to the youngest generations. Davies (1992) is an interesting, partly historical, dialectological study of dialect mixing, koineisation, and focusing in the development of modern standard Chinese. The same holds for Trudgill, Gordon, Lewis, and Maclagan’s work on New Zealand English (2000).

Koines are the results *par excellence* of dc. It can be argued that dc and dd do not constitute autonomous, separate types of linguistic change in themselves; rather, they are epiphenomena, resulting from common processes of linguistic change. Processes of linguistic change resulting in dc or dd are sometimes internally motivated (and typically structurally directional, such as simplification, regularisation, and paradigmatic levelling). However, external motivations, particularly those pertinent to contact with other varieties of the same language (such as mixing, cross-dialectal levelling, and koineisation), seem to predominate.¹¹

In his work on migrant Turkish, Boeschoten (1997: 5, 7) interprets dc and dd as spin-offs of processes such as acquisition, borrowing or calquing, interference, dialect levelling, restructuring, and attrition. Riehl’s (2001) work on ‘*extra muros*’ German (that is, outside the German-speaking heartland and including territories such as Eastern Belgium, Romania, Russia, Australia, and

¹¹ See Farrar and Jones (2002) for a succinct exposé of the interplay of internal, contact-induced, and extra-linguistic factors in language change.

Texas) facilitates an interesting comparison. She ascribes the partly convergent developments in the varieties of German in her corpus to the catalysis of internal tendencies (e.g. the loss of morphological case marking), tendencies towards typological redefinition (e.g. embedded SV_{fin}O word order), cognitive principles,¹² and the exploitation of latent categories because of language contact (as the *am V-en* continuous construction, as in e.g. *am arbeiten*, 'working', which has a limited geographical distribution *intra muros*), among other things. More about the place of Riehl's study is given in section 5.8 below.

It seems that there are no processes of linguistic change which are unique to dc and dd. The main question for our present purposes is whether the common processes or the outcomes of common processes of linguistic change can be plausibly interpreted as dc or dd. This is not least a methodological issue; we will return to this issue in section 4 below.

3.2.4 Pidginisation and creolisation The sociocultural settings of Old- or New-World dialects, on the one hand, and pidgins and creole languages, on the other, barely overlap. Yet, sociolinguistically, processes resulting in dc or dd and *pidginisation*, *creolisation*,¹³ and *decreolisation* can be compared in several dimensions.

As Hock and Joseph (1996: 387, 423) point out, koineisation, the convergence between different languages, and pidginisation usually involve structural simplification as well as the development of an interlanguage. Siegel (2001) argues that (a) pidginisation and koineisation both involve second language learning, transfer, mixing and levelling; and (b) the differences between pidginisation and creole genesis, on the one hand, and koineisation, on the other, are due to differences in the values of a small number of language-related, social, and demographic variables.¹⁴ Koineisation is usually a gradual, continuous process which takes place over a long period of sustained contact; whereas pidginisation and creolisation are traditionally thought of as relatively rapid and sudden processes. This corresponds with Samuels' (1972: 92) distinction between 'two main types of contact: Type A: stable and continuous contact between neighbouring systems that are adjacent on either the horizontal (regional) or the vertical (social) axis; Type B: sudden contact, resulting from invasion, migration or other population-shift, of systems not normally in contact hitherto'. Nowadays, however, both pidginisation and creolisation are generally seen as rather

¹² E.g. the breaking up of the brace construction, i.e. the surfacing of the non-finite verbs (in the main clause) and the entire verb cluster (in the embedded clause) in final position.

¹³ 'Pidginisation is that complex process of sociolinguistic change comprising reduction in inner form, with convergence, in the context of restriction in use. . . . Creolisation is that complex process of sociolinguistic change comprising expansion in inner form, with convergence, in the context of extension in use.' (Hymes 1971: 84). In the past thirty years of research, the insight has grown that the two processes are not always that distinct.

¹⁴ Cf. Hinskens (2001) for a summary of, and comments on, Siegel (2001).

gradual processes – like koineisation. Moreover, Kerswill (2002a) argues that koineisation can, in fact, be relatively abrupt, since the ‘normal’ transmission (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 9–10) of language/dialect across generations is interrupted in cases where children are demonstrably the ‘koinisers’.

Afrikaans developed out of processes of koineisation of several different seventeenth-century Dutch dialects, but it also has ‘creoloid’ characteristics.¹⁵ To the extent to which the diachronic study of Afrikaans is feasible, this language seems to provide unique possibilities for testing Siegel’s claims regarding the essential differences between koineisation and creolisation.

Drawing parallels between decreolisation (Bickerton 1975) and dc is made difficult by the fact that the historical relationship between a basilect (the ‘deep’ variety of a creole language) and its acrolect (the language – usually European – which supplied most of the lexical material) differs from that between a dialect and the related standard language and even more so from that between related dialects. Whereas in most cases the acrolect is one of the ancestors of the basilect, a dialect, and the related standard language, or a related dialect, are usually ‘siblings’ in the sense that many modern standard languages developed from a dialect or a group of dialects. Second, whereas decreolisation is by definition a movement in the direction of the acrolect, dc need not necessarily proceed in the direction of the standard language (cf. Hinskens 1992: section 1.2.4).

3.2.5 Mixed languages The convergence between languages can ultimately result in the development of *mixed languages* through *language intertwining*. Bakker and Mous (1994: 4–5) define mixed languages as languages ‘showing a combination of the grammatical system (phonology, morphology, syntax) of one language with the lexicon of another language’, the main difference (according to these authors) between a mixed language and a language with extreme lexical borrowing being the fact that mixed languages can have over 90 per cent ‘foreign’ elements even in the core lexicon, while languages which have undergone heavy borrowing do not typically have more than 45 per cent ‘foreign’ words. A famous mixed language is Spanish-Quechua *Media Lengua* (Muysken 1981). Some of the descendants of Romani also qualify as mixed languages (Bakker and Cortiade 1991).

The line distinguishing language intertwining from dc is not always easy to draw. According to Sarhimaa (2000), Karelian, a Balto-Finnic language spoken in northwest and central Russia and, until the Second World War, in the easternmost part of present-day Finland, has some features of a mixed language. Because of the close historical relationship between Dutch and Frisian, Town

¹⁵ According to, for example, Muysken and Smith (1995: 5); Den Besten, Muysken, and Smith (1995: 93); Mühlhäusler (1997: 7).

Frisian (Stadsfries) is even more problematic for a proper distinction between language intertwining and dc. Town Frisian is a centuries-old, originally urban, ‘variety of Dutch that preserves substratal Frisian peculiarities’ such as the fact that it is ‘spoken with a Frisian accent’ (Van Coetsem 2000: 100; cf. Van Bree 1994).

It is not yet clear whether the differences between the convergence between different languages, such as may result in mixed languages, on the one hand, and dc, on the other, are of a gradual, hence quantitative, nature or if they are essentially qualitative in nature.

4 Methodologies

In this section, we will present a compact, yet critical, discussion of some of the methods applied in the study of dc and dd. We will give short comparative overviews of the standard (as well as some not-so-standard) techniques used to collect, analyse, and interpret data in historical linguistics, dialectology, and sociolinguistics. Then we will point out a number of requirements for the proper study of either the processes or the results of dc and dd.

It is obvious that the study of dc and dd is relevant to historical linguistics, dialectology, and sociolinguistics. Apart from differences in orientation between these three subdisciplines, there are also basic differences in methodology that are relevant to the study of dc and dd. These differences concern the techniques used to collect, analyse, and interpret data, and they pertain to aspects such as

- the nature of the data (written or oral, elicited, or spontaneous)
- the ways in which the material is collected (‘armchair-method’ or ‘tape recorder-method’, recording one, a few, or a larger number of speakers)
- the types of analysis (e.g. are quantitative, statistical approaches relevant and feasible?)

Moreover, the fact that historical linguists often try to follow large numbers of changes in outline over a long period of time, whereas sociolinguists usually investigate a comparatively small number of changes in great detail (cf. Aitchison 1991: 18), affects not only the research questions but also the type of conclusions and inferences that are possible.

In its approach to, and interpretation of, linguistic change, traditional dialectology pays a great deal of attention to the relationships between the dialects affected – in other words, the nature of the *diasystem* constituted by the dialects. It is also concerned with geographical directionality, as we have seen. In having these concerns, dialectology showed little interest in the linguistic and sociolinguistic processes involved. Variationist sociolinguistics, on the other hand, concentrates on the actuation, embedding, and evaluation of the processes, sometimes at the expense of directionality and intersystemic relationships.

Thus, the two subdisciplines complement each other. The study of dialect convergence and divergence therefore needs to be informed by both subdisciplines.

Processes resulting in dc or dd often have consequences not only for the variation between related varieties (intersystemic variation) but also for 'inherent', quantitative, intrasystemic variation. Prototypically, dc and dd result from dialect contact, though language contact may (exceptionally) be involved if this results in dialects diverging from neighbouring ones as a result of borrowing of material from another language, or the effect of convergence across unrelated languages which are in contact – the *Sprachbund* phenomenon. For instance, on both sides of the Dutch–French border in Belgium, a rising diphthong develops out of /ɛ/ as in e.g. /pjert/ (<Flemish, Brabant, and Limburg dialect /pɛrt/, standard Dutch <paard>, 'horse') and /pjert/ ~ /pjɛt/ (<Fr. <perdre>, 'to lose'). Another example is the fact that, in a part of the same area, both French and Dutch systematically lack /h/, as in French 'h aspiré' and 'h muet' (cf. Van Bree 1990: 321–322).¹⁶ Research into dc and dd lies at the crossroads between contact linguistics and variationist linguistics, i.e. between the study of language change as a result of language contact and the study of language variation as a synchronic manifestation of language change, but without contact being implicated.

As we pointed out in section 2, processes leading to dc or dd may involve variable, rather than categorical, dialect features. Moreover, independently of whether the dialect features involved are categorical or variable in nature, the convergence and divergence processes will probably proceed gradually – which makes it necessary to apply quantitative techniques in their analysis.

In order to be able to interpret the outcomes of processes of linguistic change as dc or dd, at least two different dialects need to be studied and compared either diachronically, at minimally two different points in time, or in apparent time. However, in many cases the probes are limited to one single dialect, contemporary data for which are then typically compared to older ones. Descriptions of data for an older stage or stages usually constitute the calibration point; often the data representing the older stage(s) are distilled from either monographs or comparative studies, which are often based on questionnaires or maps.

In practice, in most studies only one dialect is studied in detail – which *may* make the method somewhat unreliable, since the dialect with which the dynamics in the analysed dialect is being compared may itself in the meantime have changed. This may have resulted from 'drift', by which dialects undergo parallel changes even after they have split and are not in contact with each other, that is, without any 'interdialectic influencing' (Sapir 1921: 171–172). In Sapir's view, this is brought about by 'fundamental' features which the dialects, despite

¹⁶ Cf. Hinskens, Kallen, and Taeldeman (2000: 18) for an additional example.

their split, still have in common and which are ‘fundamental to the genius of the language’.

The fact that until recently only few representatives of formal linguistic theory were concerned with language variation (let alone with dc or dd) has to do with their outspoken preference for (1) their own intuitions regarding their standard language, and, in so far as the object of their investigations is not their own standard language; for (2) the ‘armchair method’, i.e. the fact that they hardly ever study ‘undocumented’ language systems (cf. Kiparsky 1972: 193) – which is equally at the expense of nonstandard varieties. The number of theoretically oriented linguists who do fieldwork is still very limited. Besides, many linguists still regard formal theory as merely synchronically relevant. Nevertheless, there is a growing number of representatives of formal theory working on language variation and change, including dc and dd. In several of his articles, beginning with ‘Linguistic universals and linguistic change’ (1968), Kiparsky explicitly takes the position that a theory which, apart from the relevant synchronic data, can also explain diachronic data is superior to a theory which can only handle synchronic data. In this volume formal theory is most clearly represented in the chapters by CORNIPS and CORRIGAN (syntax) and KALLEN (phonology).

5 Research Questions and Hypotheses

In this section, we attempt to summarise the main current insights that have been achieved by relating them to ten sets of questions. In doing so, we will make ample reference to what we view as the most important relevant literature as well as to the relevant chapters of the present book.

5.1 *Internal factors*

What is the relationship between structural forces and contact in dc and dd?
What is the use of formal linguistic theory for the understanding of dc and dd?

5.1.1 Intrasytemic forces versus contact We need to ask which types of internal factors play a role in processes leading to dc and dd. Among the internal, structural factors which can bring about dc are ‘drift’ and the ‘genius of language’ (Sapir – briefly discussed in section 3, above), along with naturalness.¹⁷ An example of drift is the historical diphthongisation of Germanic /i:/ and /u:/ in English, German and Dutch (e.g. *ice*, *Eis*, *ijs* and *house*, *Haus*, *huis*, respectively). Another example may be phrase-internal covariation in noun phrase number agreement in Puerto Rican Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese

¹⁷ Cf. the output constraints of Optimality Theory as teleological motivations. Closely related to Sapir’s ‘drift’ is Keller’s (1994) concept of the ‘invisible hand’.

which, according to Scherre (2001: 103), in this respect display more similarities than differences. In Mattheier's (1996: 36–37) conception, dc is mainly contact (i.e. externally) induced, while dd in the first place results from 'indigenous innovations' (our translation) in one of the dialects. The latter result, in turn, from what Mattheier refers to as articulatory-perceptual or intrasystemic variation.

In section 3.2 we discussed mixing and fudging as lexical or structural manifestations of cross-dialectal convergence. In line with these considerations the question may arise whether, in cases of contact induced phonemic merger, dc prevails, while dd prevails in cases of split. Labov (1994: 313–321) discusses the expansion of mergers at the expense of distinctions in dialect geography, a tendency which he refers to as 'Herzog's Principle'.

5.1.2 Formal linguistics The question arises as to whether research into dc and dd can profit from the types of theories that have been developed in formal linguistics. If so, we must also ask whether formal theories, apart from *post hoc* explanations, also provide *predictions* which can serve to structure the empirical study of dc and dd as well as interpret its outcomes.

Formal theory has proved to be useful to the study of language variation and change, including dc and dd, in four respects:

1. in the selection of dialect features to be studied, although the selection will typically not only be based on considerations of a linguistic nature;
2. a formal explanation of the *raison d'être* of specific dialect features may be the basis for predictions about possible future changes, provided the formal account is grounded in a general theory;
3. linguistic analysis is indispensable when it comes to answering the question if and to what extent similarities and differences in changes between related dialects are motivated either by shared or even universal structural tendencies or, rather, by common external factors;
4. linguistic analysis can counteract the 'atomistic' approach to dialect features which is typical of traditional dialectology in its tendency 'to treat linguistic forms in isolation rather than as parts of systems or structures' (Chambers and Trudgill 1998: 33).

The latter three points can be illustrated on the basis of insights from the theory of lexical phonology. In this theory, three types of sound change can generally be distinguished, two of which (postlexical and lexically diffuse sound change) are productive. The third type concerns lexicalised, hence unproductive, sound change. While postlexical rules, which can introduce new allophones, have no lexical exceptions and are blind to morphological structure (i.e. they are instances of Neogrammarian regular change, or '*Lautwandel*') yet operate variably, lexically diffuse sound change ('*Lautersatz*', i.e. sound substitution through the redistribution of lexical sets over the available sound

segments) is the analogical, item-by-item extension of a nearly lexicalised sound change.

Typically, phonological innovations start as postlexical, i.e. combinatorial, strictly phonetically motivated, changes. They gradually change into morphologically motivated (lexical) processes of alternation, or else they get lexically frozen and maintain a low level of productivity, spreading on an item-by-item basis. Whatever direction they develop, ultimately they lose their productivity altogether and end up as lexicalised rules, that is, as the lexical remnants of former rules; intrasystemically (i.e. quantitatively) they do not vary. Because of their synchronically unpredictable nature, they make it impossible to establish transparent cross-dialectal correspondence rules (Hinskens 1998b).

Since sound changes have their own dynamic, what in dialect A is a postlexical rule can be a lexically diffuse rule in dialect B, and a lexicalised, hence 'dead', rule in dialect C. Word-final [t] deletion is a postlexical process in most of the relevant dialects of Dutch (such as the dialect of Nijmegen), a postlexical rule with lexical traits (because of its morphological structure sensitivity) in some dialects of Dutch (this holds for Limburg dialects of Dutch), and a lexicalised (morpheme structure type) rule in Afrikaans, a daughter language of Dutch.¹⁸ The tensing and raising of /æ/, as in *man*, similarly has a different status in the grammars of dialects of American English. The process is spreading in a lexically diffuse fashion in several Midatlantic dialects of American English. As Labov has shown (1994: 429–437), in Philadelphia the rule, which can result in vowels that are identical to AE /e/ (as in *dress*), /e/ (as in *face*), and even /ɪə/ (as in *idea*) (as manifested in the fact that *Ann* and *Ian* can be homophonous), has affected /æ/ preceding tautosyllabic /m/, /n/, /f/, /t/, /s/, /r/, and, in some items, /d/. It is also subject to prosodic and grammatical conditioning. Currently, it is spreading to items with following hetero- or ambisyllabic /n/ and /l/, such as *planet* and *personality*. Whereas this sound change is lexically diffuse in Philadelphia and New York City (Labov 1994), it operates postlexically in the Northern Cities as well as in the Midwest (for Columbus, Ohio, cf. Hartman Keiser *et al.* 1997). Differences in the dynamics in the status of a particular sound change, as it progresses, can hence lead to dd.¹⁹

In so far as dc consists of a decrease in the usage of dialect-specific features in the sound component, lexically diffuse and lexicalised sound changes can be expected to be given up earlier, as (1) they tend to be more salient; and (2) they are not automatic rules, that is to say, they are not rules that speakers are usually unaware of. The patterns of accommodation across different dialects of German revealed by Auer (1997) provide evidence for this idea.

¹⁸ Cf. Hinskens (1992, 2002); Hinskens and van Hout (1994).

¹⁹ See Hinskens (1998b) for an overview of phonological, historical linguistic, dialectological, and sociolinguistic aspects of these three types of sound change.

Borrowed sound changes will usually be embedded in borrowed lexical items. Initially a sound change thus adopted will entrench itself in the borrowing dialect in the loan words, before starting to spread in a lexically diffuse fashion.

As was pointed out in section 4 above, among the representatives of formal linguistic theory there is a growing focus on quantitative (intrasystemic) and geographical (intersystemic) variation. In phonology, both non-linear theory (especially lexical phonology and prosodic theory – cf. Nespors and Vogel 1986; and Selkirk 1984) and non-derivational, declarative models such as Optimality Theory (OT) have inspired a surprisingly large number of studies of language variation.²⁰ After so many years of neglect, there are few reasons to complain.²¹ But there are hardly any studies in which there is any recognition of the fact that one is dealing with a nonstandard variety. In other words, the subordinate position of the language variety under scrutiny does not usually seem to matter. At best, one finds statements such as: dialect nature, standard language culture (as it is put in the title of Van Marle 1997). Somewhat more appealing is Butskhrikidze and van de Weijer's (2001: 49) 'speculation' that standard varieties are more restricted phonologically in that they tend to rank 'faithfulness' constraints, i.e. constraints that require the phonetic output form to be maximally identical with the underlying form, higher than 'markedness' constraints, that is, constraints that make the phonetic output conform to prosodic and articulatory requirements. To the extent that standard varieties reflect the speech norms of the higher social classes, this speculation comes close to Kroch's (1978) claim that prestigious varieties tend to suppress natural phonetic tendencies such as contraction, deletion, monophthongisation and diphthongisation, etc. (cf. Van Oostendorp 1997).

KALLEN deals with phonological convergence (the type of diachronic development which made Dauzat and Gilliéron reject the idea of blind sound laws) in Hiberno-English, and considers the question of how phonological convergence can be accounted for from both linguistic and extra-linguistic angles.

As far as syntax is concerned, Principles and Parameters (P&P) theory is generally relatively well represented. This theory, which formed part of the pre-minimalist generative model of grammar, looks at Universal Grammar as an invariant system of highly abstract principles, some of which permit at most a specified degree of variation within a given language. Originally, this notion of variation referred to differences between languages (macroparametric variation), but the approach came to be applied to language-internal, typically

²⁰ Hinskens *et al.* (1997) contains a collection of contributions on language variation, change and phonological theory, most of which feature OT, showing how language variation can be accounted for either as mutually unranked constraints or the competition between two or more ordered constraint sets and how language change can be represented as change in constraint order.

²¹ Among the exceptions from the very beginning are Lightfoot and Kiparsky.

cross-dialectal, variation (microparametric variation). From this line of research, deeper insights are expected into the universal set of parameters, their form as well as the substantial variation they allow. Within the P&P framework, language acquisition is seen as the process of parameter setting. Along these lines, Snyder 2001 presents an analysis of grammatical variation in verb particle constructions and root compounding in first language acquisition. CORNIPS and CORRIGAN do the same for what is often referred to as syntactic microvariation (variation between related dialects or style levels), elaborating the P&P model with quantitative methods to handle data showing dc and dd from Hiberno-English as well as Limburg and the German Rhineland dialect continuum.

From a considerably wider, but not formal, angle, and on the basis of evidence from English dialects, CHESHIRE, KERSWILL, and WILLIAMS consider if dc and dd in phonology, grammar, and discourse features (such as the focus marker 'like') show parallel patterns. They explore how variables in different components pattern geographically and socially, taking into account the particular links between, particularly, syntactic variation and discourse context.

5.2 *Isolation and contact*

A range of seemingly disparate insights exists about the effect of *isolation* on linguistic diversity. While Sapir (1921: 150) claimed that 'dialects arise not because of the mere fact of individual variation but because two or more groups of individuals have become sufficiently disconnected to drift apart, or independently, instead of together',²² Labov (1972a: 324) stated that 'the fact that diversity is not automatically connected with isolation suggests that it may also be connected with the normal processes of face-to-face communication'. As Samuels (1972: 90) sees it, it is

the mere fact of isolation or separation of groups that accounts for all simpler kinds of diversity. Complete separation, whether through migration or geographical or other barriers, may result in dialects being no longer mutually intelligible; and thus, if there is no standard language to act as a link between them, new languages come into being. Lesser degrees of isolation result in what is known as a dialect continuum – a series of systems in which those nearest and most in contact show only slight differences, whereas the whole continuum, when considered from end to end, may show a large degree of total variation. Dialect continua are normally 'horizontal' in dimension . . . but in large towns they may also be 'vertical'.

A moderate degree of 'horizontal' isolation holds in the case of Balearic islands. Montoya (1995) studied five variable phonological processes in the Catalan dialects spoken in the islands, four of which appear to 'han estat totes

²² Cf. Chambers' (1995: 65–66) 'Dialect laws of mobility and isolation'.

contraries a l'evolució de la resta del català' (198), i.e. 'have all undergone evolutions which were contrary to what happened to them in the rest of [mainland] Catalonia' (our translation). A relatively high degree of isolation holds in the case of language enclaves (*Sprachinseln*). The *non plus ultra* of such enclaves in Europe is Sorbian, a small (west) Slavonic island in a German sea in what was once the GDR. This language is not spoken elsewhere. For this reason, there cannot be divergence from a homeland here.

Some of the methodological problems in the study of language enclaves are discussed in Mattheier (1997). Among the methodological problems which, in our view, are specific to emigrant dialects (which most of these enclave languages are) are questions such as: what is the point of reference to establish dc or dd? Should they be compared to the 'home' dialects or to one another? If the goal is to look for indications of divergence from the original dialect in the 'home country', is the point of reference the state of the dialect at the time of the emigration or the dialect in its present state?²³

Daan (1987: 118–120) studied the Dutch of American descendants of speakers of very precisely localised Dutch dialects. In their speech, Daan found differences compared to the present-day Dutch dialects. On the basis of the operational assumption that the American Dutch dialects she studied had not changed in the course of the generations, Daan tentatively concludes that the corresponding 'home country' dialects had probably changed. We add that such claims are only warranted on the basis of dialect use of speakers (a) who after their emigration no longer had systematic contacts with speakers of the same or related varieties who did not migrate; and (b) whose competence did not deteriorate.

Minervini (1998) seems to try to compare the emigrant dialects both to the 'home' dialects and to one another. Equally relevant is Katsoyannou and Karyolemou's (1998) study of Greco in Calabria (south Italy) in 1985; since this date, the dialect has become almost extinct.

Do old dialects imported by settlers converge in their new environment? This question has mainly been studied for language enclaves. A famous example is Schirmunski's (1930) study of a range of geographically and structurally fairly divergent dialects of German in Russia. ROSENBERG deals with German dialects in the former Soviet Union and in Brazil. Smits' (1996) study of Iowa Dutch, which, according to the author, 'is certainly not identical to Standard Dutch' (15), brings to light some of the results of intensive processes of inter-dialectal levelling.

In connection with the overseas varieties of Dutch, English, Portuguese, and Spanish (the languages of the former colonising nations), isolation with respect

²³ This problem, including the question how to reconstruct the then (spoken) dialect on the basis of older (written) sources, is discussed in Nesse (1998).

to ‘mother tongue and mother country’ and at the same time contact with originally non-contiguous dialects went hand in hand. Did this lead to similar patterns of *dc* and *dd*? And what role does the new linguistic environment have?

Russo and Roberts (1999) show that the gradual replacement of the auxiliary *être* by *avoir* in Vermont French (which is also taking place in Canadian French) is being conditioned by internal factors (grammatical properties of the main verb) and the relative frequency of usage of the main verb, but not by social factors. According to the authors, this latter fact corroborates findings of others regarding language death, language loss, and shift to the majority language. The result is divergence from the French of France and older forms of North American French.

That divergence does not need to result from isolation is demonstrated by the developments in standard Dutch as it is spoken in Belgium. There are recent developments in both phonology (Van de Velde 1996) and the lexicon (Geeraerts *et al.* 1999) which lead to divergence from standard Dutch as it is spoken in the Netherlands. Although language systems can hardly be compared to biological species, there seems to be an interesting parallelism with recent insights from evolution theory here. Evolutionary biologists and paleontologists like Stephen Gould have discovered that geographical isolation is not an absolute condition for the development of a new species; at the rim of (rather than separate from) the area of distribution of specific species of insects, fish, and birds, intermediate varieties and new species have been found to develop (Goldschmidt 2000).

Conversely, isolation does not necessarily result in linguistic non-convergence or divergence. Bolognesi (2001: section 7) argues that

the prolonged isolation of Sardinia does not bring about the archaicism of its language at all. In fact, the traits that in the [historical linguistic and dialectological] literature are considered archaic have been found to be extremely limited in number [3 out of the 15 traits discussed by the author] and they occur only in part of the structure in some of the varieties of Sardo. (our translation)

In a sense, *contact* is the opposite of isolation. Historically, contact beyond the borders of one’s own village grew with the demise of the economic role of agriculture. While in 1849 no less than 44 per cent of the Dutch population earned a living in agriculture, in 1950 this proportion had sunk to 20 per cent. In 1995 it had shrunk to less than 2 per cent. World-wide, in 1960 about 2/3 of the population lived in the country; according to recent projections by the United Nations, in 2025 only 1/3 of the world population will depend on farming for their living (Mak 1998: 44–45).

The transition from an agrarian to an industrial and, eventually, post-industrial society triggers cultural changes which indirectly and gradually have tremendous effects on the position of the dialects. Among the cultural changes are increased literacy and improved means of transportation, leading to commuting

and increased general mobility. This brings about a gradual widening of the horizon from *Gemeinschaft* (community) to *Gesellschaft* (society), as the nineteenth-century German sociologist Tönnies (1887) baptised it. World-wide, the erosion of the relatively closed rural village community, the habitat of the traditional dialects, is manifested geographically in urbanisation and the ‘usurpation’ of village communities by neighbouring cities. Regular and intensive contact of a dialect with other varieties often leads to short-term accommodation and, as some authors assume, in the long run to convergence (cf. section 5.7 below).

In general dc also plays a role in the stabilisation of standard varieties. PEDERSEN discusses the emergence of standard varieties and considers the question of how decisive the role of sustained and intensive dialect contact, dc and koineisation is in that connection.

In our motorised society, dialect contact has manifestations which are probably surprising to many a traditional dialectologist. Labov (1974) showed that the average daily traffic flow on the highways of the eastern USA allows predictions of the location of the major traditional dialect boundaries, with the exception of New York City – which is probably due to the fact that sociolinguistically the city still constitutes a ‘sink of low prestige’ (Labov 1966).

5.3 *The role of the standard variety*

To what extent are the processes of convergence and divergence between non-standard varieties dependent on those between nonstandard and standard? In order for this question to be empirically considered at all, there has to be a range of dialects plus a standard language with sufficient geographical and social spread as well as prestige; moreover, structurally they have to be part of the same diasystem (cf. AUER AND HINSKENS 1996: 5–6, 13).

Whereas the convergence and divergence of dialects affect the degree of structural distance between them (Kloss’ 1967 *Abstand*), the convergence and divergence of a dialect vis-à-vis its roofing standard language may affect not only their structural distance but also the dialect’s *Ausbau*, i.e. its stage of functional development, which is maximal in the standard language (Kloss 1967). In the latter dimension, Berruto (1990: 105) distinguishes between ‘regionalizzazione dell’italiano’ and ‘italianizzazione dei dialetti’, or, more generally, between the development of regional varieties of the standard language and of relatively standardised varieties of the dialects, respectively. For the Italian situation, both processes are characterised by gradualness and continuity (Berruto 1990). Both in that publication and in his contribution to the present volume, BERRUTO wants to take the discussion further and develop a model to account for the conceptual relationship between these tendencies, on the one hand, and the utterance-internal juxtaposition of both dialect and standard through

code-switching and code-mixing, on the other. In his view, mixing and switching are characterised by relative abruptness. Similarly, yet on the double basis of data for the developing dialect of the new town of Milton Keynes (UK) and rural newcomers in the city of Bergen (Norway), Kerswill (1996a) considers the question of what may be revealed about processes of convergence by patterns of variation, co-occurrence, and code-switching.

BERRUTO deals with situations in which, alongside the original dialects A and B, new compromise varieties A^B and B^A emerge, and code-switching between all the varieties occurs. He shows how Myers-Scotton's notion of the matrix language fails in the typical dialect and standard-language case. Still on the theme of standard–nonstandard relations, we note that Van Coetsem's (1988) distinctions between (a) source and recipient language systems; and (b) *agens* or *patiens* roles in language contact are highly useful in setting up a typology of varieties lying between a national standard and a traditional dialect. Levelled nonstandard regional varieties (which may be also be referred to as regiolects or, rather confusingly, regional dialects) typically develop in situations in which traditional dialects absorb features (usually lexical items) of the standard variety, i.e. situations in which the dialect is the recipient and plays the *agens* role.²⁴ Situations in which the dialect is the recipient but has a passive role will arise where the standard or near-standard variety forces its (grammatical or phonological) structures upon the dialect (Van Coetsem's 'imposition'). This is not uncommon in regional or national capitals or economic centres.

Regional varieties of the *standard* language can result from deliberate, but only partly successful, attempts by dialect speakers at learning the standard variety. For the (typically unstable) learners' varieties which develop in this type of situation and for which nicknames such as *Hollendsj mit knoebele* ('Dutch with bumps') or *Missingsch* exist, the dialect is the source and the dialect speakers attain the *agens* role. Berruto's (1990) 'italianizzazione dei dialetti' is a further example. Probably more common in present-day Europe, where most adults more or less master a variety of the standard, is the situation in which the standard picks out (regional) dialect features, often of a phonetic nature, as may have occurred in the case of the young 'Poldernederlands' (Stroop 1998), a supra-regional, yet northwestern, informal, spoken variety of standard Dutch which stands out, among other things, because of its lowering of the first element in the front unrounded diphthong /*ei*/ into /*[ai]*, which used to be specific to a limited set of northwestern Hollandic dialects. This is an example of the type of situation where the dialect as the source is in the passive role.²⁵ Another

²⁴ This metaphorically refers to a situation in which the borrowing of standard features occurs as a result of the active involvement of the dialect speakers.

²⁵ Cf. AUER AND HINSKENS (1996: 7–8) for a more elaborate discussion and additional examples. The regional standard variety that Cornips (1994) refers to as Heerlens Algemeen Nederlands has the dialect as its source and the dialect speakers in the *agens* role type.

potential example is the rise to prominence of regionally accented varieties of standard British English, such as ‘Estuary English’, which contains much London regional phonology combined with standard morphology and syntax (Rosewarne 1984). However, in this case it seems to be more a matter of the wider acceptance of such speech in contexts where a Received Pronunciation (RP) accent would have been expected (Trudgill 2002a). It is difficult to fit this development into Van Coetsem’s model, since it is not a matter of language change but of a change in the sociolinguistic distribution of an existing variety. Equally relevant is PEDERSEN’s discussion of the influence standard varieties can exert on the dialects in their diasystem.

Insights into the phenomenon of the regional standard variety, i.e. the types of situation in which a dialect is the source and its speakers attain either the agens or the patiens role, are still limited, which is partly due to its linguistically highly variable and hence elusive nature. Among the many issues are those regarding the relative stability of regional standards and what determines which dialect features may, and which may not, occur in this diffuse type of variety.

From a situation in which traditional dialects, on the one hand, and the national standard language, on the other, were kept neatly apart both on the level of the individual speaker and on the level of the speech community at large, in many parts of Europe a situation is developing in which variants or even varieties actually fill up most parts of the structural space between dialect and standard. Bellmann 1998 has described this development as a change from diglossia, with linguistically and contextually distinct varieties, to ‘diaglossia’, a more fluid repertoire. In this development, varieties emerge which Coseriu (1980, 1981) would refer to as secondary and tertiary dialects, specifically if destandardisation sets in. On the resulting continua shifting occurs – not switching, as abrupt transitions between the constituent systems no longer exist (cf. Auer in print).

For Flemish and Limburg dialects of Dutch, Tældeman (1998) and Hinskens (1992, 1993b: 54–56, 1998a), respectively, and for Middle German and Swiss German dialects Bellmann (1998) and Christen (1998), respectively, present findings which show that there can be a dimension in dc which is independent of the standard. In most of these cases, there is even evidence of developments which constitute cross-dialectal convergence and dialect / standard language divergence at the same time.

Largely on the basis of findings from the Málaga Urban Vernacular project, Villena (1996) models the south Andalusian verbal repertoire as a tripolar continuum, the three corners of which are formed by the traditional dialects, the national standard (Castilian), and the regional variety of the standard language (*‘andaluz culto’*). Villena’s model shows that, significantly, the regional variety of the standard language (which developed out of the various, partly diffuse,

processes of dialect / standard convergence and divergence) is for linguistic and ethnographic reasons not located on the dialect / standard continuum.

In some cases the independent cross-dialectal convergence comes about through dialect borrowing; Ramge (1982) found that certain Saarland dialects of German adopt variants of neighbouring dialects, and Dewulf *et al.* (1981: 58) come to the same conclusion for certain Flemish dialects of Dutch.

Additionally, there is evidence that younger regional varieties can develop features of their own which do not result from cross-dialectal or dialect / standard convergence. An example is the spread of the coronalisation of the palatal allophone of the voiceless velar fricative ([ç] > [ç̣]– cf. Herrgen 1986) in the dialects and regional standard varieties in the Middle German area – which constitutes divergence from the standard language.

The standard-language concept is relatively young and mass literacy is a twentieth-century attainment. Therefore, cross-dialectal levelling must be the older and, historically, the main and probably only type of convergence. As ‘late’ as 1914, Terracher’s investigations on the dialects of the Angoulême area brought to light that ‘l’agent destructeur de la morphologie des patois n’est pas le français, mais les parlers limitrophes’ (Pop 1950: 106).

Of course, the question arises as to whether the present-day levelling of cross-dialectal variation occurs completely independently of the standard language. What may seem to be purely cross-dialectal levelling may be motivated by the fact that the dialect converged towards is perceived as being (and may in fact be) closer to the standard variety by the speakers of the converging dialect. For instance, Lake Constance Alemannic German seems to converge towards the northern adjoining area of Swabian; however, since the Swabian forms adopted are closer to the standard variety, and given the attitudinal predispositions of the converging speakers, the factual convergence towards Swabian may be an ‘accidental’ result of an intending approximation of the standard variety; cf. Auer (1988, 1997). Most of the situations in which there appears to be an independent cross-dialectal dimension in dc concern speech communities where, alongside a range of dialects, a prestigious standard language is in common use. Is cross-dialectal convergence sociolinguistically independent of the standard language in these communities? Would this type of dynamics also have occurred if there had been either no standard language or another standard language?

Norway, where the two standard varieties are not in common oral use, seems to constitute an instance of the first scenario, i.e. cross-dialectal convergence occurring independently of the standard language. Sandøy (1998b) reports that, rather than adopting morphological features from larger towns (let alone either of the two standards), the various dialects studied undergo independent simplification processes.

In certain cases, the patterns of change are subtle. Some of the developments reported in Hinskens 1998a and Christen 1998b simultaneously result in

structural convergence towards, and a divergence in, the very linguistic substance from the standard language (cf. Auer 1998a: 5 for a brief comparison).

Sometimes, dc or dd have ancient roots. According to Smith (1979), the non-convergence of a group of Dutch dialects towards the standard language with respect to part of the system of diminutive formation should be accounted for by the substrate effect of Frisian. Comparable, yet much older, are the so-called 'ingveonisms' in Old Dutch.²⁶ These seem to be other situations where there is a need to distinguish non-convergence from divergence. Another example was discussed in the preceding section 5.2; cf. section 3.1 above.

5.4 *The Role of Social and Physical Geography*

What role do geographical distance and borders play? What is the relevance of nearness, community type, and family structure?

5.4.1 Distance, isolation, and the gravity model The study of processes of dc and dd necessarily has a comparative aspect and, since traditional dialects are primarily geographically defined, the geographical aspect will inevitably play a role. However, geography as such does not influence language varieties, but does so through its social effects.

In the first decades of the twentieth century, a group of Italian dialectologists known as the 'Neolinguistici' (in particular Bartoli and Terracini) proposed a set of general 'laws' of dialect geography. An example is the insight that a dialect variant whose geographical distribution is limited to an isolated or a peripheral area is the older one. These laws (or 'norms' – actually they are to be understood as tendencies) connect aspects of the spatial diffusion of linguistic forms to their relative age.²⁷

Both social and physical geography feature in Trudgill's (1983: 73–78) application of the *gravity model* to dialect geography. His formula contains both geographical distance and demographic data. The formula, which is essentially a refinement of that used in social geography to describe inter-city migration processes (Zipf 1946; cf. Jones and Eyles 1977: 194ff.) is, in turn, based on those of Newton. The parameters in Trudgill's formula, which measures 'linguistic influence', are the populations of, and the distance between, the centres, as well as their 'prior-existing linguistic similarity'. Hinskens (1992: section 12.2.2, 1993b: 56–57) successfully applied Trudgill's gravity model to account for the fact that the rural Dutch dialect of Rimborg drops more Ripuarian features than

²⁶ An old theory, recently revitalised by Van Bree (1997), who gives a very extensive overview of the older literature on the issue. Cf. (12–15) for a brief description of 18 'ingveonisms'.

²⁷ See Chambers and Trudgill (1998: 167–168) for examples, and a discussion, of these laws and Benincà (1988: 81–89) for an overview of the intellectual background and some of the main achievements of this school.

Ripuarian-East Limburg ones – by showing that in the course of the twentieth century the linguistic influence of the nearby city of Kerkrade (where a Ripuarian dialect is spoken) has shrunk dramatically compared to that of the slightly further away city of Heerlen (which lies in the Ripuarian-East Limburg transition zone). Sociogeographical and linguistic shifts appear to coincide nicely. But what exactly is the nature of this relationship?

Directly linked to the gravity model is the idea of the spatial diffusion of a linguistic change down the urban hierarchy, jumping from city to city according to their size (Britain 2002b). TAELDEMAN critically examines this model for West Flemish dialects of Dutch. An interesting new (quantitative) approach to the study of the geographical dispersion of sound change is presented in Horvath and Horvath's 2001 'multilocality' study of l-vocalisation in New Zealand and Australian English. The findings showed 'the failure of the gravity model as an explanatory device' (51).

5.4.2 Borders Borders often have an effect on change, leading mainly to *dd* between dialects on either side of the border, and simultaneously *dc* between dialects on the same side. Borders are natural (e.g. rivers, swamp areas, mountain chains) or made by humans (tribal, political, and ecclesiastical boundaries).

In Western societies, political borders, particularly state borders, may be the most influential. Linguistically, however, state borders are of different types. With respect to dialects and political borders, in present-day Europe at least three different types of constellation can be distinguished. In the first, almost the same standard language is spoken on both sides of the border; the state borders are often younger than the dialect continua they cut across. Examples are the German-Austrian border and the border between Germany and the German-speaking part of Switzerland, as well as the much more recent, and temporary, border between the Federal Republic of Germany and the former GDR. Further examples are constituted by the border area between the Netherlands and the northern, Dutch-speaking part of Belgium, as well as that between France and the southern, francophone part of Belgium.

The different status of the vernaculars on both sides of the English–Scottish political border, along with earlier phonological changes in the border area, leads Glauser (2000) to hypothesise that eventually it will coincide with the political border. A diverging linguistic effect is also exerted by the national border between Canada and the USA, as the so-called Canadian Raising of the diphthongs /ai/ and /au/ before voiceless obstruents halts at the border. Kallen (2000) deals with the political border between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic (which coincides with the old cultural border between Ulster and the other provinces of Ireland) on the basis of data collected in the 1950s for the traditional dialects of Irish and Hiberno-English. The hypothesis that

Hiberno-English reflects the dialect divisions of Irish is rejected. The traditional dialects of both languages do show a north–south division. Given the huge difference in the societal position of Irish on both sides of the border, the future may well bring divergence among its dialects along this relatively new political border.

In the second type of constellation, different but related standard languages are spoken on both sides of the border. It is exemplified by the Dutch–German transition areas along a stretch of the Dutch–German border which are part of the larger Continental West Germanic continuum, spanning what was originally one diasystem. Another example of this type of constellation is Spain and Portugal; a more restricted but even more striking example might be Galician and Portuguese. The members of each of the three sub-branches of the Slavonic languages and Scandinavia form still further examples.

The entire Romance dialect continuum, of which Spain and Portugal form a part, is itself an example of the second constellation. Applying methods from dialectometry, Goebel (2000) describes how a single geographical continuum of Romance dialects is cut across by national boundaries, each of which is associated with its own standard. Each of these standard languages, in turn, is based on dialects which are distant from the ones in the continuum at issue.

In the third type of constellation, a dialect area is again divided by a national border, but the corresponding standard language is used only on one side of the border. Since the dialect on the other side of the border does not belong to the same diasystem as the national standard language, we speak of a ‘roofless’ dialect. Examples are several dialects of Dutch origin spoken in Germany and the northwest of France; the Hungarian dialects spoken in Austria (Gal 1979); the Albanian dialects spoken in Greece; and Spanish in the southwest of the USA.²⁸ Cf. section 4 for examples of dc and dd across borders of the third type.

A subtype is formed by those cases where there is no immediate geographical contiguity of the roofless dialects with related but roofed dialects. Examples are the Albanian dialects spoken in several parts of southern Italy, the dialects of the German language enclaves in Russia,²⁹ investigated by Schirmunski (e.g. 1930), and, generally, migrant dialect communities. A further subtype is provided by Welsh and Irish, which have diffuse and non-institutional borders with English-speaking communities. Both these languages have ‘roofs’ of considerable antiquity, and these function in education and, to some extent, in administration. However, practically all speakers are bilingual and biliterate, and, for most people, English fulfils most ‘H’ functions. The former Yiddish-speaking communities in Poland and Russia belong to yet another subtype.

²⁸ Cf. AUER AND HINSKENS (1996: 15–18); and Hinskens, Kallen, and Taeldeman (2000: 18–23) for additional discussion and further examples for the three border types.

²⁹ The situation in the Russian enclaves is slightly more complicated since the German standard language has been around for a long time.

In a language community in which the dialects have no overarching standard roof the standard variety of the dominant linguistic group is part of the repertoire and fulfils many of the functions of a standard variety for the speakers of a non-related dialect as well. However, the speakers of the 'roofless' dialects do not necessarily linguistically orient themselves towards this standard variety in the way they would to a 'real' standard variety.

The French political borders are old and have been quite stable over the centuries. In the northwest the state border was not a language border, as West Flemish was spoken on both sides.³⁰ Nevertheless, traditionally the West Flemish dialects of French Flanders have three types of features which set them apart from their siblings in what used to be the Netherlands until 1830, and what has been Belgium since 1830. Ryckeboer (2000) discusses the age-old gradual ousting of West Flemish, a cluster of dialects of Dutch, from northwest France, partly as a long-drawn social process, partly as the ultimate form of cross-border dialect divergence. For a long stretch, the River Rhine coincides with the French–German border. According to Klausmann (2000), on the right bank of the river, an intermediate variety, between standard German and the traditional dialects, has emerged. It has no counterpart on the left bank, where French serves as the standard language. Instead, French has found its way into the Alsatian repertoire, in the sense that, in certain situations, left-bank speakers of Alsatian switch to standard French.

The Danish–German border is also relatively old, but has shifted southward. As a result, there are speakers of (Low) German dialects on the Danish side of the border as well as speakers of Danish (Jutland) dialects on the German side (Pedersen 2000). Sarhimaa (2000) discusses the question whether divergence in the dialects of Karelian, as well as both convergence and divergence between Karelian and other parts of the Eastern Balto-Finnic dialect continuum, is historically related to the political border between Finland and Russia/the former Soviet Union.

According to Sapir (1921: 213fn.), nationally, state borders tend to have unifying effects, although the linguistic unification is never absolute. The complement to this internal convergence is divergence at the borders, which destroys old dialect continua. Despite the fact that the seven contributions to Kallen *et al.* (2000)³¹ deal with a range of different European situations, all show that convergence on the dialect-standard language and cross-dialectal dimensions (i.e. state-internal linguistic unification) necessarily leads to divergence at the borders. This is one of the ways in which national standard languages 'minimize internal differences and maximize external ones', as Einar Haugen (1968/1972: 244) put it.

³⁰ In most other areas, Walloon dialects of French were spoken on both sides.

³¹ Namely, Glauser, Kallen, Goebel, Ryckeboer, Klausmann, Pedersen, and Sarhimaa.

WOOLHISER discusses some results of his recent research on the phonology and morphology of Belarusian dialects of the contemporary Polish–Belarusian border region; as Polish belongs to the Western and Russian, and Belarusian to the Eastern, branch of the family of Slavonic languages, this represents the second type of constellation. What makes the study particularly interesting is the fact that in Woolhiser’s research area, the border dates back only to the mid-1940s, which makes it, in principle, possible to observe related processes of dc and dd in progress.

5.4.3 Family structure and community type On an entirely different level, on the smallest scale of social geography, we find the organisation of such small communities as the household or the family. In this respect, many Western societies have in the past century or so gone through the decline of the multi-generational family and the rise of the ‘nuclear family’. This is one of the microsocial consequences of the historical transition from predominantly agrarian to industrial economies. Growing up in a nuclear family differs in many respects from growing up in a household shared by one’s grandparents and other kin. As far as language acquisition is concerned, the effects on the variability in linguistic input are evident. As the dialect is transferred to the new generations, in the nuclear family it will be the variety spoken by the younger or the middle age groups. This variety may well be structurally reduced compared to the one spoken by the older age groups; in any case, such a situation may accelerate linguistic change. KERSWILL and TRUDGILL consider cases of migration where the third, oldest generation is absent: the development of koineised forms of English in New Zealand and the new town of Milton Keynes is, they argue, accelerated by the lack of a stable local vernacular to act as a model.

Even within small-scale communities, differences lead to different dc and dd outcomes. Sandøy (2003) differentiates between two sorts of isolated, small community: the Faroese type, where it is known that, historically, most people lived in villages of about 150 individuals; and the Icelandic type, where the population lived in isolated family units of about 10 people. In the Faroe Islands, a small degree of social marking of language could take place within villages, while communities remained very close-knit. This led to linguistic differentiation between, rather than within, villages, perhaps as a marker of local allegiance. In Iceland, there was neither social stratification nor, for the children, any peer groups, a situation which inhibited linguistic differentiation both within a family unit and across the country itself.

What the sociological make-up of households and communities, as well as the nature of borders (discussed in section 5.4.2), seem to have in common is a direct effect on the interaction between individuals and groups (age groups, social networks, ethnic groups, groups which are constituted by language background)

as well as potentially on sociopsychological aspects of language use (attitudes, the linguistic projection of identity) and thus, indirectly, on language.

5.5 *The role of demographic and sociopolitical processes*

How do sociopolitical and demographic processes such as centralisation, decentralisation, and regionalisation affect or even trigger processes of linguistic change resulting in dc or dd? What is the role of urbanisation? Are cities hotbeds of processes of linguistic change resulting in dc and dd? What role do mobility and migration play in dc and dd? Is internationalisation relevant to dc and dd?

5.5.1 Centralisation in European nation states In Europe, cities developed in a postfeudal, civil society not governed by aristocrats, but characterised by trade and the emergence of the nation state; centuries later, these developments were followed by growing mobility and the emergence of the fourth estate of the media. Compared to rural communities, urban ones tend to be relatively dynamic and open to outside influences of all kinds. In cities, cultural and specifically linguistic influence can also be exerted by rural newcomers. In her study of Swedish in four Finnish towns, Ivars (1998) found that immigration from the rural hinterland has brought about levelling between the rural and the urban dialects and increases the social differentiation of the urban dialects. According to Samuels (1972: 93), ‘large cities usually show a higher rate of innovation than surrounding areas (to which innovations then radiate), and hence the classic situation in linguistic geography of an “innovating central area” flanked by “conservative peripheral areas”’. TAELDEMAN is a thorough study of both historical and contemporaneous processes of dc and dd in the area of the city of Ghent in Flanders, the southwestern (Belgian) part of the Dutch language area.

In the course of *national unification*, the process which gradually transforms a state into a nation, the contacts between inhabitants of different regions become more frequent and more intensive, while the inhabitants become socially and culturally more similar and more dependent on one another. In other words, developments generally occur as regards:

- infrastructure: transport and communication, book printing, mass media;
- economy: the increase in scale in production and trade;
- politics: growing importance of the central government, the participation of increasingly large groups in national politics;
- culture: gradual elimination of local and regional cultures.

Behind these developments complex relationships exist. Their intricacies were already appreciated by Bloomfield, who pointed out the importance for this ‘process of centralization’ of the growth of economic and political units, and the improvement of the means of communication (1933: 481, 485).

Two closely related cultural aspects of the unification process are linguistic homogenisation and standardisation. In general, the processes of national unification and linguistic homogenisation do not appear to run exactly parallel: the former does not stop after a nation state has taken shape; while the latter may require even more time. In a country such as Italy, which in its present shape by European standards is still a relatively young state, the geographical and social spread of the (originally Tuscan) standard variety is far from complete. The fact that Spain, as a much older state, continues to have regional dialects and languages suggests that the age of a state is not the decisive factor, but rather the processes of unification and centralisation which follows statehood. In Spain, political centralisation is much weaker than in France, which has a much reduced dialect diversity, at least in the central and northern areas. PEDERSEN discusses the sociopolitical and ideological aspects of the emergence of standard varieties in Denmark and Sweden, relating this to the development of urban societies in the respective capital cities in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. She argues that the greater centralisation of Denmark has all but led to the eradication of dialects there.

The type of diversification of the standard language which is sometimes referred to as *regionalisation* leads to the emergence of regional varieties of the standard language. This issue has been dealt with in section 5.3 above.

5.5.2 Mobility and migration Do social and geographical *mobility* lead to *dc* and *dd*? Because of geographical mobility, dialects do not usually exist in isolation. Hoppenbrouwers (1990) discusses the revolutionary long-term effects of the invention of the bicycle on dialect geography. Similar studies of the impact of motorised means of transportation seem to be lacking.

A special type of mobility is *migration* – a part of the human condition. Kerswill (2005) contains a discussion of the subtypes of migration and summarises their linguistic outcomes; here, we summarise some of the main points. A group of Hollandic dialects of Dutch shows that mobility can indeed lead to processes of linguistic change resulting in *dc* and *dd*. After the Fall of Antwerp in 1585, i.e. the occupation of this then very wealthy seaport by the Spanish (whose mission it was to roll back the effects of the Reformation and to reintroduce Catholicism), thousands of inhabitants of this Brabantine city and other parts of Brabant and Flanders fled to the cities in the north, especially to the cities in the The Hague–Amsterdam area. Most of the refugees were well to do and many of them immediately joined the top layers of society in the Hollandic cities. Numerically they were also very significant (cf. Van der Horst and Marschall 1992: 53–55). Ever since this immigration wave, the dialects in and around Amsterdam stand out because of the vowel in such items as *daar*, *maken* ('there', 'make'), etc., which is [o.ɑ], whereas the surrounding

dialects have [ɛ:]. The deviant Amsterdam variant has been interpreted as a Brabantism, borrowed from the highly respected Brabant refugees (Paardekooper 2001).

Migration started to grow very considerably in the Europe of the mid-nineteenth century, i.e. with the advent of industrialisation. The economic centres attracted many newcomers from the surrounding area as well as from more distant parts of the country concerned. These developments tend to have an impact on the status and, in the longer term, on the structure of the dialects involved. Cross-border labour migration also led to demographic movements hitherto unknown, including both emigration and immigration.

Emigration, and especially the founding and settling of colonies overseas, is one of the possible routes leading to new-dialect formation, the other being the development of new towns. Trudgill (1986) devoted a chapter to the emergence of new overseas dialect varieties. KERSWILL and TRUDGILL deal with new-dialect formation in New Zealand and Milton Keynes.

Immigration has led to both short-lived and relatively stable bilingualism; the latter seems to be the case of the Turkish communities in the Netherlands and Germany, and of the Indian communities in the UK. In some of the cities in northwestern Europe, ethnic minorities are gradually developing into the new lower class or even 'underclass' of society. Among young people in cities with high concentrations of migrant workers, psychological divergence sometimes results in linguistic divergence. Kotsinas (1988) reports that younger members of ethnic minority groups in Stockholm have developed their own nonstandard varieties of Swedish for in-group use on the basis of both their mother tongues and the local urban nonstandard variety of Swedish. Similar systems are presently being studied in Hamburg (Auer 1999), Amsterdam (Appel 1999), and Utrecht (Cornips 2000). One of the most remarkable things about these new, partly mixed, language varieties is that they are not only spoken by the young members of the ethnic minority groups involved but also by younger members of the majority communities (Nortier 2001). An interesting question is what effect these new, originally ethnic, nonstandards may eventually have on the maintenance and development of the indigenous urban nonstandard varieties.

Apart from labour migration, politically motivated migration has played a role in twentieth-century Europe. Stark examples are the mass movement of people in Central Europe in the period during and after Hitler's Third Reich, as well as the 'ethnic cleansing' in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s. A less emotionally charged new form of migration is mass tourism. A well-known example is the divergent development of the English diphthongs on Martha's Vineyard off the coast of Massachusetts (Labov 1963). Lanthaler (1997) attributes the increasing use of Federal Republic German (FRG) rather than Austrian German

in South Tyrol (the German-speaking part of northern Italy) to the huge numbers of German tourists in this region – an instance of convergence towards FRG German and divergence from Austrian German. De Vink (2004) claims that very similar mechanisms kept the traditional Dutch dialect of the small, orthodox Protestant fishing village of Katwijk aan Zee from converging towards the standard language.³²

5.5.3 Internationalism versus 'glocalisation' It is too early yet to tell if the internationalisation of economic and administrative structures and the increase in international communication in present-day Europe will strengthen or weaken the traditional dialects. Nelde (2001) sees a growing orientation towards local and regional identity in reaction to the internationalisation of the economy and the consequences of this for daily life. Nelde is one of the scholars who refers to this tendency as *Glokalisierung* ('glocalisation'), a blend of the adjective 'lokal' and the noun *Globalisierung* (globalisation). The notion first appeared in the late 1980s in newspaper publications by economists. According to the sociologist Roland Robertson (1993), who has popularised the notion, glocalisation describes the tempering effects of local conditions on global pressures. According to Robertson, glocalisation 'means the simultaneity – the co-presence – of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies'.

The alleged 'dialect renaissance' (German: *Dialektwelle*, Norwegian: *dialektbølge*, 'dialect wave') starting in the 1970s may well be an early manifestation of this growing orientation towards local and regional identity. It is as yet unclear if this dialect renaissance is not largely a matter of attitudes, in particular evaluation, and if it does not mainly concern those social groups who would not speak a dialect anyway. So, even for these latter groups, it seems doubtful whether the 'dialect renaissance' will have significant functional effects: metaphorically, we may be dealing with ripples on the surface rather than a wave. Yet there are national differences: the 'wave' in Norway is clearly at grassroots level and has been maintained (cf. Vikør 2001: 56); in the Dutch language area its effects have tapered off somewhat although they are still clearly observable; whereas in the German language area it seems to have led to a destandardisation and regionalisation of the standard language rather than to a reappraisal of the traditional dialects and their prestige. There have been few, if any, empirical investigations of the effects of the 'dialect renaissance', as well as of the intermediate forms, pseudo-dialectalisms, and hyperdialectalisms to which it seems to lead. Hence its effect on dc and dd are a matter of speculation.

³² Cf. AUER AND HINSKENS (1996: 18–20) for additional discussion and examples for the relevance of migration to dc and dd.

5.6 *The role of social networks and other types of mesosocial structures*

We now look at the importance of ‘mesosocial’ structures, that is, structures on a level between the ‘micro’ level of the interactional situation and the ‘macro’ level of large-scale social constructs such as socioeconomic class.

One of the best-known mesosocial structure types in sociolinguistics is the social network. Social networks were introduced into sociolinguistics by Blom and Gumperz’s study of (presumed) code-switching between the local dialect and standard *bokmål* Norwegian in the village of Hemnesberget (1972).³³ Code-choice and code-switching were analysed as a means of symbolically expressing group membership, rather than against the background of the speakers’ socioeconomic position. Also in 1972, Labov published his monograph on the Black English Vernacular in New York’s inner city (Labov 1972b). He showed how the language behaviour of members of youth gangs called Cobras and Jets depended on their position in the group (where two of the main network membership types are referred to with notions such as ‘core’ and ‘lame’). Lesley Milroy’s (1980) Belfast study placed social networks (which she sees as ‘norm enforcement mechanism’ (175)) at the centre of the sociolinguistic agenda.

These and other studies demonstrate that an individual’s socioeconomic position (usually operationalised on the basis of such parameters as educational background and occupational level) is not necessarily the prevalent social factor determining social identification, nor does it account for the survival or loss of traditional dialects. Moreover, people do not typically have a sense of ‘belonging’ to, let alone derive a sense of security from identifying with, a social class. Unlike social classes, networks, which are often determined by friendship ties, are not anonymous. Accordingly, they are, in principle, open to ethnographic study.

VILLENA-PONSODA implements the social network concept in his quantitative analyses of phonological variation in the urban/‘rurban’ Andalusian vernacular in several neighbourhoods in Málaga. In order to answer questions such as whether open vs. closed social networks have differential effects on *dc* and *dd*, Villena implements measures of social-network membership both as independent and as spurious (correlated but not causal) variables, along with educational background, sex, and age. His findings lead him to criticise a one-sidedly correlative approach to social networks and to plead for an interpretative understanding of sociolinguistic behaviour.

As is apparent from most sociolinguistic studies of social networks, a closely related mesosocial factor is neighbourhood. As Labov (2001: 259) observes,

³³ Norwegian dialectologists have called into question Blom and Gumperz’s claim that code-switching was present in Hemnesberget, preferring to refer to style-shifting on a continuous scale (Mæhlum 1996).

‘unlike gender or social class, neighborhoods are *particular* products of *particular* historical events’ (our emphasis) – arguing that it therefore appears unlikely that the study of neighbourhoods allows for the induction of *general* principles of linguistic change. Careful analysis has led Labov to conclude that change in progress in Philadelphia ‘is still led by the oldest and poorest [white] neighborhood’ and that ‘the neighborhood effects found . . . point toward diffusion of the [new] features from a local centre’ – but he adds that all this is ‘not enough to allow us to predict that this will hold true in any large city’ (260).

Other closely related concepts are integration in the local community (Lippi-Green 1989; Sundgren 2000), and ‘Ortsloyalität’, i.e. loyalty to the local community, introduced into German dialectology by Mattheier (1980).³⁴ The results of an investigation by Hofmann (1963) indicate that a decrease of ‘Ortsloyalität’ has a negative effect on the functional autonomy of the local dialect.

5.7 *The role of social psychological factors: identity and attitudes*

Several Belgian sociolinguists (Deprez 1981; Jaspaert 1986; Van de Velde 1996) have ascribed the divergent developments in the phonology and lexicon of the Belgian variety of standard Dutch from the variety of standard Dutch spoken in most of the Netherlands (cf. section 5.2 above) to shifting *identification* and slightly distancing attitudes towards the Netherlands. Interestingly, for Northern Ireland McCafferty (1998) treats religious denomination (namely Protestant versus Catholic) as ethnic identity, showing how three sound changes which originated in the largely Protestant east of the country ‘tend to be adopted primarily by Protestants, whereas Catholics tend to be more conservative’ (97).

In their study of linguistic convergence in adolescents, Kerswill and Williams (2000) are concerned with the nature and extent of peer-group pressure. This is in line with the general insight that ‘the prevalence of diversity’ is due to ‘the natural tendency for people to cling to the linguistic markers that imbue their most personal encounters’ (Chambers 1995: 229–230).

Most research on language *attitudes* is experimental in nature, as the methodology centres on the systematic manipulation and control of variables. Another way of obtaining data on language attitudes is to distil them from interviews. Both experimental research and interviewing are difficult tools for eliciting reliable data, especially when used to investigate the covert prestige of a variant or variety. In so far as the methodological problems can be solved, this type of research can provide valuable insights into how certain linguistic forms are stereotypically associated with speaker attributes such as intelligence, profession, likeability, trustworthiness, etc.

³⁴ Cf. Wollersheim (1998: 52) for references to some recent relevant studies of social psychology.

In the case of language attitudes (as with accommodation – cf. section 3.2 above), psychology and language behaviour do not necessarily mirror each other. Particularly intriguing is Hofer's (2000: 106–108) finding that there are large evaluative differences connected with relatively small linguistic differences between varieties of the Basle dialect of Swiss German and, *vice versa*, that relatively big linguistic differences between varieties are connected with small evaluative differences. Very similar findings were made by Kerswill and Williams (2002a); they associated this finding with the level of salience of particular features (see below, section 5.9).

Faced with the contradiction between the rapid diffusion of the Copenhagen variety of Danish³⁵ and the negative attitudes towards 'low' (nonstandard) Copenhagen features, in what looks like a case of covert prestige, Kristiansen (1996) applied techniques to tap data regarding more 'unconscious' attitudes. These revealed that the traditional dialects are downgraded, rather than the overtly stigmatised low Copenhagen features. KRISTIANSEN and JØRGENSEN discuss the effects of ideology, affiliation, and language attitudes on dc and dd. The covert subjective correlates were studied in situations where language was not focused on, and in which subjects were unaware of displaying attitudes towards language (speaker evaluations in both experimental and natural settings). In Næstved, adolescents gave a low rating to speakers with even a minimum of local dialect phonetics, while giving a high rating to speakers who used traditional working-class Copenhagen features.

A range of studies has shown that language attitudes have only limited prognostic power for code-choice and for language variation; it is even more difficult to use attitudinal data as predictors for language change;³⁶ the same holds for dc and dd. In so far as attitudes do affect dialects, one might hypothesise that they do so indirectly, and that attitudes have a certain prognostic value for the choice of the language of socialisation and thus

- 1st for the transfer of a nonstandard variety to a new generation;
- 2nd for the function of this nonstandard variety for the new generation; and
- 3rd in the longer run, for the structure of the nonstandard variety.

Is levelling foreshadowed by face-to-face *accommodation*? What is the relative impact of accommodation on the part of children, adolescents, and adults? The latter question is empirically considered by Kerswill (1996b), and by KERSWILL and TRUDGILL, the former by AUER and HINSKENS. On the basis of various empirical studies, carried out on speakers of dialects of Dutch,

³⁵ The use of low Copenhagen features among young Jutlanders had already been observed by Pedersen (1996).

³⁶ See e.g. Münstermann and van Hout (1986); Jaspaert and Kroon (1988); Hinskens (1993a: 235–241). See Omdal (1994); Labov (2001: ch. 6) for critical assessments of the relevance of subjective dimensions. AUER AND HINSKENS (1996: 22) speculate about possible explanations for the mismatch between language attitudes and dialect use.

Lëtzebuergesch, and German, AUER AND HINSKENS evaluate the main idea underlying Trudgill's (1986) model of dialects in contact, the idea that prolonged and frequent short-term convergence leads to dialect levelling. Although Trudgill's hypothesis is not rejected, in all the amount of empirical support is far from impressive and seems to urge a revision of the hypothesis.

In connection with convergence and divergence, not everybody thinks along sociopsychological lines. In his study of Romani and 'a possible linguistic area' in the Near East, Matras (2001: 1, 4) claims that convergence is cognitively motivated; according to him, convergence is rooted in simplification by bilingual speakers. He interprets convergence as 'the efficient management of the pragmatics of multilingual interaction: reduce the organizational effort on the one hand, maintain the structural autonomy of the systems on the other'. In this conception, there is no place for social psychology. As Trudgill points out (2002b), simplification of this sort also takes place in dialect contact in high-contact communities where adults, with their cognitive limitations in relation to language acquisition, are faced with learning second dialects.

Does this contradict the interpretations of the relevant findings for dc and dd? We would like to advance the hypothesis that in the case of the convergence and divergence between dialects in contact (where mutual comprehensibility is usually not at stake), volition and, more generally, sociopsychological factors play the *main* role; while in the case of the convergence and divergence between different languages in contact the main (but, of course, not only) role is played by proficiency and, more generally, cognitive factors, the degree to which it plays a role being proportional to the structural distance between the languages.

The proportion of 'bilectal' speakers in a speech community may be inversely related to the degree to which cognitive factors play a role in convergence and divergence between dialects in contact. The model can be even further refined by distinguishing between compound and co-ordinate 'bilectality' (by analogy with 'bilingualism'). Whereas in compound bilectality both lects were acquired simultaneously and are supposed to be cognitively represented as one system, co-ordinate bilectality is the result of the successive acquisition of the dialects at issue, which are supposed to be cognitively represented as two systems.³⁷

The obvious relatedness between accommodation, language attitudes, identification, social networks, and loyalty to the local community (the latter two of which were briefly discussed in section 5.6 above) is illustrated by Wolfram and Hazen's (1996) description of the speech of a black woman in a small community on the Ocracoke island in the outer banks of North Carolina. The authors show how the woman's English is distinguished by convergence to, and

³⁷ On compound versus co-ordinate bilingualism see Weinreich (1953); Ervin and Osgood (1954). Cf. van Coetsem (2000: 83) and the references mentioned therein.

divergence from, both the island's dialect (Ocracoke Vernacular English) and African American Vernacular English.

5.8 *The interaction of internal, external, and extra-linguistic factors*

In their seminal paper from 1968, Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog defined the three main problems in the study of language change as its actuation, its social and linguistic embedding, and its evaluation in the speech community. In our view, either *internal* (language structure, UG) or *external* (contact and borrowing) factors cause the actuation of a language change,³⁸ including changes that result in dc or dd. Clearly, internal factors determine the linguistic embedding. To the external, contact-related factors we would add *extra-linguistic* factors, which Farrar and Jones (2002: 1) define as 'sociopolitical and economic', that is, factors which are not directly related to the interaction of linguistic systems through contact. Under 'extra-linguistic' we would also include social-psychological factors, especially identities and attitudes. Both external and extra-linguistic factors determine the social and geographical diffusion of a change and its social embedding.

An indication of the interaction of internal, i.e. linguistic and extra-linguistic, motivations is found in Bailey's (1973) model, which builds on Schmidt's (1872) '*Wellentheorie*' (see section 3.2.2 above). According to Bailey, change diffuses (a) simultaneously in linguistic structure and along extra-linguistic dimensions; and (b) in wave-like patterns. Haas (1978) provides an implementation of Bailey's model in the study of a number of sound changes in dialects of Swiss German.

Andersen (1988, 1989) distinguishes adaptive, evolutive, and spontaneous innovations. While adaptive innovations are 'not explainable without reference to factors outside the linguistic system in question', evolutive innovations are 'entirely explainable in terms of the linguistic system that gave rise to it' (Andersen 1973: 778). Adaptive innovations are externally motivated and involve finality, whereas both evolutive and spontaneous innovations are internally motivated and do not involve finality. Andersen specifies a number of subtypes, only some of which seem to be relevant for the present discussion. Contact-induced innovation is a special type of adaptive innovation, usually affecting differences between language systems, and abductive innovation is a special type of evolutive innovation, which typically affects differences within a single system. Abductive innovations, which are a special type of evolutive innovation, result from an 'incorrect' analysis of the primary language data by the language learner, motivated by the 'laws of language' (Andersen 1973); in

³⁸ But even in the case of an externally motivated change, usually language internal factors will ultimately 'decide' to accept or reject it.

abductive innovations, UG motivated reanalysis, which is claimed to have its roots in first language acquisition, plays an essential role (cf. Røyneland 2000: 189–191).

On the basis of Andersen’s (1988, 1989) work, we deduce the following probabilistic model:

Internal/external origin	Type of innovation	One or both systems innovating?	Probable outcome
external	adaptive – contact	one	dc
		both	dc
internal	evolutionary – abductive	one	dc/dd
		both	dc/dd
internal	spontaneous	one	dd
		both	dc/dd

Two further specifications of the hypotheses are in order, both with respect to the concept of evolutionary innovations. In cases where only one of the language systems involved is innovating, *and if* the other system has already carried through the particular innovation, then the chances that the outcome will be convergence seem relatively good (cf. Stroop’s view on the lowering of the first element of the diphthong /*ei*/ as a pan-Germanic tendency, paraphrased in section 5.3 above). Where both of the language systems involved are innovating *and if* the relevant areas of the linguistic structure are sufficiently different to begin with, then the evolutionary innovations will probably result in divergence – unless there is drift taking place.

Structural factors can apparently also be of overriding importance in dialect / standard convergence, particularly in deciding which dialect features will be levelled out and which ones will survive. Landa and Franco (1998) studied Basque Spanish to test the following two claims: (i) the pre-existence of a certain degree of structural parallelism between the standard variety and the dialect is required for a feature to remain; and (ii) a syntactic phenomenon does not survive in isolation but its future is linked to that of a cluster of syntactic properties (cf. our discussion of parameter theory in section 5.1.2 above).

Some researchers maintain that contact can strengthen language-specific structural forces or more general natural tendencies (e.g. of a prosodic nature). In their study of Greco in Calabria, Katsoyannou and Karyolemou (1998, cf. section 5.2 above) report on the Greco dialects borrowing from the surrounding Calabrese dialects of Italian, but also displaying structures that can be considered as reinforcements of trends which existed already in Greek, where they have minor or peripheral status. Cf. our remarks with respect to Riehl (2001) in section 3.2.3 above. In recent work on the verb–object agreement system

in western, Biscayan, and eastern dialects of Basque (which is an ergative language), Elordui (1998) found that what looked like *dd* appeared on closer consideration to be *dc*, since the dialects show basically the same dynamic – which they share not only among themselves but also with French and Spanish. ROSENBERG discusses comparable questions on the basis of findings from his investigations of the situation in some of the former German language enclaves in Russia and elsewhere.

In situations of sustained isolation, internal tendencies possibly have free play; Biberauer (to appear) shows that, as far as the syntax of the finite verb is concerned, in its modern spoken versions Afrikaans, a partly creolised daughter language of Dutch, is in the process of diverging further away from Dutch.

VILLENA-PONSODA questions the fine-grained quantitative approach to social networks as it does not allow him to account for the entire amount of variability in the changes in the use of the linguistic variables in his Málaga project. However, as processes of language change are usually determined by a cocktail of factors and are, hence, to be seen as ‘multi-causality phenomena’ (Dressler 1986: 520; cf. Hinskens 1992: section 2.5.1), in relation to *dc* and *dd* each single external, extra-linguistic, and internal factor needs to be understood as a probabilistic explanation – leaving the investigator with the task of developing a model which is at the same time maximally explanatory and maximally simple and parsimonious.³⁹

Andersen uses the adjective ‘external’ in the sense of ‘from another linguistic system’ (hence⁴⁰ it stands for borrowing in the widest sense of the word – and this is the sense in which we use it), but sometimes (as in the chapter by KALLEN) ‘external’ refers also to language-external, hence extra-linguistic factors. Kallen discusses the relationship between internal and external (extra-linguistic as well as contact-related) factors in *dc* and *dd* in the phonology of Irish English.

5.9 *Salience*

In Kiparsky’s conception (1992: 59), the likelihood of an innovation being adopted is ‘inversely proportional to its salience, as measured by its distance from the old form’.⁴¹ Salience itself is not defined by Kiparsky, who merely states that, like frequency, salience has ‘no structural correlate’.

³⁹ The latter requirement is sometimes referred to as ‘Occam’s Razor’.

⁴⁰ Also in Thomason and Kaufman (1988), who knock the bottom out of a number of common methodological principles on the basis of which historical linguistics keeps potential external explanations (*in casu* borrowing) for particular instances of structural change out of the picture (57–64). This seems to be a matter of conceptual orientation in the first place.

⁴¹ As well as ‘to the old form’s entrenchment, measured primarily by frequency’. At the same time, the success of an innovation is ‘locally proportional to its functional value, and to the productivity . . . of the process that derives it’.

According to some dialectologists, the relative ‘salience’ of individual dialect features plays a role in short- and long-term accommodation. In Trudgill’s (1986) model of the sociolinguistic consequences of dialect contact (to be sketched in section 5.10 below), this factor has both linguistic and extralinguistic correlates, as shown below (adapted from Trudgill 1986: 11):

- the variable has at least one variant which is overtly stigmatised;
- the variable has a high-status prestige variant reflected in the orthography;
- the variable is undergoing linguistic change;
- variants are phonetically radically different;
- variants are involved in the maintenance of phonological contrasts.

Though plausible, this part of the model is weakened by the fact that salience is sometimes used as an explanation for accommodation (and diffusion or reduction – e.g. 1986: 45) and sometimes to explain why accommodation does *not* take place. In other cases it is simply not possible to decide whether a dialect feature is salient or not. The problem is that it is probably impossible to give an intersubjective operationalisation of this notion.

A predecessor of Trudgill’s ideas regarding the factor salience is Schirmunski’s (1930) distinction between primary versus secondary dialect features. Here primary dialect features are the ‘am stärksten auffallenden’ (most strongly salient), as against the secondary ones, which are the ‘weniger auffallenden’ (less salient). In Schirmunski’s conception, primary dialect features are very susceptible to change or loss, while secondary ones are relatively resistant. Though he mentioned derived criteria,⁴² Schirmunski has not done much to prevent his critics from accusing him of having introduced an impracticable and basically non-empirical proposal. Despite this pessimistic view, dialectologists have been able to apply Schirmunski’s classification of dialect features in a meaningful way. Thus, TAELEDMAN (section 4.2) applies the label ‘primary dialect feature’ to variants which stand out through their ‘conservative insularity’ (cf. relic forms). In Taldeman’s view such primary features may even be the result of the polarisation of an existing feature of a regionally or locally limited nature.

Schirmunski’s and Trudgill’s models are obviously related to Labov’s (1972a) tripartite distinction between *indicators* (which signal, passively, membership of a particular speech community), *markers* (which have geographical and sociostylistic differentiation), and *stereotypes* (geographical relevance and sociostylistic differentiation plus conscious awareness). In the case of stereotypes, conscious awareness on the part of speakers can lead to positive or negative evaluations, including stigmatisation. However, Labov does not

⁴² A typology of the many criteria that have been proposed in relation with the primary versus secondary distinction as well as three possible operationalisations are presented in Hinskens (1986). Cf. Auer (1993); Taldeman (1993); Auer *et al.* (1998); Kerswill and Williams (2002a).

differentiate between the evaluation by the speakers themselves (which may lead to autostereotypes) and by others (which may result in heterostereotypes).

The same question can be raised in connection with 'salience': salient to whom? To the speakers themselves or to speakers of other dialects? From the point of view of dc and dd, we need to ask the question of whether speakers have to be aware of dialect features at all either to converge with, or diverge from, them. Kerswill and Williams (2002a) considered this question by investigating speakers' awareness of particular features of dialect grammar in three British cities. Awareness varied widely, both between the different features and between different socioeconomic groups. This result led them to conclude that 'salience' has a complex set of determinants including linguistic factors such as phonetic distance. More importantly, and usually decisively, salience is also derived from extra-linguistic cognitive, pragmatic, interactional, social-psychological, and sociodemographic factors. In the end, it may not be possible, even in principle, to predict levels of salience. It may also be impossible to determine whether a given level of salience, once established, leads to the adoption or the non-adoption of a feature in dc or dd.

5.10 *Comprehensive models for the outcomes of dialect convergence and divergence?*

What are the possible 'results' of dc and dd? Can we construct a comprehensive model which can at the same time accommodate such constructs and processes as koinés, 'new dialects' (the subject of the chapter by KERSWILL and TRUDGILL), new 'regiolectal' varieties, regional standards, dd across borders, language enclaves, dialect loss, and dialect death?

In Trudgill's (1986) model of the sociolinguistic consequences of dialect contact, accommodation between individual speakers of different dialects takes place with respect to features that are salient. As in Giles' theory, the accommodation may take the form of the reduction of differences or even the adoption of features from the dialect of the interlocutor. Trudgill states: 'If a speaker accommodates frequently enough to a particular accent or dialect . . . then the accommodation may in time become permanent, particularly if attitudinal factors are favourable' (39). 'When a speaker employs a new feature in the absence of speakers of the variety originally containing this feature' (40), the accommodation becomes stabilised. This is a necessary condition for the diffusion of features in the contact situation. In this process, geography (distance) and demography (population size) play a role. The accommodation constituting such interdialect convergence need not be complete. The result may be (a) quantitative variation between the 'old' and the 'new' variants; or (b) the occurrence of the 'new' variant, in some words, but not in others, giving rise to a lexically diffuse incidence; this process is termed *transfer* and its product a

mixed dialect; or (c) intermediate, phonetically approximate, forms, the resulting variety being a *fudged dialect*; phonetically intermediate forms are a type of *interdialect forms*; another type is *hyperdialectalism*. This, however, is the result of divergence rather than convergence (62–78).

Contact between dialects may lead to ‘an enormous amount of linguistic variability in the early stages’ (Trudgill 1986: 107). In this situation, we are likely to observe *koineisation*, which consists of *levelling* (the reduction in the number of competing variants through the loss of rare or otherwise linguistically marked forms) combined with *simplification*. However, not all variation of the phase preceding koineisation is reduced. The remaining variation, i.e. the ‘forms that are not removed during koineisation . . . will tend to be re-assigned according to certain patterns’ (110). This *reallocation* can cause variants to take on a specialised linguistic (allophonic) or extra-linguistic (social, stylistic, or geographical) function (110–126).

Siegel (2001) presents an overall model for the comparison of contact between speakers of closely related language systems (koineisation) and between speakers of typologically very different, unrelated systems, who do not speak each other’s language (sometimes leading to pidginisation and creole genesis). We will here mainly summarise the contours of the first part of the model.⁴³ Koines result from prolonged contact between related linguistic systems, usually more or less contiguous dialects of the same language, sometimes closely related languages (cf. Siegel 1993), in other words, between linguistic systems which are sufficiently similar to be mutually intelligible (Siegel 2001). However, continuous contact between related systems as such does not necessarily lead to the formation of a koine. What is needed is sufficient ‘integration or unification of the speakers of the varieties in contact’ (Siegel 1985: 369). This may result from ‘some large-scale political, economic or demographic change in society which causes increased interaction among speakers of different dialects and decreased inclination to maintain linguistic boundaries’ (Siegel 1992: 110; 1985: 456; 1993: 116–117). In short, social and sociopsychological conditions have to be favourable.

The process of koine formation itself can be roughly defined as structural *convergence* between closely related linguistic systems, eventually leading to the *stabilisation* of some compromise variety. On the basis of a typology of standard/dialect repertoires Auer (in print) proposes a general model for the historical development of dialects, koines, standard languages, new ‘regiolectal’ varieties, regional standards, dialect loss, and dialect death. The model postulates a sequential arrangement of various repertoire types – from a repertoire with an exoglossic standard overarching the vernacular varieties via a diglossic repertoire with a written standard and a diglossic repertoire with a spoken

⁴³ The second part and the comparability have already been sketched in section 3.2 above.

standard variety to a diaglossic repertoire (a more fluid repertoire – cf. section 5.3). Both the diaglossic and the diglossic repertoire may lead to dialect loss, although they do so through different mechanisms of erosion vs. shift. This type of a model enables one to compare seemingly non-comparable situations, ranging from the type of a situation where dialects thrive and the standard language hardly plays a role in the verbal repertoire, to situations where there is almost nothing left of the traditional dialects and where merely some style-shifting occurs between the standard variety and a regional standard.

In the model developed by BERRUTO (part of which has already been sketched in section 5.3 above), a distinction is drawn between language system and language use. On the level of the language system, convergence (which grows in the course of time) or advergence (see note 1) takes the form of interference. On the level of language use convergence or advergence manifest themselves as code-switching and code-mixing. Both interference and code-mixing lead to *hybridisation*, which can, in turn, either lead to complete advergence of one of the dialects involved, to the convergence of all dialects involved (which Berruto equates with the development of a mixed system), or to language shift.

One of the questions that arises, is whether, and to what degree, these models are mutually compatible. Another question is how general these models are. A third question is if and how these models can account for such phenomena as dialect levelling independent of a standard language, tripolar continua (Villena-Ponsoda 1996), the three types of koineisation sketched by Sobrero (1996; section 3.2.3, above), and the like. A fourth, equally important, question is how the basic notions underlying these models are defined and how they can be operationalised in empirical research.

6 Design and Goal of this Volume

In this concluding section, we will outline the rationale underlying the general design of this volume.

There is a general conviction that processes of linguistic change are ‘multi-causality’ phenomena (cf. section 5.8 above). It is unlikely that processes which result in dc or dd are exceptions to this general rule. Typically, innovations will have either internal (structural and language-specific, more general, or universal) or external (contact-induced) sources. Additionally, extra-linguistic factors play a part, including large-scale (sociological) as well as smaller scale (social-psychological, psychological, and interactional) factors. Moreover the proportions in which the several types of factors exert their influence vary from case to case – though usually not as causes in the strict sense, but as guiding, promoting, or restraining factors.

We have grouped the chapters in this volume according to these general insights. While the chapters in Part I deal with a range of issues in connection

with internal factors, the chapters in Parts 2 and 3 focus on social issues. Macrosocial dimensions are central in Part 2, while microsocial dimensions are dealt with in Part 3. The chapters all have a similar structure: after a survey of the main literature and a brief discussion of the principal insights, the authors present an example of their own research.

The aim of each chapter is to discuss critically and test some of the specific insights of our field, and thus reach a more general level of description and explanation in dc and dd. The book achieves this by focusing, on the one hand, on sociolinguistic and dialect geographical issues and, on the other, on linguistic description and theory. In so doing, it shows the fullest range of external and extra-linguistic factors that can lead to dialect change, and illustrates the wide range of approaches to dc and dd taken by scholars in the field. The book also shows that an understanding of linguistic structure, informed by theory, gives us insights into what is frequently, and what is less frequently, subject to contact- or isolation-induced change. Especially with respect to the linguistic aspects, the overall aim is to proceed from the *idiographic* level, i.e. the level of the description of unique, particular, situation-specific findings regarding single dialect features, to the *nomothetic* level, the level of general, preferably universal, principles underlying processes resulting in dc and dd.