

39. Ethnolects of Dutch

1. Introduction
2. Surinamese Dutch as a case study, in relation to other ethnic varieties
3. Dutch ethnolects in a European perspective
4. The Roots of Ethnolects project
5. Issues for further research
6. References

1. Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the different ethnolects that exist in the Netherlandic-speaking language context. It is convenient, but not entirely accurate, to define these simply as ethnic varieties of Dutch, on a par with dialects and sociolects. This is also suggested in the title of this chapter, but it ignores the fact that other languages are involved as well, to a greater or lesser degree (cf. Muysken 2010).

In section 1.1. I present an encyclopedic overview of a number of ethnolects in the Netherlandic domain, in 1.2. I discuss problems of definition and demarcation, and in 1.3. some sociolinguistic issues. Section 2. is devoted to a case study of a single well-known ethnolect, Surinamese Dutch, and section 3. to a wider European and global perspective on ethnolects. In section 4. a particular research project is presented, the Roots of Ethnolects study, and in 5. some issues for further research are presented.

1.1. Overview

In Table 39.1, the main ethnolects on which some studies are available are listed in terms of their date of genesis, from the middle of the eighteenth century until the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Yiddish Dutch emerged when groups of Ashkenazic Jews started coming to the Netherlands (Gans 1988), primarily to the city of Amsterdam, but only really took off when they were forcefully ‘emancipated’, i.e. more integrated into mainstream society and starting speaking Dutch (Prins 1916; Slijper 1916; Beem 1954; Kish 1968; Van de Kamp 2005; cf. also Hinskens and Jacobs 2005).

Indonesian Dutch emerged in the colonial society of the Dutch East Indies, among the European settlers and in the growing ‘Indo’ community of people of mixed Dutch and Indonesian descent. It had various ‘layers’, ranging from deeply restructured and mixed varieties of Dutch – such as Javindo (De Gruiter 1990), Petjoh (Van Rheedeen 1995), and Steurtjestaal (Van Rheedeen 1999) – to very slightly accented versions of metropolitan SD with some special local lexicon. De Vries (2005) presents a useful overview.

Surinamese Dutch had its roots lexically in the colonial Dutch of the slave plantation society and the colonial capital of Paramaribo in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but gained most of its striking grammatical and semantic characteristics when gradually

Tab. 39.1: Initial characteristics of a number of ethnolects in the Netherlandic domain

	Date of genesis	Setting of genesis	Where spoken	Maintenance/shift	Mixture	Main other language(s) involved
Jewish Dutch	1750	Immigration	Urban	Shift	Accent Lexicon	Yiddish
Indonesian Dutch	1900	Colonial	Urban	Maintenance Shift	Mixed variety Phonology Syntax	Malay, Javanese
Surinamese Dutch	1900	Colonial	Urban	Maintenance	Code-switching Phonology Syntax	Sranan
Moluccan Malay Dutch	1920	Colonial	Army camps, communities	Maintenance	Mixed variety Syntax	Moluccan Malay
Antillean Dutch	1950	Colonial	Urban	Maintenance	Code-switching	Papiamentu
Moroccan Dutch	1970	Immigration	Urban	Shift	Phonology Syntax	Moroccan Arabic, Berber
Turkish Dutch	1970	Immigration	Urban	Partial maintenance	Code-switching	Turkish, Kurdish

Dutch was acquired as a second language by larger sections of the non-white Surinamese population. Cf. below and Christa de Kleine (this volume, ch. 45).

Moluccan Malay Dutch is naturally closely related to general Indonesian Dutch but developed later and, due to the social isolation of the group involved, developed more of its own characteristics. It is generally studied as a component of the mixed language *Melaju Sini* ('our Malay'), as in Tahitu (1989), Huwaë (1992), involving elements both of Malay and of Dutch.

Antillean Dutch as a linguistic variety is distinct from Dutch mostly on the lexical level. In contrast with Suriname, there never was a period of extensive learning of Dutch as an L2 in the Antilles until recently. Antillean Dutch has been discussed by Joubert (2005), and it seems that it is primarily characterized by specific lexical features. Since Papiamentu is the primary language of communication in Aruba, Bonaire, and Curacao, Antillean Dutch has had a limited use in the colonial setting by the Dutch-speaking elite, which explains the fact that it only differs from the metropolitan standard language lexically.

Moroccan Dutch and *Turkish Dutch* developed out of the Mediterranean labor migration to the Netherlands and Flanders that started in the 1970s. These varieties are of particular importance at the current moment.

In Belgium, interesting work has been done on the use of Moroccan Dutch ethnolect in interethnic conversations by Jürgen Jaspers (2005a,b, 2006a,b, 2008, 2009a,b) at the University of Antwerp (see also Jaspers and Meeuwis 2006, Jaspers and Vandekerckhove 2009). Central in Jaspers' work is the notion of stylization (see below).

El-Aissati (2001) has studied the consequences of rapid language shift in the Moroccan Arabic and Berber-speaking immigrant communities in the Netherlands for identity and language use. The detailed thesis of Backus (1996) documents code-switching patterns among several generations of Turkish immigrants, with important implications for our conception of their ethnolect, since in Turkish it plays an important role as well. Nortier (2001), Van Krieken (2004), Van Lier (2005) and Nortier and Dorleijn (2005) present overviews of some of the relevant features of Moroccan and Turkish ethnolects.

In ongoing research of Frans Hinskens, Roeland van Hout, and myself these last varieties are being studied in some detail; In section 4. I return to these varieties.

With respect to the setting in which the ethnolects emerged, we have to distinguish between colonial varieties and immigration varieties. Of course, the colonial varieties – Indonesian Dutch and Surinamese Dutch – also became immigration varieties, but they emerged outside of the Netherlandic area proper. Moluccan Malay Dutch may have originated in Indonesia as well, but the Moluccans came to the Netherlands primarily as speakers of a range of Indonesian local languages, as well as Moluccan Malay. The same holds for Antillean Dutch. Some Dutch is spoken in the Dutch Antilles, but the majority of the immigrants to the Netherlands arrived speaking Papiamentu rather than Dutch. Yiddish Dutch, Turkish Dutch, and Moroccan Arabic Dutch emerged in the Netherlands.

Most ethnolects are urban in nature; the exception is Moluccan Malay Dutch, spoken mostly in smaller provincial towns due to the Dutch national policy of settling the Moluccans in rural areas.

Turning to the dichotomy between maintenance and shift scenarios, introduced by Thomason and Kaufman (1988), in a number of cases the ethnic communities involved were prone to maintain their community languages, while in others there is more evidence of a shift. The scenario involved has immediate consequences for the nature of the ethnolect itself. In the case of maintenance, there is a tendency towards considerable amounts of code-switching.

1.2. Problems of definition and demarcation with street language

One of the recurrent problems is the delimitation between ethnolect and ‘street language’ or ‘youth language’. It is possible to separate them through their definitions:

- (a) *Ethnolect* can be defined as a more or less stable and permanent way of speaking characterizing a particular community in terms of its ethnicity. While speakers may be (semi-)conscious of some features of their ethnolect, this is by no means necessary. Ethnicity in this definition of ethnolects tends to be viewed as something inherent and automatic. Linguistic features of ethnolects tend to be phonological and syntactic, given the fact that they serve as a means of communication with speakers of the dominant majority language, with members of other ethnic groups, as well as for in-group communication in some cases.
- (b) *Street language* is defined as a way of speaking engaged in by young people particularly in the public domain to demarcate ethnic boundaries or redefine ethnic relationships. Implicit in the definition is that the features characterizing street language

Tab. 39.2: Features distinguishing street language from ethnolect

	Ethnolect	Street language
Stability	More or less stable	Highly dynamic
Consciousness	At most semi-conscious	Conscious
Ethnicity	Inherent	Dynamic
Features	Phonology, syntax	Lexicon, pragmatics
Domain of use	Intergroup, in-group	In-group

are more or less conscious: speakers are able to manipulate them. Consequently, street language is quite dynamic and subject to change. The type of ethnicity expressed in street language tends to be dynamic as well, and may be more or less inclusive; cf. Table 39.2. The interaction domain for street language tends to be in-group, where the reference point may be generation rather than ethnicity.

Defined in this way, the two notions only share the fact that they correspond to vernacular and informal speech and are linked to the notion of ethnicity.

However, the oppositions drawn in these definitions and in Table 39.2 summarizing them are a bit of a caricature. We do not know how stable ethnolectal features really are, the issue of consciousness is quite complex on both sides, ethnicity is likewise a complex phenomenon, and the range of features of both sets of phenomena remains to be studied. Furthermore, ethnolects manifest themselves most clearly, though probably only partly, in street language.

Most likely, specific language use phenomena can be situated somewhere on a scale from stable/ethnolectal to dynamic/street language- and performance-related.

1.3. Sociolinguistic issues

A number of sociolinguistic issues will be very briefly touched upon but needless to say merit a much more detailed treatment.

1.3.1. Ethnolects and language history

One thing that is obvious from the discussion above is the importance of the historical context in which the ethnolect emerged. Post-colonial ethnolects could be compared to fort creoles (cf. Bickerton 1988), while immigration ethnolects resemble plantation creoles more closely. In fort creoles, substrate influence is evident and pervasive, as even Bickerton acknowledges, while in plantation creoles this remains controversial. In post-colonial ethnolects, the original community language was strongly present as a second language in the community while the ethnolectal variant of the colonial language emerged and was spoken, giving rise to complex transfer patterns. In the immigration setting, on the other hand, the original community language has a much weaker presence, leading to more selective transfer.

1.3.2. Social and political issues: Ethnicity, ethnolects and identity

The existence of ethnolects is clearly dependent on the role that ethnicity plays in the social configuration of a particular country or region. In the United States certain ethnicities are clearly recognized – White, Black, Latino –, while others – Japanese, Scandinavian – play a minor role (Fought 2006). Similarly in the Netherlandic domain the importance of ethnic differences varies across time and between different ethnic groups, and this undoubtedly has an effect on the chances of survival of ethnolects. Ethnolects are not the automatic result of the existence of ethnic groups but constructs in specific social and political configurations.

1.3.3. Mono- and multi-ethnolects

Similarly, the specific role of ethnicity may influence whether ethnolectal boundaries are drawn in terms of specific single ethnic groups (e.g. Turkish) or whether a general ethnic distinction between ‘native’ and ‘immigrant’ is drawn, as appears to be the case in some Scandinavian settings (Quist 2000). Again, much depends here on the dynamics of the ethnic groups involved and on in- and exclusion mechanisms in the overall community.

1.3.4. Stylization

Particularly within the ethnographic tradition there has been considerable interest in the notion of stylization: the semi-conscious presentation of specific identities through ethnolectal speech styles (cf. e.g. Cornips and De Rooij 2003). It is clear that some ethnolect speakers will involve in stylization in specific interactions where the projection of their ethnic identity is at play. However, this may not hold for all ethnolects, nor for all ethnolectal features.

1.3.5. Class

Very little work, if any, has been done on the role of social class distinctions with respect to ethnolects, probably under the tacit assumption that ethnic groups are homogeneous as far as their class backgrounds are concerned. Nonetheless, there is considerable variation in social class and income both within and between different ethnic groups, and this is a potential for considerable variation, e.g. in the type of Dutch adopted and transformed within the respective ethnolect.

2. Surinamese Dutch as a case study, in relation to other ethnic varieties

Van Ginneken (1913: 275) is one of the first authors to discuss the Surinamese ethnolect, as noted by De Kleine (this volume), but he formulates his treatment primarily in terms of ‘mistakes’. About a Surinamese Dutch (henceforth SurD) hymn he notes: ‘Who con-

siders this in detail can observe here and there, next to High-Dutch sophistications, Creole language errors – ...’ (my translation, PM). Here I will present SurD as a typical case of an ethnolect, because it presents many of the features and poses many of the problems. SurD is spoken both in Surinam and in the Netherlands, the original colonizing country to which many Surinamese have migrated. It is a widely recognized ethnolect in the Netherlands, and some of its features have led to ethnic stereotypes. It has also been described on a number of occasions, in part under the rubric of ‘mistakes’ of Surinamese children in the Dutch classroom. Charry (1983) is still the most sophisticated study focusing on phonological variation in this variety, which requires much more investigation. De Kleine (2007) is an extensive morphosyntactic study. In Suriname, paradoxically, SurD is not an ethnolect but an ethnically neutral national variety.

The historical development of SurD remains to be studied. Of course it is part of the overall sociolinguistic development of the Surinamese people. The history of SurD began in 1667 with the Dutch take-over conquest of the originally British plantation colony. Until the abolition of slavery in 1863, the originally African slaves were not allowed to speak Dutch. In the contact between blacks and whites and among the growing creole population Sranantongo or Sranan (formerly known as *Negerengels*, ‘Negro-English’) developed, a lexically English-based creole language. Sranan was also sometimes used among the whites. However, as argued by De Kleine (2002; 2007) there was a nascent bilingual urban middle class, of mixed descent, from the eighteenth century onward, which also spoke Dutch and must have influenced the colonial variety. Colloquial Dutch as spoken in Surinam of that period has not been studied yet; few relevant documents have survived.

Thus, in the period before the emancipation of the Surinamese slaves due to the abolition of slavery in 1863 and the introduction of compulsory education in 1876, Dutch remained primarily the language of the European population. This means that presumably it remained grammatically close to the metropolitan varieties in its standard form, even though it must have adopted a number of new words (to name the new animals, plants, objects, and customs found in Suriname) and have undergone some changes in the meaning of existing words. Most likely, according to De Kleine (2002; 2007) the non-standard variety was already changing, under the influence of Sranan, but this has not been well documented yet. From the late nineteenth century onwards, the bilingualism between Dutch and one of the other languages of Suriname, in particular Sranan, increased and Surinamese Dutch started acquiring more speakers.

In 1873 the blacks were allowed to leave the plantations. In 1876 compulsory education laws were introduced. Through education Dutch was propagated not only as the official but also as the only language – and these efforts were effective as for most people Dutch became the second language.

Well before the abolition of slavery in 1863 a start had been made with the recruitment of contract workers – notably Chinese, Hindustani and Javanese, who maintained their original languages, although in all cases specifically Surinamese varieties developed (e.g. Sarnami is Surinamese Hindustani). These groups gradually acquired Sranan as well as Dutch, but most probably the emerging Surinamese variety rather than the official, metropolitan, according to De Kleine (pers. comm.).

In 1954 Surinam was assigned ‘internal autonomy’, which, however, did not lead to an autonomous language policy. This situation did not change after Surinam had become independent in 1975; the government has always officially adhered to the norms of the continental variety of Dutch.

The usage of Dutch in Surinam has always been largely confined to the city, Paramaribo, where there has been a non-white Dutch speaking elite ever since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Members of the higher classes tend to use Dutch at home, in many cases even as their mother tongue, while members of the lower classes mainly speak their ethnic language at home, although they are competent in Dutch (De Kleine 2002). From 2003 onwards, when Surinam became an ‘associated member’ of the *Nederlandse Taalunie* (lit. ‘Dutch Language Union’, until then a cooperation between the Dutch and the Flemish governments to support the Dutch language), Dutch seems – at least officially – to have gained a firmer ground in Surinam. However, it remains the code primarily associated with the high authority, although specifically Surinamese vocabulary is used in all media in Suriname. In daily life, Dutch competes with Sranan; in fact, a probably multi-dimensional continuum extends between Sranan via SurD to ‘metropolitan’ SD (Van Donselaar 2005: 117; Van Bree and De Vries 1997: 1149). In their daily contacts, according to the stylistic requirements of the interactional circumstances, most people use the various gradations in the part of the continuum that ranges from Sranan to SurD. At the same time, frequent code switching and mixing occurs between Sranan and SurD. Edgar Cairo’s novel *Kollektieve Schuld. Famir-man-Sani* (1976) is often cited as a literary representation of SurD, but in actual fact Cairo uses language in various ways for stylistic reasons.

SurD is a diffuse language variety. Apart from Dutch items, its vocabulary mainly contains Sranan, English as well as some originally Indian elements (mainly to refer to specific species of plants and animals). Grammatically, Surinamese Dutch is generally characterized by among other things the variable non-realization of short function words such as *er* (‘there’), the expletive subject *het* (‘it’), pronominal objects, the reflexive pronoun, as well as by the focus particle *is*. (for more information, see De Kleine, Ch. 44 in this volume). A recent inventory of SurD lexicon appears in De Bies (2009).

Large scale migration from Surinam to the Netherlands started in the 1960s – in most cases of people with a reasonable educational background. In the time of Surinam’s independence, considerable numbers of less educated Surinamese came to the Netherlands. Nowadays, the Surinamese are the largest ethnic minority in several big cities in the western part of the Netherlands.

SurD in the Netherlands is characterized by a large variation bandwidth, but almost all varieties have the stereotyped bilabial /w/, the slightly nasalised /ɛ/ before nasals (as in e.g. *mens*, ‘human being’), frequent SVO word order and subordinate clauses which are not introduced by *dat*, ‘that’, as well as, obviously, words and idioms from Sranan. Features of the Surinamese ethnolect of Dutch which also occur in indigenous varieties of Dutch are the devoicing of voiced fricatives, the use of *hun* (dative ‘them’) as a subject pronoun and the use of *gaan* (‘go’) as a future auxiliary (see also the study by Cornips [2000] on this verb in the speech of children of Moroccan and Turkish descent). Almost all of these features characterize Surinamese Dutch both in the Netherlands and in Surinam.

Parabirsing [Rappa] (2009), in a blog, expresses the complexity very well. He describes a visit from a Suriname resident to the Netherlands and an interaction with his brother-in-law living there. The punch line in the blog comes half-way, with the brother-in-law switching to Sranan (printed bold italic here). The fragments glossed XXX are imitation Mediterranean ethnolect.

reflecting local identities as well (cf. also Khan 2006). Similarly, Stuart-Smith et al. (2009) propose the term of ‘Glaswasian’ for ‘an emerging regional ethnic accent which integrates accent features typical of Glaswegian and Asian together’, to describe the emerging ethnolect of Glasgow.

Kerswill et al. (2008) and Cheshire et al. (in press) have linked the emergence of ethnolects in Britain to ongoing changes in English. Recent projects in this area include ‘Multicultural London English (MLE)’ and ‘Linguistics Innovators: The Language of Adolescents in London.’

3.2. Germany

In Germany the focus has been on the ethnolect of the largest single group of immigrants, the Turkish-German community. Relatively early on the *nom-de-guerre* ‘Kanaken Deutsch’ or ‘Kanak Sprach’, with echoes of Germany’s colonial past, came to be used to describe the stylized version of this ethnolect in the media. In Potsdam a number of studies have been carried out on intonation and pragmatics in the German of young Turkish immigrants (Kern and Selting 2009). Keim (2002), working in Mannheim, likewise stresses issues of pragmatics and conversational meaning. Wiese (2009), working in Potsdam, speaks of ‘Kiezdeutsch’ as a non-stylized multi-ethnic variant among young people in German cities such as Berlin, with distinct pronunciation, variable omission of grammatical endings, and a different mapping of information structure on the clause. This Kiezdeutsch is distinct from the traditional notion of ‘Gastarbeiterdeutsch’, which refers to a product of incomplete L2 acquisition by labor immigrants.

Auer and colleagues (2003a,b; Dirim and Auer 2004; see also Auer and Kallmeyer, in press), in contrast, have worked on the use of Turkish elements by young people of German origin to establish a special register. Androutsopoulos (2001) stresses the role of ethnolectal varieties in the media and the role of the media in the dissemination of (genuinely or supposedly) ethnic traits.

3.3. France

In France the study of ethnolects is quite diffuse, and linked to various youth languages and, in general, tensions in the French society.

In a first series of studies, the focus is on Algerian French. In Meunier (2001), the Pied Noir French of Oran is described as having been strongly influenced by Spanish, but also by Arabic, from which it has borrowed discourse markers and lexical items. There is some evidence of simplification as in *peut-être il est là* instead of *peut-être qu’il est là*. In the latter case, the conjunction *que* is present. Typical words in Pied Noir French are *toubib* ‘doctor’ and *bled* ‘small village’. Mazella (2005) is an overtly nostalgic lexical source for Pied Noir French.

A second series of studies is concerned with the French of the *banlieues*, the large neighborhoods with a dominant immigrant population surrounding the big cities. Some

of this research is actually carried out by researchers in the UK or the US. Fagyal (2010, in press) focuses primarily on rhythmic and intonational patterns, while Jamin (2004, 2005; Jamin et al. 2006) focuses on segmental phonetic variation.

3.4. Scandinavia

The study of ethnolects in Scandinavia started with Rinkeby Swedish in Stockholm. Rinkeby Swedish (*Rinkebysvenska*) is a general term for varieties of Swedish spoken mainly in suburbs where many immigrants and their descendants live. Rinkeby in Stockholm is the suburb which gave its name to this variety, but the term Rinkeby Swedish may sometimes be used for similar varieties in other Swedish cities as well. While Rinkeby Swedish has been studied by Kotsinas in a number of publications (e.g. 1988, 1998), Stroud (2004), however, criticizes the notion of an inclusive Rinkeby Swedish, ‘a potential, imagined, pan-immigrant contact variety of Swedish’ as a way of positioning immigrants ‘outside of a symbolically reconstituted community of “real” Swedish speakers, in strategic attempts to restrict their access to important linguistic and symbolic resources.’

More recently, Fraurud and Boyd (2006) have explored multilingual language use in several Swedish cities, including Gothenborg and Stockholm.

In Denmark, Quist (2000) and Jørgensen (to appear, (ed.) 2008) have consistently stressed the multi-lingual and multi-ethnic nature of ethnolects, as was already alluded to above.

3.5. The European setting in contrast with other continents: patterns of migration and empire formation

It is clear that ethnolects, which surely are a universal phenomenon, have different social embeddings in different places. The brief overview of the situation in four areas of Europe given above makes it clear that the study of ethnolects is very much embedded in different perceptions of social reality. In the United Kingdom, regional identities play a central role; in Germany the public perception of the Turkish-origin immigrant population as a people-within-a-people; in France the discourse is characterized by the opposition between the State and disenfranchised young people; in Scandinavia, finally, the general fear that the immigrant groups, undifferentiated ethnically, will not blend into mainstream society, as hoped originally. In the Netherlands, we will see, the dominant focus is currently on the speech of a single ethnic group, immigrants of Moroccan origin, as in earlier decades the immigrants from Surinam were focused upon. Altogether, then, in *Europe*, ethnolects are manifested as immigrant and post-colonial varieties in a linguistically very heterogeneous continent.

Turning for a moment to other continents, in *Australia*, there is a single dominant language, English, and a number of ethnolectal variants, which differ widely in the degree to which they diverge from dominant Australian English (Clyne 2003), corresponding to a large extent to degrees of ‘social embedding’ in mainstream Australian society.

In *Africa* the situation is exceedingly complex and does not lend itself to easy generalizations. The one place where ethnolects have been studied and are being studied (e.g.

Mesthrie 2002) in some detail is in South Africa, where different varieties of English coexist, corresponding to the different ethnic groups in this still divided nation.

In *South America*, Spanish shows ethnic differentiation which is often defined as regional variation. In the Andes there are distinct varieties of Indian Spanish, and in the Caribbean, varieties of Afro-Antillean Spanish. In Brazil, the main ethnic divisions within Portuguese appear to be those between Afro-Brazilians and the others.

In *Eurasia* and *Asia*, again the situation is complex. Little is known systematically about ethnolinguistic variation in the large regions where Russian, Mandarin, and Bahasa are spoken, often as second languages. In India, a post-colonial variety of English is spoken, which linguistically shares many features with ethnolects but is itself anything but ethnolectal in its sociolinguistic function.

In *North America*, finally, the situation is complex with official bilingualism in Canada (combined with a number of immigrant languages some of which serve as identity markers) and English-Spanish bilingualism in the United States, with immigrant groups accommodating to regional standards and an African American/Anglo division.

4. The Roots of Ethnolects project

The research project ‘The roots of ethnolects. An experimental comparative study’, supervised by Pieter Muysken and Frans Hinskens, officially started in January 2005 and will be finished in 2013. It concentrates on the possible emergence of two young ethnolects of Dutch, as spoken by second generation migrants (i.e. born in the Netherlands) of Turkish and Moroccan descent, and focuses on two cities: Amsterdam and Nijmegen. The design and approach are semi-experimental and quantitative in nature. Below I present the research questions (section 4.1.) as well as the design, the speakers and other aspects of the method used (4.2.).

4.1. Research questions

The research questions in the *Roots of ethnolects*-project are descriptive but also directed at specific issues. The main question of course is *which aspects of language use* (components of the grammar) characterize the ethnolects in question as distinct varieties? In short, what are their linguistic features?

The focus is on two components of the grammar: phonology and morphosyntax. We take lexicon in itself not to be indicative of ethnolectal variation. To provide data for the description of the linguistic features of the ethnolects, in the *Roots*-project spontaneous in-group conversations were recorded, and a set of elicitation tasks were administered.

Three key questions, as can be seen from the literature cited above, are geared towards disentangling the origins of the ethnolectal features. One concerns the role of L1: to what extent are ethnolects based on *interference from the original language* (L1) of the ethnic group in question? To what extent do ethnolect features originate in the original mother tongues of both ethnic groups (‘substrate effects’)?

To answer this question, in the *Roots*-project young males from Moroccan (Rif Berber) and Turkish backgrounds were compared. Language background of the parents (first generation speakers of Rif Berber and/or Moroccan Arabic, and Turkish, respectively) and place of birth (Amsterdam, and Nijmegen, resp.) were controlled for; and only speakers with strong ethnic network ties were selected. The speakers' language use is systematically contrasted with the original languages of their community as well as with native Dutch.

A second question focusing on the roots of the ethnolects concerns the extent to which we can reduce features of ethnolects to properties resulting from *processes of L2 acquisition*. Second language acquisition plays an important role in the emergence of ethnolects, although the ethnolect for the speakers themselves is the first language, perhaps next to the original language.

Generally speaking, language acquisition can leave two different types of traces behind: either interference from L1 (substrate effects) or general, language independent characteristics of second language acquisition. Both kinds of acquisition traits are found in ethnolects. However, although ethnolects emerge in the context of second language acquisition, they are not fully determined by it, since they are not mere learners' varieties. These latter varieties are used to communicate, but their norms are – in contrast with norms of ethnolects – not rooted in the speech community. On the contrary, learner varieties as such are not subject to clear norms, and are therefore unstable and somehow fluctuate 'between' varieties.

To determine the role of acquisition, in the *Roots*-project (a) speakers of two age groups (12 and 20 years of age) were compared, and (b) the data were systematically compared with existing recorded first and second language acquisition data from the relevant ethnic groups. The age comparisons are made to see to what extent socialization in the ethnolect takes place (sociolinguistic fine-tuning), and the data from acquisition are explored to see to what extent the ethnolect shows interlanguage features.

As became clear in the presentation of various British studies mentioned above, there may be an interaction between local dialect features and ethnolectal features, and hence we want to investigate to what extent ethnolects are based on *local non-standard varieties*. In order to answer this question, neighborhoods were studied in the *Roots*-project in two large towns with quite different urban dialects: Amsterdam (specifically the neighborhood called Transvaal) and Nijmegen (various neighborhoods). These towns were chosen because both have been the object of systematic sociolinguistic studies of local urban dialects.

In addition to these three questions about the possible sources or 'roots' of the ethnolect features, further questions about the nature of the ethnolect were posed. Inspired by the Scandinavian research, we want to find out whether ethnolects are specific for an individual ethnic group, or do they reflect a more *global non-native identity*? Do features spread across ethnolects?

Originally, most non-standard features of ethnolects are either features of dialects of the majority language or traits of the immigrant language; therefore few similarities between ethnolects are expected. However, most ethnolects share a typical history of origin. To establish to what extent ethnolects are specific for an individual ethnic group, or in contrast reflect a more global non-native identity in the *Roots*-project first, specifically 'Turkish' or 'Berber' non-standard features in Dutch ethnolect were compared to features common to the Dutch of both groups; second, informal conversations between

Turks and Moroccans (out-group contact) per urban setting were recorded; and third, the in-group recordings were systematically compared and contrasted with recordings from Dutch peer group speakers.

We also want to establish, following the work of Hewitt (1986) and Rampton (1995; 1998), whether there is any evidence of spread of ethnic varieties to peers outside of the ethnic groups involved. If so, do ‘uniquely’ ethnolectal traits spread to peers outside the ethnic networks merely because of their ‘covert prestige’ or also/rather because they represent less marked options?

To find out whether there is any evidence of spread of ethnic varieties to peers outside of the ethnic group, in the *Roots*-project in both cities two peer groups of Dutch speakers of comparable social backgrounds were recorded: a group with frequent contacts with Moroccan Arabic and Turkish background speakers of Dutch (*Du1*) and a group with few contacts with Moroccan and Turkish background speakers of Dutch (*Du2*).

A final question in our research concerns the issue to what extent speakers of an ethnolect can *shift to more standard varieties* and to non-ethnic non-standard varieties. In the *Roots*-project systematic comparisons were made of the language behavior of the members of the Turkish and Moroccan groups in various settings:

- in-group conversations
- in out-group conversations with members of the other minority group and in out-group conversations with native Dutch speaking peers
- an experimental situation with elicitation tasks

4.2. Speaker design and other methodological aspects

To answer all the questions listed in section 4.1., we needed a speaker design in which ethnic background, age, city and, for the Dutch speakers, the presence or absence of regular contacts with Turks and Moroccans are interwoven. Table 39.3 shows how this is obtained for the present project.

What this table does not show is the ‘within subjects factor’ in-group – out-group contact, a situational factor which is relevant to questions (f) and (g) in 4.1.

As pointed out above, relatively spontaneous conversations have been recorded both in in- and out-group contact situations. An early step in the analyses of these data consists of drawing up inventories of non-standard features.

Tab. 39.3: Summary of the speaker design (the 2×3 notation refers to the fact that each of the six speakers in a ‘cell’ were each recorded in different interactive settings)

Ethnic Group	Turkish		Moroccan		Dutch			
	tight ethnic network		tight ethnic network		tight ethnic network (<i>Du1</i>)		no ethnic network (<i>Du2</i>)	
contacts in minority ethnic groups								
years of age	12	20	12	20	12	20	12	20
Amsterdam	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3
Nijmegen	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3	2×3

Apart from conversations, also elicited language use was recorded. In the dependent variables for the elicited data (i) both morphosyntax and phonology should be represented; and (ii) in both components local and non-local, specifically ethnic and non-ethnic features are included.

4.3. Preliminary results

The most striking morpho-lexical feature of the ethnolectal data, which has also entered the public consciousness and become object of conscious manipulation, is the generalization to a single gender in nouns. While SD has a neuter/non-neuter distinction (the additional masculine/feminine distinction is only found in dialects), in ethnolectal variants this distinction is absent:

<i>die meisje</i>	[SD dat meisje]	‘that girl’
<i>de mooie spel</i>	[SD het mooie spel]	‘the beautiful playing’

It is also clear that an important grammatical feature of our recordings is the omission of different kinds of functional elements:

- a. object pronouns as in:

Waarom doe je [me] na?
‘Why do you imitate [me]?’

Ja ik weet [het].
‘Yes, I know [it].’

- b. subject pronouns, as in:

Hoezo, wat wat voor spelletjes moeten [we] dan?
‘How so, what kind of games must [we] (play) then?’

Oh [het] is nog net geleden joh.
‘Oh, [it] just happened, you know.’

- c. [er] locative and quantitative pronouns used in existential and adverbial constructions:

Ja maar hij zegt [er] niks over.
‘Yes but he does says nothing [there] about.’

Hij heeft [er] negen gedaan. Ik heb er acht gedaan.
‘He did [there] nine. I have done there eight.’

Van Ginneken, (1913: 275) cites the following utterances from a Carib girl educated by the Moravians in Suriname, which demonstrate this typical feature of Dutch ethnolects that is also the subject of study in Van Wijngaarden (2010):

*Ik heb [er] een blikken koffer van gekocht, om mijne kleederen in te
I have a tin suitcase of bought, for my clothes in to
bewaren.*

keep

‘I have [there] bought a tin suitcase with (this money), to keep my clothes in.’

Ik heb mij [er] zeer over verheugt.

I have me [there] very about rejoiced

‘I have very much rejoiced about it.’

- d. Indefinite articles, as in: *En mag ik [een] dambord gaan halen bij groep uh zes?*
‘and may I [a] checkers board go fetch in group uh six?’

Het is [een] meisje.

‘It is [a] girl.’

- e. Auxiliaries and copulas

Mijn broertje [is] rijk geworden.

‘My brother [is] become rich.’

Ik zei tegen haar uh hoeveel denk je dat ze gekost [hebben]?

‘I said to her uh how much you think that they [have] cost?’

In addition to the omission of elements like the above (further examples include definite articles and prepositions), there are also

- f. special forms of negation, some of which seem like simplification patterns:

We hebben niet meer gym.

‘We have not more gym.’

Ik ga geen één euro geven voor één uurtje.

‘I go no one euro give for one hour.’

Another area of interest is

- g. the indication of possessive relations:

Dat is jouw huis van je moeder.

‘That is your home of your mother.’

mij oom

‘me uncle’

Op de eerste plaats staat Marokko z’n vlag.

‘In the first place there is Morocco his flag.’

Furthermore we find cases of overgeneralized use of auxiliaries, but this needs further exploration.

Turning now to phonological aspects, a number of phenomena have been observed, some of which have been subject to more detailed analysis in our project (cf. Van Meel 2011; Hinskens 2011).

With respect to consonants we notice a number of specific phenomena, some of which are ethnicity-specific (e.g. the Moroccan group), and some locality-specific (e.g. Nijmegen but not Amsterdam):

- realization of /r/, e.g. in connection with the centralization of preceding long mid vowels (in items such as *meer* ‘more’, *deur* ‘door’ and *voor* ‘for’) and in unstressed syllables in trochaic forms such as (simplex) *moeder* ‘mother’, *nuchter* ‘sober’, etc., as well as (morphologically complex) *hoger* ‘higher’, *vlieger* ‘kite’, etc.
- an overlong, sometimes almost geminated /z/ (Moroccan)
- word-final [t] deletion
 - in final clusters (general)
 - lexicalized in *wat* ‘what’, *dat* ‘that’, *niet* ‘not’ (Nijmegen)
- palatal versus velar or even uvular /ɣ/
- [ʃx] for /sx/, also across word boundaries, as in
 - school ‘school’
 - is goed ‘is good’ / ‘is fine’
- aspiration of voiceless plosives
- [tʃə] rather than [cə]
 - in diminutives (*katje* ‘little cat’, *handje* ‘little hand’)
 - across word boundaries (*zit_jouw broer* ‘sits your brother’, *had_je* ‘had you’)

In the vowel domain, again, there are also locality-specific phenomena:

- open /ɛ/ (*lekker* [lækər] ‘good’) (Nijmegen)
- diphthong <ij> as [i.] (Nijmegen) vs. [a] (Amsterdam)
- diphthong <ui> as [y.] Nijmegen vs. [œ] (Amsterdam)
- monophthongal vs. diphthongal realization of long mid vowels
- full rather than reduced pronunciation of grammatical clitics such as expletive *er* ‘there’ and *het* ‘it’
- staccato speech style, including reduction of sequences of identical syllables

This rich set of phonological variables is currently being further explored.

5. Issues for further research

It is clear that much further research is needed in the study of ethnolects if we want to answer questions such as the following.

5.1. Potential for language change

One issue that will be on the future research agenda is the degree to which ethnolects actually lead to language change in a more permanent sense (Hinskens 2004). This

change can have two dimensions: change internal to the ethnolect, resulting in a more or less permanent feature of the particular ethnic group, and change in the wider speech community. The issue of spread beyond the original ethnic group is a complex one, since there is often an interaction between ethnicity-specific features and more general features. The replacement of the complementizer *of* ‘if’ by *als* ‘as’ in Surinamese Dutch (SurD) is a case in point:

Ik weet niet als jij van Leefbaar bent.

‘I do not know [as] you are from Leefbaar [local political party].’

This phenomenon is often found in SurD, but also in Jewish Dutch (Hinskens p.c.) and in Dutch dialects. However, the link to Sranan, an important source for SurD is clear: the Sranan conjunction *efi* corresponds to both ‘as’ and ‘if’.

5.2. Stylization versus the vernacular

Some authors do not distinguish between ethnolects as ordinary day-to-day vernaculars and the phenomenon of stylization (as in the media representation of ethnolectal varieties), while other analysts draw a clear boundary. Since stylization plays an important role in street language as well, it is clear that my own inclination is to draw a clear line. However, the dynamics of the interaction between the vernacular and stylized varieties remains an important issue for further research.

5.3. Cross-ethnolectal features

When we compare the features of Moroccan and Turkish ethnolects of Dutch to those of other ethnolects, we are immediately struck by the many similarities. To give just one

Tab. 39.4: Some Dutch ethnolects and some of their features

	Indonesian Dutch	Surinamese Dutch	Moroccan and Turkish Dutch
A	lexical borrowings from traditional language	Yes	Limited
B	reduction or omission of final -t	Yes	Yes
C	reduction of diphthongs		
D	adaptation of consonants		
E	sentence stress		
F	present tense iso past	Yes	
G	past perfect iso present perfect	Yes	
H	gender reduction	Yes	Yes
I	omission of indefinite article	Yes	Yes
J	er-omission	Yes	Yes
K	omission of subject or object pronouns	Yes	Yes
L	strong form of possessive pronoun	Yes	
M	adverb <i>ook</i> in final position		
N	preposition selection	Yes	Yes

example, the Indonesian Dutch (Indisch-Nederlands) described by Broer van Dijk (1989) is argued to have the features listed in Table 39.4 (for a similar list see den Besten and Hinskens 2005 and Van der Sijs 2005).

The question then is how these similarities can be explained. Are they simply the result of parallel processes of incomplete second language acquisition? Do they reflect parallel differentiation strategies of bilingual speakers? A more detailed study is clearly necessary to settle this issue.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for comments from the editors of this volume, particularly Frans Hinskens, and want to acknowledge the work of other members, at different stages, of our *Roots of Ethnolects* project (funded by NWO) team: Esther van Krieken, Wouter Kusters, Hanke van Buren, Ariën van Wijngaarden, Linda van Meel, and Roeland van Hout. Christa de Kleine provided very useful comments on the section of Surinamese Dutch. However, all errors of interpretation in the present paper are my responsibility. The current paper was funded through my KNAW chair.

6. References

- Androutsopoulos, Jannis
 2001 *From the streets to the screens and back again: On the mediated diffusion of ethnolectal patterns in contemporary German*. (LAUD Linguistic Agency, Series A: No. 522.)
 URL: <http://jannisandroutsopoulos.files.wordpress.com/2009/09/iclave_2001_laud.pdf>.
- Auer, Peter
 2003a Türkenslang: Ein jugendsprachlicher Ethnolekt des Deutschen und seine Transformationen. In: Annelies Häcki Buhofer (ed.), *Spracherwerb und Lebensalter*, 255–264. Tübingen: Francke.
- Auer, Peter
 2003b “Crossing” the language border into Turkish? Uses of Turkish by non-Turks in Germany. In: Lorenza Mondada and Simona Pekarek Döhler (eds.), *Plurilinguisme Mehrsprachigkeit Plurilingualism*, 73–94. Tübingen: Francke.
- Auer, Peter and Werner Kallmeyer (eds.)
 in press *Social identity and communicative styles. An alternative approach to variability in language*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Backus, Ad
 1996 Two in one. Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands. Katholieke Universiteit Brabant, Studies in Multilingualism 1. Ph.D. thesis, Tilburg University Press.
- Beem, Hartog
 1954 Yiddish in Holland: Linguistic and socio-linguistic notes. In: Uriel Weinreich (ed.), *The field of Yiddish. Studies in Yiddish language, folklore and literature*, 122–133. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Bickerton, Derek
 1988 Creole languages and the bioprogram. In: Frederick J. Newmeyer (ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey*, vol. 2: *Linguistic theory: Extensions and implications*, 268–284. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Broer van Dijk, Stephan
 1989 De taal van Sinjo's en Nonna's; een (socio)linguïstische studie van het Indisch-Nederlands. M.A. thesis, Department of Linguistics, University of Amsterdam.
- Cairo, Edgar
 1976 *Kollektieve Schuld. Famir-man-Sani*. Baarn: Het Wereldvenster.
- Charry, Eddy
 1983 Een sociolinguïstische verkenning van het Surinaams-Nederlands. In: Eddy Charry, Geert Koefoed and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *De talen van Suriname*, 138–161. Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Cheshire, Jenny, Sue Fox, Paul Kerswill and Eivind Torgersen
 in press Ethnicity, friendship network and social practices as the motor of dialect change: Linguistic innovation in London. In: Alexandra Lenz and Klaus J. Mattheier (eds.), *Sociolinguistica* 22. Special issue on Dialect Sociology.
- Clyne, Michael
 2003 *Dynamics of language contact: English and immigrant languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cornips, Leonie
 2000 The use of *gaan* + infinitive in narratives of older bilingual children of Moroccan and Turkish descent. In: Helen de Hoop and Ton van der Wouden (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2000*, 57–67. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cornips, Leonie and Vincent de Rooij
 2003 “Kijk, Levi's is een goeie merk. Maar toch hadden ze 'm gedist van je schoenen doen 'm niet.” Jongerentaal heeft de toekomst. In: Jan Stroop (ed.), *Waar gaat het Nederlands naartoe? Panorama van een taal*, 131–142. Amsterdam: Prometheus.
- De Bies, Renate
 2009 *Woordenboek Surinaams Nederlands*. Utrecht: Uitgeverij Het Spectrum (Prisma).
- De Gruiter, Victor
 1990 *Het Javindo, de verboden taal*. The Hague: Moesson.
- De Kleine, Christa
 2002 Surinamese Dutch. In: Eithne B. Carlin and Jacques Arends (eds.), *Atlas of the languages of Suriname*, 209–230. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- De Kleine, Christa
 2007 *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Surinamese Dutch*. Munich: Lincom.
- Den Besten, Hans and Frans Hinskens
 2005 Diversificatie van het Nederlands door taalcontact [Diversification of Dutch through language contact]. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, 10: 283–309.
- De Vries, Jan W.
 2005 Indisch-Nederlands. In: Van der Sijs (ed.), 59–78.
- Dirim, İnci and Peter Auer
 2004 *Türkisch aus dem Munde der Anderen. Eine Studie zur Unschärfebeziehung zwischen Sprache und Ethnie*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- El-Aissati, Abder
 2001 Verandering en verankering: taal en identiteit bij jonge Marokkanen. In: Hans Bennis, Guus Extra, Pieter Muysken, Jacomine Nortier (eds.), *Een buurt in beweging: talen en culturen in het Utrechtse Lombok en Transvaal*, 251–262. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Fagyal, Zsuzsanna
 2010 Rhythm types and the speech of working-class youth in a banlieue of Paris: The role of vowel elision and devoicing. In: Dennis R. Preston and Nancy Niedzielski (eds.), *A Reader in Sociophonetics*, 91–132. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fagyal, Zsuzsanna
 in press *L'Accent des banlieues: aspects prosodiques du français populaire en contact avec les langues de l'immigration*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

- Fought, Carmen
2006 *Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraurud, Kerstin and Sally Boyd
2006 The native/non-native speaker distinction and the diversity of linguistic profiles of young people in Swedish multilingual urban contexts. In: Hinskens (ed.), 53–70.
- Gans, Mozes H.
1988 *Memorboek. Platenatlas van het leven der joden in Nederland van de middeleeuwen tot 1940*. 6th, revised edition. Baarn: Bosch & Keuning.
- Harris, Roxy
2006 *New Ethnicities in Language Use*. London: Palgrave.
- Hewitt, Roger
1986 *White talk black talk: Inter-racial friendship and communication amongst adolescents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinskens, Frans
2004 *Nieuwe regenboogkleuren. Jonge typen niet-standaardtaal en hun taalkundig belang*. Inaugural address. Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.
- Hinskens, Frans
2011 Emerging Moroccan and Turkish varieties of Dutch: Ethnolects or ethnic styles? In: Friederike Kern and Margret Selting (eds.), *Ethnic styles of speaking in European Metropolitan Areas*, 103–131. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hinskens, Frans (ed.)
2006 *Language Variation – European Perspectives*. Selected papers from the Third International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 3), Amsterdam, June 2005. Studies in Language Variation 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hinskens, Frans and Neil Jacobs
2005 Ashkenazic Jewish Dutch or Jewish Dutch? To appear in: Neil Jacobs (ed.), *The children of Yiddish: Studies in post-Yiddish ethnolects*
- Huwaë, Rosita
1992 *Tweetaligheid in Wierden: het taalgebruik van jongeren uit een Molukse gemeenschap*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Jamin, Mikaël
2004 Beurs and Accent des Cités: A Case Study of Linguistic Diffusion in la Courneuve. *Contemporary French and Francophone Studies* 8(2): 169–176. URL: <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1026021042000199355>>.
- Jamin, Mikaël
2005 Sociolinguistic variation in the Paris suburbs. Ph.D. thesis, Department of French Studies, University of Kent at Canterbury.
- Jamin, Mikaël, Cyril Trimaille and Médérique Gasquet-Cyrus
2006 De la convergence dans la divergence: le cas des quartiers pluri-ethniques en France. *Journal of French Linguistic Studies* 16: 335–56.
- Jaspers, Jürgen
2005a *Tegenwerken, belachelijk doen: talige sabotage van Marokkaanse jongens op een Antwerpse middelbare school*. Brussel: VUBpress.
- Jaspers, Jürgen
2005b Linguistic sabotage in a context of monolingualism and standardization. In: *Journal of language and communication* (Special issue: James Collins and Slef Slembrouck [eds.], Multilingualism and diasporic populations: Spatializing practices, institutional processes, and social hierarchies) 25: 279–297.
- Jaspers, Jürgen
2006a Stylizing standard Dutch by Moroccan boys in Antwerp. *Linguistics and Education*, 17: 131–156.

- Jaspers, Jürgen
 2006b Marokkaanse jongens en het algemeen Nederlands: substandaardisering als sociale onderhandeling. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 11: 258–285.
- Jaspers, Jürgen
 2008 Problematising ethnolects: naming linguistic practices in an Antwerp secondary school. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 12: 85–10.
- Jaspers, Jürgen (ed.)
 2009a *De klank van de stad: stedelijke meertaligheid en interculturele communicatie*. Leuven: Acco.
- Jaspers, Jürgen
 2009b Inleiding. In: Jaspers (ed.), 7–32.
- Jaspers, Jürgen and Michael Meeuwis
 2006 Playing with language in a media-promoted standardisation context: Public broadcasting and adolescent linguistic practices in Flanders. *Acta academica: supplementum* 2: 111–140.
- Jaspers, Jürgen and Reinhilde Vandekerckhove
 2009 Jong Nederlands. *Nederlandse taalkunde* 14: 2–7.
- Jørgensen, J. Normann
 to appear Plurilingual conversations among bilingual adolescents. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Jørgensen, J. Normann (ed.)
 2008 Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. Special issue of *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3).
- Joubert, Sidney
 2005 Curaçaos-Nederlands. In: Van der Sijs (ed.), 31–57.
- Keim, Inken
 2002 Bedeutungskonstitution und Sprachvariation. Funktionen des “Gastarbeiterdeutsch”. Gesprächen jugendlicher Migrantinnen. In: Arnulf Deppermann and Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), *Be-deuten. Wie Bedeutung im Gespräch entsteht*, 134–157. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Kern, Friederike and Margret Selting
 2009 On some syntactic and prosodic structures of Turkish German in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41: 2496–2514.
- Kerswill, Paul, Eivind Torgesen and Sue Fox
 2008 Reversing “drift”: Innovation and diffusion in the London diphthong system. *Language Variation and Change* 20: 451–91.
- Khan, Arfaan
 2006 A sociolinguistic study of Birmingham English: Language variation and change in a multi-ethnic British community. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Lancaster University.
- Kisch, Ilan
 1968 Notities betreffende de ghetto-uitspraak van het Nederlands. *Studia Rosenthaliana* 2: 245–252.
- Kotsinas, Ulla-Brit
 1988 Immigrant children’s Swedish – a new variety? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 9: 129–140.
- Kotsinas, Ulla-Brit
 1998 Language Contact in Rinkeby, an immigrant suburb. In: Jannis K. Androutsopoulos and Arno Scholz (eds.), *Jugendsprache, Langue des jeunes, Youth language*, 125–148. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Mazella, Léon
 2005 *Le parler pied-noir. Mots et expressions de là-bas*. Paris: Rivages.
- Mesthrie, Rajend (ed.)
 2002 *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Meunier, André
2001 *Remarques sur le français des pieds-noirs d'Oran*. Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle.
- Muysken, Pieter
2010 Ethnolects as a multidimensional phenomenon. In: Muriel Norde, Bob de Jonge and Cornelius Hasselblatt (eds.), *Language Contact*, 7–26. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Nortier, Jacomine
2001 *Murks en straattaal. Vriendschap en taalgebruik onder jongeren*. Amsterdam: Prometheus.
- Nortier, Jacomine and Margreet Dorleijn
2005 Is Moroccan Dutch developing into a general ethnolect? Paper Presented at the ICLAVE conference, Amsterdam June 2005.
- Parabirsing, R. J. [Rappa]
2009 Niet Loellen. On Blogspot Caribisch Uitzicht, posted September 5, 2009.
<<http://es.goldenmap.com/Rappa#>>
- Prins, Izak
1916 *Het Joodsch in Nederland*. Review article of van Ginneken 1914 and of Voorzanger and Polak 1915.
- Quist, Pia
2000 New Copenhagen “Multi-ethnolect”. Language use among adolescents in linguistic and culturally heterogeneous settings. *Danske Talesprog* 1: 143–212.
- Rampton, Ben
1995 *Crossing. Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, Ben
1998 Language crossing and the redefinition of reality. In: Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation*, 290–317. London: Routledge.
- Rheeden, Hadewych A. van
1995 *Het Petjo van Batavia – ontstaan en structuur van de taal van de Indo's*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Instituut voor Algemene Taalwetenschap.
- Rheeden, Hadewych A. van
1999 The emergence and structure of *Steurtjestaal*, a mixed orphanage language of colonial Java. Unpublished manuscript, University of Amsterdam.
- Sebba, Mark and S. Tate
2002 “Global” and “local” identities in the discourses of British born Caribbeans. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 6: 75–89.
- Slijper, Ezechiël
1916 Bekattering. *Nieuwe Taalgids* 10: 29–46.
- Stroud, Christopher
2004 Rinkeby Swedish and semilingualism in language ideological debates: A Bourdieuean perspective. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8: 196–214.
- Stuart-Smith, Jane, Claire Timmins and F. Alam
2009 Investigating ethnic accents: A sociophonetic analysis of “Glaswasian”. Paper presented at the 7th UK Language Variation and Change Conference (UKLVC7), Newcastle.
- Tahitu, Egbert
1989 *Melaju Sini. Het Maleis van Molukse jongeren in Nederland*. Ph.D. thesis, Leiden University.
- Thomason, Sarah G. and Terrence Kaufman
1988 *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wiese, Heide
2009 Grammatical innovation in multiethnic urban Europe: New linguistic practices among adolescents. *Lingua* 119: 782–806.

- Van Bree, Cor and Jan W. de Vries
 1997 Netherlands. In: Hans Goebel, Peter Nelde and Zdenek Starý (eds.), *Contact Linguistics. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*. Vol. 2, 1143–1152. (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Sciences 12.1.) Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Van de Kamp, Justus
 2005 Het Jodenhoeks, “een echt joden spoegsprakie”. In: Van der Sijs (ed.), 79–110.
- Van der Sijs, Nicoline (ed.)
 2005 *Wereldnederlands. Oude en jongere variëteiten van het Nederlands*. The Hague: sdu.
- Van Donselaar, Jaap
 2005 Het Surinaams-Nederlands in Suriname. In: Van der Sijs (ed.), 111–130.
- Van Ginneken, Jacques
 1913 *Handboek der Nederlandsche taal. Deel I. De sociologische structuur der Nederlandse taal I*. Nijmegen: Malmberg.
- Van Krieken, Esther
 2004 Marokkaans etnolect in Nijmegen. M.A. thesis, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Van Lier, Eva
 2005 Straattaal. *Neerlandica Extra Muros* 43: 12–26.
- Van Meel, Linda
 2011 Phonological aspects of ethnolects. Ph.D. thesis, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Van Wijngaarden, Ariën
 2010 Grammaticale aspecten van etnolecten. Ph.D. thesis, Free University Amsterdam.

Pieter Muysken, Nijmegen (The Netherlands)

40. Varieties of Dutch / Dutch as a minority language in Germany

1. Types of varieties and the Dutch-German dialect continuum
2. Dutch in Germany: A literature survey; main findings and insights
3. Linguistic results: Loans from Dutch, name relics, and a new language border
4. Lacunae, issues and possibilities for further research
5. References

1. Types of varieties and the Dutch-German dialect continuum

The history of Dutch in Germany cannot be reduced simply to an antithesis of Dutch on the one hand and German on the other. A description of Dutch as a minority language in German territories has to take its origin, varieties and domains of use into account (Kremer 1989a, 1989b).

A basic distinction which has to be made – more or less in chronological order – is that between the existence of Dutch (1) as an autochthonic language in German territories (peripheral Netherlandic, *Randniederländisch*); (2) as the language of Netherlandic peasant immigrants, settling in different parts of Germany, mainly during the twelfth