1. A methodological preliminary
- convergence, stability and divergence are relational concepts
- hence real time (diachronic) or apparent time ('micro-diachronic') data required for at least one of the language systems studied

2. Some key notions

Language contact, dialect contact
- Language contact
  - maintenance
  - shift
  - creation of a new language
- Dialect contact

Dialect contact
- convergence – divergence
- cross-dialectal dimension (horizontal) – dialect-standard dimension (vertical)

Dialect-standard dimension
- cross-dialectal convergence as a side-effect of dialect-standard convergence (Sobrero 1996: ‘passive koineisation’)
- cross-dialectal divergence as a side-effect of convergence towards different standard languages (D – G) / different varieties of the standard language (NLs – Flanders)
Hyperdialectisms; 1

- by L2 speakers: over-application of a dialect feature in contexts where it does not ‘belong’ historically

Phonetics vs. phonology

- /r/ and variable /r/-vocalisation by ethnic Italians in Philadelphia (Labov 2001):
  - phonetic quality of ‘constricted’ /r/ identical to that of AmE = convergence
  - post-vocalic realisation (‘vocalisation’) differs from that of AmE = divergence

Hyperdialectisms; 2

- by L1 speakers: in order to dissociate;
  ‘polarisation’ (Hock 1991)
  e.g. naboooposisjon (Larsen 1917)
Method

- apparent time method: representatives of three different age groups
- per speaker three different types of data: elicitation, in-group conversations, out-group conversations

Table 1. Some main findings from the elicited data
Cross-dialectal convergence and dialect-standard divergence

in the case of the loss of
- ‘Ach-laut’ allophony:
  surviving ːçː vs. standard ːxː all over
- non-palatalisation of epenthetic ːsː in allomorph of diminutive suffix following velars:
  [] all over the place in onset clusters

4. r-lessness in three groups of Dutch dialects

The (historical) deletion of postvocalic /r/ before coronal obstruents in dialects of Dutch, e.g. in dialect variants of standard Dutch

(1) kort  'short'
     woord  'word'
     baard  'beard'
     beurs  'wallet; stock market'
     koorts  'fever'
     eerst  'first'
     worst  'sausage'

A quantitative diachronic study

Method

Data from
- Reeks Nederlandse Dialectatlassen (RND)
  fieldwork between 1925 (South-West) and the mid sixties (North);
  1956 local dialects;
  135 sentences plus isolated words and paradigms;
  narrow phonetic transcriptions
- Goeman-Taeldeman-vanReenenproject (GTR)
  fieldwork between roughly 1980 and 1995;
  631 dialects of Dutch and Frisian;
  1854 words and 22 sentences;
  narrow phonetic transcriptions;
  digitized, database accessible through website Meertens Instituut;
  source of Fonologische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten
  and Morfologische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten
Some overlap between RND and GTR as regards:
- local dialects
- lexical items

For this study: overlapping RND- and GTR-data for:
- 50 dialects: 16 North-East, 17 Centre, 17 South-East
- Choice of dialect areas based on maps 187-190 of FAND vol. 4 (hart, kort, baard, dors).

... and overlapping RND- and GTR-data for 9 lexical items;
- monomorphemic and monosyllabic

Choice of items balanced for five phonological parameters:
- preceding vowel: back – front,
- preceding vowel: low – non-low
- preceding vowel: rounded – not rounded
- preceding vowel: V – VV (or lax - tense)
- following coda obstruent(s): C – CC

Map 8. rlessness in three groups of Dutch dialects
Some main findings

Table 2

Figure 1. Real time change in the overall proportions of r-lessness in three groups of Dutch dialects

effects token frequency, type frequency?

- deletion:
  - conditioned sound change (still productive or lexicalized) or dialect borrowing restoration of R
  - re-lexicalization with the standard variants
5. Amsterdam ‘grave’ /s/

Map 9. Amsterdam ‘grave’ /s/

Prins (1916: 3, 9):
Yiddish dying, but not without leaving traces behind

“There is a variety of Dutch, that only Jews know,
and there is a variety of Yiddish that can pass for
Yiddish only in the Netherlands.”

Jewish German (Ree 1844; Matras 1991):
transfer of sibilants, i.e. the mixing up of ‘hushers’ and
‘hissers’ (next to a number of morpho-syntactic and
prosodic traits)

‘ghetto-pronunciation’ of Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>transliterated</th>
<th>standard Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stjerne</td>
<td>sterven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stlinkende</td>
<td>stinkende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunst</td>
<td>kunst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post</td>
<td>post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winkler (1874) and Prins (1916):
in the main Jewish neighbourhood in Amsterdam, Jewish Dutch also used to be spoken by non-Jews / Christians

Den Besten (2006):
in Dutch Bargoens (thieves’ cant) /z/ in originally Yiddish / Hebrew words was sometimes devoiced, while /s/ was sometimes palatalized and /ʃ/ was sometimes depalatalized
Merely ‘circumstantial evidence’

6. Two dimensions of ethnolectal variation in the realisation of /z/

‘The roots of ethnolects. An experimental comparative study’

Conceived and supervised by Pieter Muysken (Nijmegen) and Frans Hinskens (Amsterdam)

Financed 2005-2009 by
- Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO),
- Meertens Instituut, and
- Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

2005 and 2006:
Esther van Krieken (Nijmegen) and Wouter Kusters (Amsterdam)
2007-2009:
Hanke van Buren (Nijmegen) and Arien van Wijngaarden (Amsterdam)
2009 – 2011:
Linda van Meel (Nijmegen and Amsterdam) and Arien van Wijngaarden (Amsterdam)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>city</th>
<th>total n of inhabitants</th>
<th>Moroccan descent (%)</th>
<th>Turkish (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>742 783</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>158 215</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Three demographic facts about two Dutch cities

Method and design

Factorial design:

a) speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>city</th>
<th>main lg background</th>
<th>age group</th>
<th>12 years old</th>
<th>18 to 20 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>2x3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>native Dutch + 'ethnic ties'</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>native Dutch - 'ethnic ties'</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijmegen</td>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>native Dutch + 'ethnic ties'</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>native Dutch - 'ethnic ties'</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Speaker design
b) four recordings of every single speaker (except for the ones in the native Dutch with weak ‘ethnic ties’ group):
- conversation with a speaker whose main Ig background is Moroccan
- native Dutch with strong ‘ethnic ties’
- individual elicitation

Some features of Moroccan and Turkish Dutch
(morpho-) syntax
phonology / phonetics
exotic as well as local / regional dialect
more different variants

variation in the realisation of /z/:
endogenous: devoicing
exotic: overlength
‘sharp’ realisation
regressive voice assimilation to a preceding obstruent
‘super-diversity’

Some main findings from the conversational data
researcher:
Linda van Meel (Radboud Universiteit / Meertens Instituut)
Voicing

Findings

Figure 3 Mean voicing of /z/ for D, T and M speakers, split for context and interlocutor.

7. Sizing up

Table 5

Table 6

Thank you!