CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Review: [untitled]
Author(s): John R. Rickford
Source: *Language in Society*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Jun., 1990), pp. 268-274
Published by: Cambridge University Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4168138
Accessed: 03/06/2011 18:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Language in Society.*

http://www.jstor.org

Wardhaugh appears very well informed about his topic. I offer a case in point. Being born in Belgium and having lived through and studied the linguistic problems of that country thoroughly, I cannot but be impressed with the accuracy and incisiveness of his description and evaluation of the very complex Belgian language situation (Chapter 9:203–11). Like the other two reviewed studies, Wardhaugh's book is a valuable contribution to the study of language contact.

REFERENCES

Bátori, I. (1979). Russen und Finnougrier. Zweisprachigkeit und sprachliche Interferenz. In P. S. Ureland (ed.), *Standardsprache und Dialekte in mehrsprachigen Gebieten Europas. Akten des 2. Symposions über Sprachkontakt in Europa. Mannheim 1976*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 1–26.

Danchev, A. (1988). Interlanguage simplification in Middle English vowel phonology? In D. Kastovsky & A. Szwedek (eds.), *Linguistics across historical and geographical boundaries. In honour of Jacek Fiziak on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday*. Vol. 1. (Linguistic Theory and Historical Linguistics.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 239–52.

Görlach, M. (1986). Middle English – A Creole? In D. Kastovsky & A. Szwedek (eds.), *Linguistics across historical and geographical boundaries. In honour of Jacek Fiziak on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday*. Vol. 1. (Linguistic Theory and Historical Linguistics.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 320–44.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across culture: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Rayfield, J. R. (1970). *The languages of a bilingual community*. The Hague: Mouton.

Van Coetsem, F. (1988). *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton. (Originally published as number 1 of the series Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York.)

Reviewed by FRANS VAN COETSEM
Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

(Received 2 May 1989)

PETER TRUDGILL, *Dialects in contact* (Language in Society 10). Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1986. Pp. viii + 174.

This book, by a leading British sociolinguist, is a study of the kinds of changes that arise through contact between speakers of different *dialects*. More specifically, "It deals with how and why mutually intelligible linguistic varieties may influence one another, as well as with the social and geographic spread of linguistic forms from one dialect to another. It also focuses on the way in which, in certain dialect mixture situations, totally new dialects may be formed" (vi).

Trudgill's general strategy is to scrutinize specific cases of dialect variation or change through contact, trying to extract general principles about the role of internal and external forces with the ultimate (but presently unattainable) goal of being able to predict the precise outcome in specific circumstances.

Not surprisingly, given the focus of the author's previous work (for instance, Trudgill 1974, 1983a), most of the cases involve dialects of English, especially in London, Norwich, and surrounding areas, and most involve phonology. But there are some examples from dialects of other languages (for instance, Norwegian and Bhojpuri) and some from morphosyntax and the lexicon, suggesting that the postulated principles apply more generally.

In general, this data-rich book is clearly and interestingly written, and the author's concern with explanation and theory building quite refreshing. But the ad hoc quality of some of the explanations is disappointing, as is their slighting of external factors in favor of internal ones, even though (or perhaps because) these are more general trends in some branches of sociolinguistics and dialect studies.

Chapter 1, "Accommodation Between Dialects," represents the theoretical heart of the book, in which the author suggests that Giles' (1973) accommodation theory is a fruitful basis for understanding the linguistic convergence (sometimes divergence) that takes place when speakers of different dialects interact. Providing more linguistic detail than the sociopsychologists who study accommodation usually do, Trudgill explores a number of unanswered questions about the process, such as which linguistic features it affects, in what order, and why. He considers both short-term accommodation among members of the same region or speech community, for example, variation in the frequency with which he glottalized intervocalic (t) when interviewing different Norwich informants, and long-term accommodation among members of different speech communities, for instance, the acquisition of American English features by native speakers of British English (= UK English) living in the United States and vice versa.

A key concept in this chapter is the relative *salience* of a dialect feature, a measure of its awareness or distinctiveness to speakers of other dialects, and their readiness to vary or accommodate to it. Salience is related (11) to four factors: stigmatization, linguistic change, phonetic distance, and phonological contrast. American *r*-fulness (in *more*), involving the presence of a phoneme usually absent in British English, is more salient for British *r*-less speakers than American æ-raising (*bad* as [bɛˑəd]), a phonetic feature. Salience is not by itself a perfect predictor of order of acquisition, however, as Trudgill discovers in working through specific examples of British–American adjustment. There are also accelerating factors, such as comprehension difficulties and phonological naturalness, and inhibiting factors, such as phonotactic constraints, homonymic clash, and extra-strong salience.

Trudgill's discussion of this key concept is both clever (using the imitations of American English features by British pop singers as a rough gauge of their salience) and honest (in this chapter, as elsewhere, he readily admits where it breaks down). But it could be more systematic – individual accelerating and inhibiting factors are added on an ad hoc basis to account for particular cases,

but it would be nice to have each case investigated against the full set of potential constraints. It could also be more system oriented – where Weinreich (1953:15) laid out the full inventory of Romansh and Schwyzertütsch phonemes as a basis for predicting potential interference between them, Trudgill highlights only a few features of the systems in contact. And, if salience is ever to become a truly predictive concept, its component factors (for instance, phonetic difference) have to be more rigorously defined and operationalized (compare Guy, in press; Naro 1981). Finally, Trudgill displays a tendency to slight external constraints in favor of internal ones, which I found disappointing for a leading *socio*linguist. For instance, in his convenient end-of-chapter summary (37), he suggests that the component factors in salience can perhaps be reduced to two: phonetic difference and phonemic contrast (i.e., the internal or purely linguistic ones). But there are examples in his own chapter – for instance, the "extra-strong salience" of American /æ/ for British speakers (18) or the inhibiting effect of moving to a new dialect area after the age of 12 (31–37) – that suggest that the external or social factors cannot be set aside. Weinreich (1953), who devoted two full chapters to individual and community factors, was quite insistent on this point: "A full account of interference in a language-contact situation . . . is possible only if the extra-linguistic factors are considered (3)." And so are Thomason and Kaufman (1988:35), who after reviewing the failure of proposed linguistic constraints (such as naturalness) on contact-induced change, asserted (and then demonstrated) that "linguistic interference is conditioned in the first instance by social factors, not linguistic ones. Both the direction of interference and the extent of interference are socially determined; so, to a considerable degree, are the kinds of features transferred from one language to another."

Another important concept in Chapter 1 is the regularity of the order with which speakers accommodate to particular features, best demonstrated by the fixed route for the acquisition of American English features by British speakers (20). However, Trudgill's conclusion (37) that such regularity does not apply equally to nonphonological variables or to the linguistic behavior of children is premature. The "irregular" Norwegian–Swedish adjective data (Table 1.2), which lead him to the former conclusion, yield a better implicational scale when speakers are reordered and regular or "fixed" routes are well-enough established from earlier grammatical studies of decreolization, first and second language acquisition (Bickerton 1973; Dulay, Burt, & Krashen 1982:200–31; Rickford 1988).[1]

In Chapter 2, "Dialect Contact," Trudgill turns his attention from the short-term accommodation of individuals in contact with speakers of different varieties to the diffusion of features from one geographical area to another. The phenomena are not unrelated, he argues, since geographical diffusion can be viewed as the result of speakers from area A *accommodating* to speakers of area B often enough and on a large enough scale for area B fea-

tures to become established in area A. One corollary of this is that face-to-face interaction (as opposed to TV or radio exposure) should be necessary for diffusion, and this is apparently true for most features of core syntax and phonology. Another corollary is that salience and other concepts developed to predict which features will be accommodated to, on the interpersonal level, should also help to predict which features will be diffused from one area to another.

Much of Chapter 2 is devoted to the examination of particular instances of diffusion from London to East Anglia to see whether salience is in fact a good predictor of diffusion. In a number of cases, it works well. The diffusion of *h*-dropping, a sociolinguistic marker that is involved in phonemic contrast and the focus of overt comment, is "no surprise" (45), as is the non-diffusion of such features as the pronunciation of *meat* with [əi] rather than [ɪi], "a purely phonetic difference of very low salience" (53). In other cases, such as the diffusion of *l*-vocalization – a feature that is rarely commented on overtly and does not initially involve surface contrasts – salience yields disappointing or mixed results.

One notable case, the diffusion of the variable merger of /θ/ with /f/ and /ð/ with /d/ or /v/, poses no problem for salience itself but for the larger assumption that diffusion takes place through interpersonal accommodation. The problem arises from the fact that the Norwich and other East Anglian teenagers who use this London-based innovation most extensively seem to have little face-to-face contact with Londoners (compared with commuting adults, for example). The ingenious solution involves recognizing the partial role of "language missionaries" (Steinsholt 1962), in this case the children of families that had moved temporarily to London and then returned to Norwich, providing an "insider" conduit for "outsider" features (56). Like Feagin (1988:82), I found Trudgill's discussion of this case fascinating. But I would have liked to see more documentation (demographic data, personal history accounts) of the role of this external factor, and I would also have liked to see Trudgill note here the relevance of an internal factor that he doesn't introduce explicitly until Chapter 3 (119): the tendency, originally noted by Labov (1972:300), for mergers to expand at the expense of distinctions in contact situations. Most of the diffusing London features discussed in this chapter are mergers.

Some of the diffusion examples considered in this chapter involve *partial* diffusion, in the sense of variable acquisition or use; lexical diffusion (use in some words but not others); or most interestingly, interdialect (novel intermediate forms). Trudgill's discussion of *hyperdialectisms* (66–78), the aggressive retention of less prestigious or local features but often in modified interdialect form, is especially worth reading. One unmentioned but relevant work is Rogers (1983), which deals with the diffusion of innovations in a variety of areas besides language and provides a useful general framework for sev-

eral aspects of the process (the role of networks, early adopters versus late adopters, S-curve patterns, etc.).

Chapter 3, "Dialect Mixture and the Growth of New Dialects," is a natural outgrowth of Chapter 2, insofar as the discussion of interdialect forms is extended to include whole new interdialect *varieties,* the sort created in border towns and other communities to which speakers from different dialect areas are transplanted. Trudgill's end-of-chapter summary (126) is the best in the book, and I can do no better than quote extensively from it:

> In a dialect mixture situation, large numbers of variants will abound, and through the process of *accommodation* in face-to-face interaction, *interdialect* phenomena will begin to occur. As time passes and *focusing* begins to take place, particularly as the new town, colony or whatever begins to acquire an independent identity, the variants present in the mixture begin to be subject to *reduction* . . . via the process of *koinéization*. This comprises the process of *levelling,* which involves the loss of marked and/or minority variants; and the process of *simplification,* by means of which even minority forms may be the ones to survive if they are linguistically simpler, . . . and through which even forms and distinctions present in all the contributory dialects may be lost. Even after koinéization, however, some variants left over from the original mixture may survive. Where this occurs, *reallocation* may occur, such that variants originally from different regional dialects may in the new dialect become *social-class dialect variants, stylistic variants, areal variants,* or . . . *allophonic variants*.

What is especially attractive about this chapter is its coverage of areas and varieties outside of England, including Fronteririço along the Brazil/Uruguay border; the postcreole continuum in St. Kitts/Nevis; the Bhojpuri/Hindi of Fiji, Trinidad, and Mauritius; the English of Belize and Belfast; and the Norwegian of Høyanger. I found Trudgill's discussion of the Høyanger and Fijian cases (95–106) particularly enjoyable and instructive, especially because of the explicit recognition given to the role of external factors such as settlement history and social network (although the conclusion still suggests that "purely linguistic forces" [126] are more important).

My primary reservation about this chapter (and much of the book) is that it could have gone further, in theoretical terms, by building more fully on the available literature. For instance, when the reallocation of unleveled variants was first mentioned, in connection with their emergence as stylistic variants in Mauritian Bhojpuri (109), I was reminded of Bell's (1984:151) axiom that stylistic variation derives from and echoes social variation, and wondered whether it applied to this case. Trudgill doesn't provide the relevant data for this case, but the other instances of reallocation discussed in this chapter suggest that Bell's style axiom is generally upheld (that marked social class or

other interspeaker variation precedes stylistic), and incorporating it into the model of dialect mixture processes would enhance its predictive power. Similarly, Hymes' (1971:65–90) rich discussion of the component processes of reduction, admixture, and intergroup use that apply in pidginization, creolization, koinéization, and other contact situations is highly relevant to this chapter but is not cited nor built upon.

Trudgill's fourth and final chapter, "Koinéization in Colonial English," is essentially a demonstration that the processes of leveling, simplification, and reallocation introduced in Chapter 3 apply also to colonial varieties of English, those that "resulted from movements of people outwards from Britain" (127), as in the Falkland Islands, Newfoundland, Australia, Canada, and Ireland. About two-thirds of the chapter deal with specific controversies relating to the development of Australian English (129–42) and Canadian English (153–61). Both discussions have a fascinating detective-novel quality, as alternative hypotheses are advanced and set aside in turn. Whereas these sections will probably appeal most directly to specialists in these areas, they hold a more general lesson for all of us, since the shorter discussions of other contact situations elsewhere in the book might lull us into believing that their processes and results are relatively transparent. The Australian and Canadian cases remind us that it can be difficult to distinguish diffusion from independent creation and to determine the true direction of change, and that *the more linguists there are who work on a particular contact situation, the more difficult (but also potentially insightful) the problems turn out to be.*

The book is beautifully typeset and laid out, with lots of maps and tables and very few typos, all minor (for example, "<" for ">" 18; "Bojpuri" for "Bhojpuri" 101–02; "relexes" for "reflexes" 112; "1985" on 106 for the Holm reference listed as "1986" in the bibliography and actually published in 1988). Readers who want to do some follow-up scholarship of their own might be inconvenienced by the absence of *n*s for tables with percentages (especially in Chapter 1) and the absence of page numbers in some citations (for instance, the quote from Wells [1982] on page 79). The inclusion of an IPA chart at the beginning of the book (as in Wells 1982) would also have been helpful, given the ubiquity of fine-grained phonetic detail. But these quibbles about form are offset by the quality of Trudgill's writing, which is as clear and lively in this book as in his classic (1983b) *Sociolinguistics* introduction and other works.

One parting comment that applies simultaneously to content and form is that this book, stimulating though it is, could fruitfully be longer and go further. Among today's sociolinguists and dialectologists, Trudgill has first-hand knowledge of a wider variety of contact situations than most, and like Weinreich (1953), he is familiar with many other little-known or rarely cited case studies. In short, he is in an excellent position to give the field the theoretically comprehensive and predictive sociolinguistic theory of dialect and lan-

guage contact we need. This relatively brief book is not so far-reaching in its aims, but hopefully Trudgill himself (and others) will extend its valuable hypotheses and findings and attempt the larger enterprise.

NOTE

1. If the speakers in Table 1.1 are rearranged in the following order from top to bottom, 87.9 percent of the cells (58/66) are nondeviant, just short of Guttman's (1950) 90 percent minimum but identical to the "still adequate" 87.9 percent of Bickerton's (1973:653) Table 3: Jenny, Bodie, Blenda, Charlotte, Stina, Lisbeth, Katarina, Fanny, Erna, Helen, Mona, Linda, Henny, Ellen, Eva, Carin, Barbro, Alma, Inez, Lena, Nancy, Nina. Of course, as Pavone (1980) has noted, linguists do need stronger goodness-of-fit measures for their implicational scales, but the reproducibility or scalability index (% of good cells) is what Trudgill uses to establish the regularity (96%) of Table 1.2.

REFERENCES

Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13:145-204.

Bickerton, D. (1973). The nature of a creole continuum. *Language* 49:640-669.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Feagin, C. (1988). Variation studies in Great Britain. *American Speech* 63:76-87.

Giles, H. (1973). Accent mobility: A model and some data. *Anthropological Linguistics* 15:87-105.

Guttman, L. (1950). The basis for scalogram analysis. In S. A. Stouffer et al. (eds.), *Measurement and prediction*. New York: Wiley. 60-90.

Guy, G. R. (in press). Saliency and the direction of syntactic change. *Language*.

Hymes, D. (1971). Introduction to Part III, General Conceptions of Process. In D. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 65-90.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Naro, A. J. (1981). The social and structural dimensions of a syntactic change. *Language* 57:63-98.

Pavone, J. (1980). *Implicational scales and English dialectology*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.

Rickford, J. R. (1988). Decreolization paths for Guyanese singular pronouns. In G. Gilbert (ed.), *Pidgin and creole linguistics: Essays in Honor of John E. Reinecke*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 130-38.

Rogers, E. M. (1983). *Diffusion of innovations*. 3rd ed. New York: The Free Press.

Steinsholt, A. (1962). Målbryting i hedrum. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Trudgill, P. (1974). *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

______ (1983a). *On dialect*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

______ [1974] (1983b). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. Rev. ed. Middlesex: Penguin.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Wells, J. (1982). *Accents of English*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reviewed by JOHN R. RICKFORD
Department of Linguistics
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

(Received 5 October 1989)