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The existence of a fork in the road does not in itself lead to divergence, since, under continual contact between the neighboring dialects, the principle of accommodation may lead to a resolution of the opposition in one direction or another, and to eventual convergence.
(Labov 2010: 156)

The paper opens with a discussion of some key notions; in this connection a proposal is made to distinguish two different types of hyperdialectism. Subsequently, a two-pronged hypothesis and a methodological consideration are presented. Attention will then be paid to four different studies of non-standard varieties of present-day Dutch. Three of these concern endogenous dialects, the fourth one deals with two modern ethnolects; in the presentation of the dialect studies, the geographical perspective will gradually widen. In all four studies, attention will focus on instances of variation and change in the sound components which can be analyzed as divergence. Finally, the findings from the cases studied will be discussed against the background of the hypothesis. Special attention will be paid to the role the two types of hyperdialectisms may have played and to a recent proposal by Labov.

1. Introduction

Divergence between closely related dialects seems to be the marked case. Before presenting both the hypothesis leading this study of dialect divergence and a methodological consideration, attention will be paid to some key concepts. In
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connection with the key concept of dialect divergence, a proposal will be made to distinguish two different types of hyperdialectism, both of which will be succinctly discussed and illustrated with relevant work by, among others, Johan Taeldeman and William Labov (the only non-Dutch case to be briefly discussed in this paper), respectively.

This contribution will then zoom in on four different studies of specific (groups of) non-standard varieties of present-day Dutch. Three of these varieties are domestic ("dialects"), the other is partly exotic in origin ("ethnolect"); in the presentation of the dialect studies, the geographical angle will gradually widen. In all cases, attention will focus on instances of variation and change in the sound components (phonetics, phonology and morpho-phonology) which can be analyzed as divergence. For each case, the question will be addressed to which extent internal factors can be shown to be at work and to which extent the contact situation may have given rise to the developments observed. With regard to the contact situation, a distinction will be drawn between (external) linguistic and social psychological forces.

Finally, a modest attempt will be made to synthesize the findings and insights from the six cases discussed against the background of the hypothesis. The question will also be considered how the two types of hyperdialectism distinguished may play role in the cases of divergence discussed. Finally, some issues for future research will be sketched.

2. Some key notions

In situations of long-lasting, intensive dialect contact, dialects can converge or diverge as the result of processes of change in one or more of the dialects involved. *Dialect convergence* can be defined as the increase in similarity between dialects, with "partial similarities increasing at the expense of differences" (Weinreich 1954:395). Processes leading to convergence affect the structure of (dialect or standard) varieties and thus that of the diasytem and linguistic repertoires they are part of; these processes result in unification, focusing and homogenization of the linguistic repertoire. This can include the emergence of koines. A *koine* is a lingua franca which incorporates features of various dialects; koines mostly develop through dialect mixing, simplification and reduction (cf. Siegel 1985, 2001; Trudgill 1986; Hinskens, Auer and Kerswill 2005:11). A koine is thus a compromise dialect. In the processes which give rise to koines, reduction consists of the elimination of the most peculiar features of the constituent dialects; typically these are local features, but of course features can also be involved which are specific to different community types, such as neighborhoods. Siegel (2001)
Distinguishes between regional koines and immigrant koines. The latter typically develop in extra muros situation (language islands or dialect islands); the present contribution will be confined to intra muros situations and hence to the potential formation of regional koines.

_Dialect divergence_ is a decrease in similarity between dialects, which amounts to linguistic diversification, growing diffuseness and heterogenization – although it may lead to focusing in a repertoire, making the surviving varieties more distinct from each other. The study of divergence and diversity is, in a sense, complementary to the quest for formal language universals, "those constant properties of language that reflect the innate biological endowment of the human species – the language faculty" (Labov 2010: 4).

Convergence and divergence are relational concepts, affecting the degree of structural distance between dialects. Divergence as such exits just as little as convergence; divergence and convergence do not constitute autonomous, separate types of linguistic change in themselves. Divergence and convergence are epiphenomena which are rooted in relatively common processes of language change and attrition. Processes of linguistic change resulting in divergence or convergence are sometimes internally motivated (and typically structurally directional, such as simplification, regularization, and paradigmatic levelling). The most stable or resistant parts of the language system tend to be fully productive phenomena that speakers are not too aware of, such as, e.g. 'late' phonology (postlexical processes) and phonetics proper (phonetic implementation; cf. Hinskens 1992, 1998). However, external motivations, particularly those pertinent to contact with other varieties of the same language, and extra-linguistic mechanisms are usually important driving forces.

As a result of dialect contact, convergence and/or divergence can occur in the _cross-dialectal_ dimension (horizontal) and/or in the _dialect-standard_ dimension (vertical). These dimensionalties may constitute a vector field. In the structural space between the traditional dialects and the standard language, which used to maintain a diglossic (Ferguson 1959) relationship, continua of subtly different intermediate varieties can develop (cf. Bellmann's 1996 _diaglossia_); the various intermediate varieties form a continuum between the traditional dialects and the standard variety. For this fan of older and younger, make-shift varieties and variants the Dutch dialectologist Hoppenbrouwers (1983) coined the notion of _regiolect_. In his paper, Hoppenbrouwers presents his findings of a study of changes in the old three gender system of a small group of East-Brabantine dialects of Dutch, showing how the gradual erosion of the gender system (both adnominally and pronominally) is giving way to the common-neuter two-gender system of standard Dutch; the various intermediate varieties form a continuum between the traditional dialects and standard Dutch. Meanwhile, many use the notion of regiolect to refer to cross-dialectal convergence or koineisation (hence not to dialect – standard convergence).
Obviously, dialect divergence can be brought about or catalyzed by political borders. At least three different types of border constellation can be distinguished. In one type, almost the same standard language is spoken on both sides of the border. In a second type, the border separates language areas with different but related standard languages and in the third constellation type, a dialect area is divided by a border on one side of which it is 'roofed' by the corresponding standard language and on the other side it is 'roofless' because an unrelated standard language is spoken (cf. Auer & Hinskens 1996; Hinskens et alii. 2000). The larger Dutch dialect landscape has borders of all three types of constellation (Hinskens 2006:7–11, 19).

The same typology of border constellations is the main organizational principle of Harnisch’s (2010) excellent overview of recent research on dialect divergence in “the Continental West Germanic language space and its neighboring areas”, discussing not only structural developments, but also ‘(socio-) pragmatic’ divergence (which “concerns the composition and the structure of the repertoire of varieties and the domains of their use”) and attitudinal divergence (276; 290).

Empirical studies of changes in the dialect-standard dimension (not only for the Dutch language area) have made increasingly clear that cross-dialectal convergence can be a side-effect of dialect-standard convergence – a mechanism which Sobrero (1996) has referred to as 'passive koinization'. Alternatively, cross-dialectal divergence can be a side-effect of convergence towards different standard languages, the first of the three types of border constellation sketched above. With regard to the Dutch/German situation, studies by Kremer (1990), Hinskens (199x) and Giesbers (2008) have added considerably to the insight that, as a consequence of the erosion of old dialect continua, the state border is gradually developing into a dialect border.

Hyperdialectism can add to dialect divergence, although this may not hold for every type of hyperdialectism. With respect to divergence, it may be useful to distinguish at least two different types. The first type of hyperdialectism is introduced by native (L1) speakers and it typically serves to dissociate; the mechanism has also been referred to as ‘polarization’. It is a mechanism which can act defensively, by slowing down 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). It results in obvious divergence from related other dialects. It would seem that, for polarization to occur, there are two preconditions regarding the speakers: (i) a certain level of awareness of the dialect feature concerned, and (ii) negative or at least non-integrative attitudes towards the speakers of the relevant neighboring dialect(s). Cf. Kühle & Braünnmüller (this volume: 34): “The effort it takes to act in a linguistically divergent manner in language contact situations presupposes strong motivation and a certain degree of linguistic awareness by these speakers”.

(1997)
An example concerning Norwegian, more in particular dialects of the inner Sogn area in Norway, has become famous as 'nabo-oposisjon', lit. 'neighbor opposition' (Larsen 1917 – cf. Trudgill 1988). Polarization may have played a role in the history of Hiberno-English (cf. Hinskens, Kallen and Taelman 2000: 4).

Another example is from the Dutch language area and it stems from a study by Taelman from 2006. In the (north-) western part of Belgium, the West-Flemish and East-Flemish dialects are spoken.

\[
\text{[a] from Middle Dutch ii (e.g. ijs /'ice')}
\]
\[
\text{[i] from Middle Dutch uu (e.g. huis /'house')}
\]
\[
\text{[y] from Middle Dutch oe (< Gm. ø) before [-alv.] C (e.g. broek /'trousers')}
\]

to the east: diphthongisation
area with overdiphthongisation

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Map 1. East Flemish overdiphthongization} \\
\text{As is clear from the diatopic type of information on Taelman's map, the West-Flemish dialects have conserved the old West Germanic high vowels, whereas the East-Flemish dialects (and standard Dutch) have lowered and diphthongized these vowels. In the shaded area, which borders the West-Flemish dialect area, overdiphthongization has occurred; the first, prominent elements of the diphthongs have been lowered further. Examples are:}
\end{align*}
\]
The latter variants display diphthongization of historical vowel categories which did not diphthongize elsewhere. Taeldeman (2006: 239–241) discusses this case in a paper on polarization, hence as something the speakers do deliberately in order to dissociate from the speakers of West-Flemish, hence for social-psychological, identity-related reasons. What Taeldeman does not discuss in his 2006 paper (but is well aware of) is the fact that the lowering of the first, prominent element of this diphthong can simultaneously be motivated internally; in view of the historical developments of the (front un rounded as well as back rounded) diph thongs in German and English as well as certain non-contiguous dialects of Dutch (Van Oostendorp 2013: 407), this dialect-specific change may well be a matter of drift ( Sapir 1921) taking effect with phase differences across languages and, here, closely related language varieties.

This first type of hypercorrection results from speakers overdoing a phonetic or linguistic difference (a feature of their own dialect) in reaction to speakers of related, yet slightly different varieties lacking the feature.

Another type of hypercorrection originates in non-native (L2) speakers or semi-speakers, who sometimes over-apply a dialect feature in contexts where it does not ‘belong’ historically. These speakers “do not know any better: their analysis of the target variety is faulty” and for that reason they extend a given phenomenon “into words where it is not historically justified” (Trudgill 1988: 551, 553).

An example from the Limburg dialect area is

(2) plur. bl[œː]r for traditional bl[œː]r sing. blad ‘leaf(s)’
                    r[œː]r          r[œː]r        blad ‘wheel(s)’

Here umlaut is applied in an item which did not have this historically. The relevant dialect does have nouns which are pluralized exactly with the combination of the suffix -<a>l and umlaut of the stem vowel (Hinskens 1992: Section 5.3.18), such as lœːk – lœːkəl ‘hole(s)’.

Sound changes and morphological operations can lose their productivity before reaching lexical saturation, become lexically stored and hence distributed in an unpredictable way, resulting in “non-systematic but recurrent” facts (Lloret 1997), as in the case of umlaut pluralization. It can be theoretically argued and empirically demonstrated that hyperdialectisms of the second type, which are a consequence of the fact that “speakers prefer inter-systematically equivalent forms or patterns” (Kühl & Braunmüller this volume: 11), can only occur with rules or
processes which are no longer productive, in other words in rules or processes which have been grammatically or lexically frozen. In these and similar cases there is one-way traffic:

(3) dialect X: \( a \rightarrow \) dialects Y and Z: \( b \)

but not necessarily vice versa:

*dialects Y and Z: \( b \rightarrow \) dialect X: \( a \)

since \( b \) in Y and Z can also correspond to \( c \) in X. Hence, the incidence of \( a \) in X is a subset of the incidence of \( b \) in Y and Z. For the lexical set at issue, the diatopic system can be formulated as:

\[
(3') \frac{x /a \sim c/}{y, z /b/}
\]

Therefore this type of hyperdialectism is not to be expected in connection with postlexical phonological or phonetic processes, which after all are lexically exceptionless.

Like intermediate variants, hyperdialectisms of this second type occur in make-shift dialect varieties. An example is what Hoppenbrouwers (1990: 124) has referred to as Gevelbrabants, lit. ’façade Brabantine’, visible in the names which owners (especially if they are speakers of another dialect) give to their restaurants, bars and similar places in order to add to the suggestion of the place’s authenticity; an example is *Den ouden tramhalte* (*The old tramstop’, in which the head, *tramhalte*, is treated as if it were grammatically masculine) instead of *D’aauw tramhalte*, which is grammatically well-formed in the relevant dialects. Another example (from Swanenberg 2009) is diminutive *clubske* for traditionally well-formed *clubke*, standard Dutch *clubje*, ’little club’. This variant definitely has a Brabantish ring to it and it may well be used to flag the (claim to) Brabant identity of the speaker. However, the authentic dialect variant of the diminutive would not have the -ske allomorph, which merely occurs following stems ending in a velar. Hyperdialectisms of this type have also been reported for the local Hollandic dialect of the old fishermen’s town of Katwijk by De Vink (2004).

---

2. Cf. Chambers’ (1992) ‘complex’ phonological rules; Hinskens (2007:287). Other historical causes for the unpredictability of the distribution of sound correspondences can be the paradigm shift of individual items, phonemic mergers or splits and competing sound laws.


4. Or Limburg, for that matter.
In some cases, hyperdialectisms of the second type seem to be gaining ground, thus ousting the traditional dialect variants. As in the Netherlands and Flanders it is no longer self-evident for parents to raise their children in the local dialect, many children acquire the dialect at later stages in their development or even as an L2 (cf. Kühl & Braunmüller this volume: 8). The resulting incomplete acquisition feeds into the spread of hyperdialectisms. For the East-Flemish dialect of Dutch spoken in Maldegem, Rys et al. (2012: 81–82) find that in the second dialect production of teenagers the number of *overgeneralisations*, 'overgeneralisations', specifically hyperdialectisms of the second type, displays a significant positive relationship with the number of 'enemy neighbours', i.e. items which are phonologically similar in the standard variety but not in the dialect – in other words, in items which fall outside of the diastematic correspondence. These are the items in which given historical phonological changes have not been lexicalized in the dialect at issue.

The development and spread of make-shift dialect varieties and regiolects seems to thrive partly because of the mutual boosting of both types of hyperdialectism. Cf. Vandekerckhove's (2013) observations regarding Zeeland dialects of Dutch: "A polarizing feature like the [subject] use of object *ons* 'us', which has functioned as a well-known marker of the Zeeland dialects for a long time (cf. stereotypes like *aans bin zowig* 'we are economical' / 'we live frugally'), forms a good breeding ground for the creation of (analogous) hyperdialectisms [...]. People tend to exploit features which distinguish their dialect from that of the neighbouring dialects to enhance the polarization. Moreover, imperfect dialect acquisition by the younger generations may have been an extra trigger for the observed pronoun shift" (Vandekerckhove 2013: 206). Lenz (2003a: 207–211) analyses hyperdialectisms for the Mosel Franconian dialects of German spoken in the Wittlich area, but she does not report similar tendencies, arguing that hyperdialectisms "have no real chance of becoming part of the dialectal system" (2003b: 287).

Ethnolectal variation sometimes originates in mechanisms which are typical for second language acquisition. The realization of the English liquid /t/ by ethnic Italians in Philadelphia (Labov 2001) is a case of ethnolectal variation where the distinction between convergence and divergence is not clear-cut. The ethnic Italians have introduced an allophony which does not exist in most other dialects of American English: in the speech of the members of this group, the phonetic quality of 'constricted' (roughly: retroflex approximant) /t/ as [ɹ] is identical to that of standard American English (convergence), yet the 'vocalized' post-vocalic realization differs from that of American English (a matter of divergence "beneath the surface" – Kaufmann 2010: 484). E.g.

'vocalized'
with constricted and 'vocalised' realization or final /r/, respectively. In the Philadelphia dialect of American English (as in most other varieties of American English), vocalization of postvocalic /r/ does not occur. One might add the interpretation that distributionally, the ethnolectal patterning may be a trace of the phonology of Italian /r/, which is more sonorous than the (American) English one.

In this section, some of the key terminology has been succinctly discussed. In that connection a general distinction was proposed between two types of hyperdialectism. The first type is intentionally introduced by native (L1) speakers; it consists of the deliberate incrementation of the phonetic or linguistic extent of a variable phenomenon, resulting in developments diametrically opposed to what is found in other dialects. It typically serves to polarize, i.e., to dissociate from speakers of related, yet subtly different varieties lacking the phenomenon. The second type of hypercorrection originates in incomplete acquisition by non-native (L2) speakers or semi-speakers, including children acquiring the dialect at later stages in their development. It consists of the unintentional over-application of a dialect feature in contexts where it does not 'belong' historically. This type of hyperdialectism is not to be expected in connection with productive phenomena, such as postlexical phonological or phonetic processes, which after all are lexically exceptionless. Which role does the distinction between both types of hyperdialectism, which were illustrated with cases of divergence documented in recent studies of specific varieties of Dutch and American English, exactly play in processes of divergence?

In Sections 4 through 7, four more cases of lectal divergence will be discussed in more detail; the first three concern endogenous dialects of Dutch, the fourth one concerns emerging ethnolects of Dutch. Subsequently, in Section 8 an attempt will be made to systematically compare and synthesize the findings from the studies discussed. First, the hypothesis will be presented guiding this study.

3. A two-pronged hypothesis and a methodological preliminary

In language contact, convergence seems to be the default case; it is almost as if it is divergence that calls for an explanation. Cf. Labov's view that "we are not surprised when neighboring dialects converge. [...] However, when two groups
of speakers living side by side, in daily communication, begin to speak differently from one another, we encounter a type of divergence that calls for an explanation" (Labov 2010: 5), in Chapter 1 of volume 3 of his Principles of Linguistic Change, part B (Chapters 5–12) of which is devoted to dialect divergence. The types of explanation which will be considered in this contribution are internal (i.e. structural), external (contact-induced) and social psychological (the attitudes towards the speakers of the dialect or language involved in the contact). The two-pronged hypothesis will be considered that (a) divergence is a multi-causality phenomenon (cf. Dressler 1986:520), and (b) if they apply, social psychological mechanisms do not stand alone. Findings from recent empirical studies of modern non-standard varieties of Dutch will allow the hypotheses to be tested.

As argued in Section 2 above, convergence and divergence are relational concepts. Therefore in connection with the question whether convergence or divergence has occurred, i.e. whether or not two or more linguistic systems have become more similar or dissimilar, real time (diachronic) or apparent time ('micro-diachronic') data are required for at least one of the systems studied. In each of the four studies which will be discussed below this requirement is fulfilled.

4. Dialect leveling in Limburg

Limburg is a hamlet in the far south-east of the Dutch language area, in the Dutch province of Limburg. It is located next to the Dutch/German state border.

Limburg is the easternmost, relatively isolated part of the village of Ubach over Worms. Map 3 shows the area in a bit more dialect-geographic detail. The main detail is the fact that there are three groups of dialects to be distinguished, here labeled A, B and C.

The data for the study of processes of dialect leveling in Limburg were collected using the apparent time method with representatives of three different age groups. Per speaker three different types of data were recorded: elicitation, ingroup converzations and out-group converzations. The data pertain to dialect features of three types and the types are directly to the three dialect groups distinguished on the map of the area. Features of the type A merely occur in dialect group A, B-type features occur in dialect groups A and B, while C-type features occur in dialect groups A, B and C. So going from dialect group C via B to dialect group A the features stack up to form a terrace-shaped dialect landscape (German 'Staffellandschaft'; cf. Frings in Aubin et alii 1926; Frings 1957); the A-type features have the smallest areal spread.
Table 1 summarizes some of the main findings for the elicited dialect use. (The converzational data were analysed for three dialect features only; the related findings will not be discussed here. Cf. Hinskens 1992.)

As appears from the findings summarized under ‘loss – overall’, in all three types there are features which are in the process of being leveled out as well as features which are not. The latter features (marked by a ‘-‘ symbol) seem to be stable. The proportion of relatively stable dialect features increases with their geographical spread (A: 1/5, B: 3/7, C: 6/9); hence the further a feature is geographically spread, the more resistant it tends to be. This poses a hen-and-egg problem: are these phenomena more resistant because of their relatively generous areal distribution or do they have a wide areal distribution because of their resistance? In the latter case, the resistance must have an independent explanation.

The erosion of the majority of the features with the smallest geographical distribution will eventually make the local Rimburg dialect to merge with the surrounding B-type dialects into a regional koine, which (given the loss of a good
number of B-type features) in turn may as such be in the process of being absorbed into a larger C-type Limburg koine.

Among the eleven features which appear to be undergoing structural dialect loss there are two phenomena, namely the A-type features 'Ach-laut/Ich-laut' allophony (5) and the non-palatalization of epenthetic /s/ in the diminutive allomorph which occurs following velars, as in (6)

\[\begin{align*}
A & \text{-type dialects} & B & \text{-type dialects} \\
(5) & \text{tś lač} & \text{tś lać} & \text{‘I laugh’} \\
(6) & \text{kvkskə} & \text{kvakə} & \text{‘cake-DIM’}
\end{align*}\]

the leveling out of which result in both convergence and divergence: convergence towards the surrounding B-type dialects and divergence from the standard language. In the case of the loss of the 'Ach-laut/Ich-laut' allophony, palatal /ç/
Table 1. An overview of the findings regarding the apparent time loss of dialect features in the elicited speech material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>overall</th>
<th>LOSS? conditions</th>
<th>dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ach-laut' allophony</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>0/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ'-weakening</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l-lowering</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dorsal fricative deletion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s] in dimin. suffix</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-deletion</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>5/13</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-deletion</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deriv. suffix -'iij'</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V preter. suffix weak verbs</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V prefixless past participles</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V subjunctive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V strong/irreg. – weak conjug.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-deletion</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0/11</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sandhi voicing</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0/30</td>
<td>0/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deriv. suffix -'da'</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absence inflectional shwa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun pluralization</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5/25</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V strong/irreg. – weak conjug.</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V stem V 2 &amp; 3 sing.prel.indic.</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblique form of certain pronouns</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expletive element</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and its voiced counterpart /γl/, the voiced palatal velar fricative, survive and take over all environments; acoustically, these segments contrast quite strongly with ubiquitous standard Dutch /x, γl/. As a result of the loss of the non-palatalization of /s/ in the allomorph of the diminutive suffix following velars, the dialect will ultimately have [JJ] all over the place in onset clusters and this allomorph of the diminutive suffix no longer constitutes an exception. In the standard language the diminutive suffix -ko and its allomorph -ska do not occur, let alone the palatalization of /s/ in onset clusters.

This is the relief perspective which emerges from analyses of data regarding a large set of features of one single local dialect. What is the picture that arises from analyses of data for a multitude of related dialects? In the following section, the geographical angle will be widened to 50 different local dialects of Dutch.
5. r-less in three groups of Dutch dialects

Several different groups of Dutch dialects stand out by the deletion of postvocalic /r/ before coronal obstruents. Examples are the dialect variants of standard Dutch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>kort</th>
<th>kɔt</th>
<th>'short'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>woord</td>
<td>woɔt</td>
<td>'word'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>baard</td>
<td>bɔrt</td>
<td>'beard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beurs</td>
<td>bœrɔʃ</td>
<td>'wallet; stock market'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>koorts</td>
<td>koɔrts</td>
<td>'fever'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eerst</td>
<td>eɾst</td>
<td>'first'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worst</td>
<td>wuɔst</td>
<td>'sausage'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second column in (7) contains broad phonetic transcriptions of the variants of the dialect of Rimburg (Section 4 above) as well as the dialects in the transition zone between Ripuarian and East-Limburg dialects of Dutch; some items (in these dialects e.g. the variant of standard Dutch koorts) are not r-less.

Evidently, as far as the left-hand environment is concerned, the deletion occurred after both tense and lax vowels, after back and front vowels, after rounded and unrounded vowels. In many Limburg dialects of Dutch (including the subset of r-deleting ones), items such as eerst, beurs and worst have a high vowel; hence deletion occurred after high, mid and low vowels. As far as the right-hand environment is concerned, the deletion took place preceding both voiced and voiceless stops, preceding fricatives and preceding both single and complex coda's.

In dialects in which the process has been lexicalized in the environment before an obstruent, hyperdialectsisms of the second type occur (cf. Hinskens 2007: 287); in the dialects illustrated in (7), [koɔrts] for standard Dutch koorts, would be a hyperdialectism.

In order to find out more about change in the spread and conditioning of the phenomenon in the speech community at large, a quantitative diachronic study was carried out. The method consisted of the real time comparison of data from two major diatopic, questionnaire-based fieldwork projects carried out in the 20th century. The oldest one is the Reeks Nederlandse Dialectatlassen (RND), i.e. Series of Dutch Dialect Atlases. The data for this project were collected in fieldwork between 1925 (southwest) and the mid '60s (north). They concern 1956 different local dialects and consist of dialect translations of 135 sentences plus

---

6. The long periods of time that elapsed between the fieldwork for the different dialect regions constitute the Achilles heel of these data (and of RND generally). For the regions at issue, the fieldwork was carried out between 1930–'35 (Brabant), 1938–'48 (Limburg), 1947–'62 (the central dialects) and 1956–'61 (the north-eastern dialects).
isolated words and paradigms; the data are available in the form of narrow phonetic transcriptions. The youngest of the two studies is the Goeman-Taeldeman-van Reenen project (GTR). The data for this project were collected in fieldwork between roughly 1980 and 1995; they concern 613 different dialects of Dutch and Frisian and consist of dialect translations of 1854 words and 22 sentences. For this project, too, the data are available in the form of narrow phonetic transcriptions; they have been digitalized and the database is accessible through the website of the Meertens Instituut. Much of the data collected for GTR is the source of both the *Fonologische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten* (1998–2005), i.e. Phonological Atlas of the Dialects of Dutch, and the *Morfologische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten* (2005–2008), i.e. Morphological Atlas of the Dialects of Dutch.

There is some overlap and thus some limited direct comparability between RND and GTR as regards both local dialects and lexical items for which dialect variants were elicited. For the present study overlapping RND- and GTR-data have been used for 50 different dialects which together represent three parts of the Dutch language area; 16 dialects are spoken in the north-east (Lower Saxonian), 17 in the centre (Hollandic; western Brabantic), and 17 in the south-east (southeastern Brabantic; Limburgian). Most of the dialects in each of these three areas appear to be r-less in these items.

Map 4. Sampling points for r-lessness in three groups of Dutch dialects
From the lexical items for which RND- and GTR-data overlap 9 were chosen for the present study; all 9 items are monomorphemic and monosyllabic. The choice of items was balanced for five phonological parameters. They pertain to the quality of the preceding vowel (viz. the place of articulation of the preceding vowel: back or front and low or non-low, as well as roundedness versus unroundedness), to the quantity of the preceding vowel (V - VV) or to the number of following coda obstruents (C - CC).

The RND- and GTR-data for the realization of each of the 9 items in each of the 50 dialects were coded as '0' in case the /t/ is phonetically realized, even if only weakly, '1' in case both variants with and without phonetically realized /t/ were transcribed, and '2' for r-less variant(s). Moreover, the data were coded for the type of phonetic realization of /t/ in postvocalic position generally; in both sources two main types were distinguished, namely apical [r] and relatively velar or uvular [k].

Some main findings are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. The main findings for the analyses of r-lessness per factor group.
Legend: '-' = no significant effect, 'T' = trend towards significance (.05 < p < .1), '+' = significant effect (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preceding vowel</th>
<th>Following obstr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>back-front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correlation?7</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different level of r-lessness?8</td>
<td>front &gt; back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-lessness per factor group significantly affected by:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time x phon.fac.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time x phon.fac. x real. /t/</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time x phon.fac. x space</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. All (paired samples) correlations p = .000.
8. t = 3.911; df = 98; 2-tailed p = .000; t = -2.740; df = 99; 2-tailed p = .007.
9. Outcomes of ANOVAs with repeated measures with phonological factor group as within subjects variable and time (RND–GTR), phonetic realisation of /t/ and space (or region) as between subjects variables.
space x phonetic realization of /rt/: in the central and south-eastern dialects, r-lessness indexes are significantly higher in case /rt/ has an apical realization than in case it has a uvular realization the (north-eastern dialects only have apical [r]). This finding indicates that r-deletion, apart from simplifying the cluster, may additionally be an instantiation of the Obligatory Contour Principle, i.e. the general constraint prohibiting adjacent identical elements, in casu the feature [coronal]. The fact that the r-lessness indexes are significantly higher following front vowels than following back vowels may be an additional indication that r-deletion is originally an OCP-effect; it has been proposed that front vowels and coronal consonants are both specified [coronal] (e.g. Hume 1992).

The token frequency of the concerned items seems to play no or at best a marginal role. Insofar as token frequency plays a role, the effects are contrary to what usage-based approaches à la Bybee (2001) would predict. This also holds for type frequency, i.e. words which have a similar phonological shape, here: the number of monosyllabic words ending in an /r/ and a tautomorphemic coronal obstruent, specified for the phonological parameters mentioned above. Breaking down the analyses of the frequency effects for the three dialects groups hardly changes the picture and the support for usage-based approaches does not grow (Hinskens 2011a).

It appears, then, that in the north-eastern and central dialects r-deletion is a productive, conditioned and phonologically (OCP) motivated sound change, which makes the dialects diverge from standard Dutch. In the south-eastern dialect groups, in which r-deletion has presumably been lexicalised, the current restoration of /rt/ as /r/ or [x] seems to be rather a matter of re-lexicalization of the relevant items with the lexical representations of the standard variants.

This is the picture which arises from analyses of data for one single phenomenon in 50 different local dialects of Dutch. Which perspective do the analyses of data regarding multitudes of features of a vast amount of related dialects add? This question is central in the next section.

6. Homogenization of the dialect landscape and the effect of the Dutch-Belgian state border

In Section 2 it was briefly pointed out that recent research has shown that cross-dialectal convergence can be a side-effect of dialect-standard convergence, while cross-dialectal divergence can be a side-effect of convergence towards different standard languages. However, cross-dialectal divergence can also result from
convergence towards different varieties of the standard language. Strong evidence for this comes from Heeringa’s recent ‘From dialect to regiolect’ project (2007–2011, funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, NWO).

For this project, Heeringa did fieldwork, collecting comparable data for no fewer than 86 different local dialects of Dutch, both in the Netherlands and in Flanders, the northern part of Belgium. A growing number of studies (many of which are summarized in Geeraerts and Van de Velde 2013 and Haeseryn 2013) make plain that the Dutch language area is gradually becoming a pluricentric (Clyne 1992) or at least bicentric one. Thus today the Dutch-Belgian border constitutes a type of constellation one in which a slightly different standard language is spoken on both sides of the border.

In Heeringa’s research project, each local dialect was represented by at least two males aged 60 or older and two or more female speakers aged between 20 and 40. The groups are one generation apart. However, since older men generally speak relatively traditional dialect varieties while women tend to be ahead of men in terms of linguistic innovation, older male and younger female speakers are presumably at the extreme ends of a tradition-innovation scale.

An episode of the Charlie Chaplin movie ‘The Kid’ served as the basis of the recordings. The story was presented to the dialect speakers by way of stills from the movie as well as in narrative form, in written form in the standard variety. The episode can be regarded as a cross-section of plain, simple daily spoken language. The speakers were asked to write a dialect translation together, which they both (or all three or four) read aloud; both the older male and the younger female speakers operated in small groups. 13 of the total of 23 sentences, including a maximum of 125 words in the written standard Dutch version of the text and 90 different word types, were selected for analyses. Linguistically, the analyses concern aggregated (coded) data, as is commonly the case in dialectometry, rather than single linguistic variables or dialect features. Distances were calculated with the aid of the Levenshtein algorithm, with graded weights which are effectively segment distances. The algorithm was adapted to account for variation in vowel ‘quantity’, segmental modification (mainly palatalization and nasalization) and variation in syllabification.

Cluster analyses run on the Levenshtein distances (and more particular the so-called ‘elbow method’, the point from where onwards adding more clusters does not lead to an interesting increase in explained variance; cf. Heeringa and Hinskens 2015 for more details) made clear that, unlike morphology, for phonology and phonetics the numbers of dialect groups have decreased in apparent time. In the course of this overall process, the Dutch/Belgian state border, which was established as recently as 1830, seems to be developing into a watershed.
In the Maps 5 through 8, each dialect group is marked with its own symbol. Whereas analyses of the dialect morphology of older male speakers reveal 4 different dialect groups, the dialect morphology of the younger female speakers reveal 5 different dialect groups (Maps 5 and 6, respectively); in this respect, no homogenization is occurring – on the contrary. However, in phonological and phonetic respects, a reduction occurred from 13 different dialect groups in the speech of older males to 11 different dialect groups in the younger female speakers (Maps 7 and 8, respectively).

Map 5 (top left). Dialect groupings at the morphological level, obtained on the basis of variation measured among the transcriptions of the older males

Map 6 (bottom left). Dialect groupings at the morphological level, obtained on the basis of variation measured among the transcriptions of the younger females

Map 7 (top right). Dialect groupings at the level of the sound components, obtained on the basis of variation measured among the transcriptions of the older males

Map 8 (bottom right). Dialect groupings at the level of the sound components, obtained on the basis of variation measured among the transcriptions of the younger females
Notice how the dialect groups become more and more separated by the state border or, put differently, how they become increasingly specific to the Netherlands and the Flemish varieties of Dutch: both for morphology and for the sound components the number of dialect groups crossing the state border has shrunk from 3 (older male speakers) to 2 (younger female speakers). In the case of Flanders this is probably largely a matter of endonormative stabilization, the gradual acceptance of regional or local norms, "supported by a new locally rooted linguistic self-confidence", as Schneider (2007) calls it in the context of his Dynamic Model of Postcolonial Englishes.

In this and the previous two sections findings from analyses of data regarding (multitudes of) features of a vast amount of related traditional endogenous local dialects of Dutch were presented. What is the picture that emerges for ethnolects, i.e. dialects which also bear exotic marks (from substrate effects and general traits of L2 acquisition)? The next section will zoom in on two different ethnolectal varieties of modern Dutch.

7. Two dimensions of ethnolectal variation in the realization of /z/

The first Dutch research project which systematically pays attention to language contact and universal traits of second language acquisition as sources of synchronic variation is 'The roots of ethnolects. An experimental comparative study',11 The project focuses on synchronic variation in the speech of bilingual as well as monolingual native speakers of Dutch, on the speech of members of the 'white' majority as well members of two specific ethnic minority groups. The study zooms in on the emergence, position and social spread of two young ethnolects of Dutch in the cities of Amsterdam en Nijmegen.

They are spoken by second and third generation migrants of Turkish and Moroccan descent. Table 3 contains some relevant demographic facts (from 2005, the year the project and the fieldwork started) about the two cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total no of inhabitants</th>
<th>Moroccan descent (%)</th>
<th>Turkish descent (%)</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>

11. Conceived and supervised by Pieter Muysken (Nijmegen) and the present author. The project was financed 2005–2012 by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), Meertens Instituut, and Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Other researchers involved were/are Hanke van Buren (Nijmegen), Roeland van Hout (Nijmegen), Esther van Krieken (Nijmegen), Wouter Kusters (Amsterdam), Linda van Meel (Nijmegen and Amsterdam) and Arjen van Wijngaarden (Amsterdam).
The approach is language-centered rather than ethnographic (Hinskens 2011b: 113, 124). One set of research questions concerns the linguistic makeup of ethnolects: to which extent are they rooted in substrates, in phenomena that are typical of second language acquisition and in endogeneous non-standard varieties? Another set of questions concerns the place of the ethnolect in the verbal repertoires of its speakers. Yet other questions concern the spread of ethnolectal features to other ethnic groups.

The data for this project were collected such that they fit a factorial design, constituted by equal numbers of young male speakers from Amsterdam and Nijmegen, of three backgrounds: Moroccan, Turkish and ‘white’ Dutch and two age groups – with age group serving as an apparent time or cross-sectional operationalization of acquisition, one of the hypothesized roots of ethnolectal variation. The speakers with Moroccan and Turkish backgrounds grew up bilingually in the Netherlands; hence they are also native speakers of some variety of modern Dutch. Among the ‘white’ Dutch boys, a distinction is made between those with strong and those with weak or no network ties with boys from other ethnic groups. Cf. Table 4.

Except for the ‘white’ Dutch boys who have but few if any friends from other ethnic groups (‘weak inter-ethnic ties’), four recordings are being made of every single speaker; three recordings concern conversations, one with a speaker whose
main background is Moroccan, one with a speaker with a Turkish background and one with a 'white' Dutch boy with friends from other ethnic groups. Additional recordings of these speakers concern individual elicitation sessions.

Features of Moroccan and Turkish Dutch in the recorded data include variation in (morpho-) syntax (e.g. regarding gender marking in determiners, demonstratives and relativizers; the variable omission of functional elements such as object pronouns, subject pronouns, the locative and quantitative pronoun er) as well as phonology and phonetics (several speakers with a Turkish background nasalize any lax vowel preceding /n/ which is tautosyllabically followed by another consonant). The feature pool contains both exotic and local / regional dialect features; yet other features (e.g. concerning gender marking) are typical language acquisition phenomena. The number of different variants of prior-existing linguistic variables is sometimes higher than in indigenous varieties. E.g., the southern Dutch dialects (including the one spoken in Nijmegen) have a palatal realization of the velar fricative /ɣ/, whereas the western and northern dialects do not. The Turkish-Dutch and (even more so) Moroccan-Dutch speakers in our sample add uvular and pharyngeal realizations, thus widening the spectrum of variants.

The data show several different types of variation in the realization of the voiced and the voiceless coronal fricatives /z, s/. The variation in the realization of /z/ is partly endogenous, in that it is frequently devoiced into [s], which is fairly common in colloquial standard speech in a large part of the Dutch language area. Exotic variants include

- overlong [z:], although there is no phonemic length contrast in Dutch consonants. An utterance containing this variant is

(8) [z:]e wil nou niet 'she doesn't want now'

Mustapha (Moroccan-Dutch, 20 years old, Nijmegen)
- a 'sharp', dental realization, resulting in a 'hisser' with relatively much frication, hence [z] or, voiceless [s]. E.g.

(9) ik heb geen [z]in meer, man 'I don't feel like it anymore, dude'
Mustapha (Moroccan-Dutch, 20 years old, Nijmegen)

- regressive voice assimilation to a preceding obstruent as in

(10a) o[bz]ich — endogenous: o[ps]ich, <op zich> 'as such'
Mustapha (Moroccan-Dutch, 20 years old, Amsterdam)
(10b) nou moet i[gz]ien — endogenous: i[ks]ien <ik zien> 'now I must see'
Emre (Turkish-Dutch, 20 years old, Nijmegen)

This sandhi voicing of a preceding obstruent by a voiced fricative is very 'undutch' (it does not occur in any endogenous variety of modern Dutch) and quite salient to the Dutch ear. It may be supported by the phonology of Tarafit Berber, in which obstruent clusters are typically either voiced or unvoiced (McClellan 2008:58). The dental realization may be related to the fact that both Turkish and Moroccan Arabic have been described to have dental /z, s/; for references see Van Meel et alii. 2013.

The variation in the realization of /z/ thus shows 'super-diversity' in microcosmos. In what follows, attention will be confined to the variation in place of articulation (dental versus alveolar) as well as to the pharyngeal specification regarding voicing in the realization of /z/ in conversational speech by 37 speakers in the sample, evenly distributed over background, city and age group. All transcriptions, codings, acoustic measurements and statistical analyses were carried out by Linda van Meel MA.

Some of the main results for the 'sharp' versus plain (i.e. dental versus alveolar) realization of /z/ are visualized in Figure 2. The degree of 'sharpness' was measured on a scale ranging between 0 and 1.

The 'sharp', dental [z] does not occur in the speech of the 'white' Dutch speakers. There is no statistically significant difference between the two cities; there is one for the speakers' background, though ($F = 5.644, df = 2.25, p = .011$) and also for the interlocutors' background ($F = 6.722, df = 2.50, p = .003$). There is a complex interaction effect of city, speakers' background, and interlocutors' background ($F = 4.606, df = 4.50, p = .007$). The Moroccan-Dutch speakers (right-hand graph) in the two cities show the same pattern. Sharpness seems to be a stylistic marker for the Moroccan-Dutch, with a high peak in the curve for Moroccans talking to Moroccans – so the 'sharp' realization of Dutch /z/ may be a Moroccan in-group phenomenon. It thus appears that for Moroccan speakers of Dutch in Nijmegen, /z/ is subject to stylistic manipulation, i.e. the sharpness of [z] varies according to the situation, more in particular the background of the interlocutor, making it an instance of Bell's (1984) 'audience design'.
Figure 2. Mean sharpness of voiced /z/ by T speakers and M speakers, split for city and interlocutor.

The main aspects in the patterning of voicing of /z/ are visualized in Figure 3. The degree of voicing was measured on a scale ranging between 0 and 1; internally, the results are broken down for the natural class of the preceding segment.

'sharpeness' (dentality)
The ‘white’ Dutch speakers have systematically less voicing across the board; after obstruents, the ‘white’ Dutch hardly produce any voiced [z] at all, unlike the Turkish-Dutch and the Moroccan-Dutch. The Turkish-Dutch have the highest average scores on voicing (T = .2435, M = .2037) in this environment.

8. Sizing up and looking ahead

What does all this mean? How much support is there for the two-pronged hypothesis regarding the forces and mechanisms underlying divergence, presented in Section 3? Do the two types of hyperdialectism, distinguished in Section 2, play a role?

Table 5 summarizes per case the central aspects regarding the language components, phenomena or dialect features concerned, the language system or speech community which seems to constitute the negative pole of the divergence process, as well as the positive pole – i.e. the language system or speech community towards which convergence is taking place.

It appears that in almost all cases discussed, there is no divergence without concomitant convergence. In other words in most cases, divergence in one dimension implies convergence in another dimension (cf. Harnisch 2010:290; Kühl & Braunmüller this volume: 3).

Three types of motivation have been distinguished. Structural motivations are internal; cf. Andersen’s ‘evolutive innovations’, which are “entirely explainable in terms of the linguistic system that gave rise to it” (Andersen 1973:778). Contact-induced-motivations are external; they are a special type of Andersen’s ‘adaptive innovation’, i.e. the type of innovations which are “not explainable without reference to factors outside the linguistic system in question” and they usually affect differences between language systems. Adaptive innovations involve finality,
Table 5. Summarizing some central aspects for the cases discussed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
<th>Divergence</th>
<th>Convergence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Towards what/whom?</td>
<td>Towards what/whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taeldemann</td>
<td>reflexes W GMic high vs</td>
<td>West Flemish dialects of Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>successor ‘ach-laut’ allophone</td>
<td>standard Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>newly palatalised [j] in dim.</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allomorph</td>
<td>less ‘deep’ surrounding Limburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/Rimburg</td>
<td>deletion post-voc. /r/</td>
<td>standard Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>before coron. obstr. in NE and</td>
<td>idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Dutch dialect groups</td>
<td>r-deleting Dutch dialects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Leanness</td>
<td>morphology; sound comp.</td>
<td>contiguous dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbouring country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heeringa</td>
<td></td>
<td>stand. variety own country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnol. /z/</td>
<td>dental realization: [z]</td>
<td>(standard awa non-standard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sandhi voicing of prec. obstr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The possible motivations for divergence in these cases are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Summarizing aspects of the alleged motivation for divergence for each of the cases discussed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taeldemann</td>
<td>drift? [not discussed by author]</td>
<td>with less ‘deep’ Limburg dialects</td>
<td>dissociation</td>
<td>type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/Rimburg</td>
<td>/s/ in allomorph no longer exception to s-palatalization in clusters</td>
<td>With less ‘deep’ surrounding Limburg dialects</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Leanness</td>
<td>*COMPLEXCoda and OCP</td>
<td>With r-less dialects?</td>
<td>dissociation?</td>
<td>type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heeringa</td>
<td>With stand. variety in own country</td>
<td></td>
<td>type 1?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnol. /z/</td>
<td>Dental: no</td>
<td>Turkish awa MArabic</td>
<td>dissociation?</td>
<td>type 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhi voicing preceding obstr: no</td>
<td>Tarifit Berber?</td>
<td>type 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
whereas evolutive innovations do not. Social-psychological motivations typically pertain to attitudes towards the 'others', here: speakers of other varieties. The type of hyperdialectism involved (if any) is partly linked to the socio-psychological motivation type, but it also has autonomous dimensions.

Since Heeringa’s analyses concern aggregated (coded) data for 86 different local dialects rather than specific dialect features, most motivation types cannot be specified. The remaining four studies may allow the tentative discussion of some general trends.

First, structural properties of the relevant varieties of Dutch are never the only motivation for divergence to occur, as they invariably go hand in hand with other motivation types. In Mattheier’s (1996:36–37) conception, dialect convergence is mainly contact (i.e. externally) induced, while dialect divergence in the first place results from ‘indigenous innovations’ (my translation, FH) in one of the dialects. The latter result, in turn, from what Mattheier refers to as articular-perceptual or intrasystemic variation. Here, only Taeldeman, R/Limburg and r-lessness are clearly relevant to Mattheier’s claim. Although Taeldeman analyses the instance of polarization as a matter of attitudes, overall Mattheier’s claim is not contradicted. Second, contact, i.e. external motivations often play a role, though not always. In the case of the ethnolectal realization of /z/, it is not entirely evident that sandhi voicing of preceding obstruents may be rooted in Tarifit dialects of Berber, since it is the Turkish-Dutch rather than the Moroccan-Dutch who have the highest proportions. Third, socio-psychological motives only seem to play a role in situations in which internal and/or external factors apply, i.e. whenever a linguistic vehicle is already available. It can be established that both parts of the hypothesis are corroborated.

From the various studies discussed, whatever the type of variety and however narrow or wide the geographical perspective, there is converging evidence for the claims that (a) divergence often has external motivations which are usually ‘boosted’ by internal ones, and (b) social psychological forces presuppose internal and/or external motivations.

In Section 2 above a proposal was made to distinguish two types of hyperdialectism; while hyperdialectism type 1 is introduced intentionally by L1 speakers in order to dissociate from speakers of a related variety, type 2 is introduced unintentionally by L2 speakers who overgeneralize morphologically conditioned or lexicalized rules. Does this distinction play a role in the cases of divergence discussed?

Deliberately adding to the phonetic distance to the standard language, which would be an instance of hyperdialectism type 1, may well play a role in the further spread of r-lessness. Against the background of the definitions proposed above, it may seem counterintuitive to consider the ‘sharp’, dental realization of voiced [z] as a hyperdialectism type 1; however, it should be kept in mind that the speakers
studied are members of the 2nd and 3rd generations of migrants and all of them are native speakers of Dutch. Insofar as the variation in place of articulation and the variation in voicing of /l/ emanated in the groups at issue, their differential interpretation in terms of hyperdialectism would lead one to predict that the relatively high proportions of voicing, and especially the phonologically 'undutch' sandhi voicing of a preceding obstruent, is the older of the two exotic features in the realization of /l/.

It does not seem to be the case that whenever dissociation does not play a role (as in the L/Rimburg developments) hyperdialectism type 2 is automatically involved. But like most other aspects of the proposal regarding hyperdialectisms, this one is empirically 'undersubstantiated'. Further research is needed to establish to which extent and how the two types of hyperdialectisms distinguished are relevant to the structural divergence between varieties of a language.

Labov (2010) discusses dialect divergence at length, empirically underpinning his arguments largely with data from the *Atlas of North American English* (Labov et al. 2006). In Chapters 5 through 8 of the book, considerable attention is paid to structural factors – as sources of diverging developments (as in the second column from the left in Table 6 above), but also as consequences. In the latter respect, Labov adds important additional insights into the phenomenon. Building on the metaphor of the fork in the road, where one can proceed either in the direction of A or in the direction of B, Labov points out that "lasting divergence occurs when the structural consequences of adopting A or B trigger further changes driven by [...] unidirectional principles [...] which are not easily reversed. In the domain of sound changes, these may be chain shifts, splits or mergers" (2010: 156). Or, in slightly other words, "the permanent separation and the continued divergence of neighboring dialects [...] will occur when the bidirectional change [which is reversible – FH] is succeeded by a unidirectional change" (p. 172).

In connection with the cases discussed above, the latter would apply if

- the lowered diphthongs would participate in changes affecting (tense or long) low vowels (re Taeldeman);
- the former velar fricative allophones, which have disappeared by becoming palatal across the board, in (lexically /yI/ or derived /C/> /yI/) voiced shape would be subjected to variable dialectal yI-weakening (re L/Rimburg). In this scenario, e.g., *yoga, 'yoga*, would be realized as *yo[j]a* rather than, traditionally, *yo[s]a*;
- sandhi voicing of an obstruent preceding /l/ would be generalized into sandhi voicing of an obstruent preceding any voiced fricative (re ethnolectal /l/).

There are some indications that the new L/Rimburg scenario may materialize (such as a younger male dialect speaker producing the form *za[y]a* instead of
za[s]o, 'to say'), but systematic data are lacking as yet. Clearly this, the two other scenarios of permanent separation briefly sketched, and the general issue of 'parasitic' further structural developments cutting off the way back to earlier bidirectional changes, constitute ample issues for future research.
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