

Chapter 6: Setting and linguistic variables

6.1. Introduction

In chapter 4, we formulated a number of hypotheses about the effects of feature- and speaker-related factors on second dialect acquisition. In chapter 5, we described how the feature-related factors were operationalized. In section 6.4 of the present chapter, we will discuss all dialect features that were entered as linguistic variables in the present study and we discuss the results of the implementation of some of the feature-related factors for each feature. First, however, we will deal with geographical and socio-demographic aspects of the research location (i.e. Maldegem) (section 6.2). The next section (6.3) is devoted to the linguistic situation of Maldegem. We first discuss the three language varieties spoken in Maldegem (section 6.3.1) and then present the phonological characteristics of the Maldegem dialect from a geographical perspective (section 6.3.2). The phonological dialect features that were involved in the present study are discussed in more detail in section 6.4. We conclude with a schematic summary of the Maldegem phonological and phonetic system (section 6.5).

6.2. The research location

The present study in the secondary acquisition of a dialect by children who were raised in Standard Dutch or a substandard variety was carried out in Maldegem. Recall from chapter 5 that our informants were selected on the basis of the fact that they were living and going to school in Maldegem. In this section we discuss the geographical location of Maldegem and its socio-demographic characteristics.

Maldegem is a municipality in the outer northwest of the province of East-Flanders. Its centre is situated at about 4 kilometres to the south of the border between Belgium and the Netherlands and about 4 kilometres to the east of the border between the provinces of West- and East-Flanders (cf. map: appendix 7).

The municipality (22,289 inhabitants, 94.64 km²) is divided into three localities: Maldegem (15,626 inhabitants, 61.08 km²) in the centre, Middelburg (586 inhabitants, 5.86 km²) in the north and Adegem (5,867 inhabitants, 27.7 km²) in the east.¹ The locality of Maldegem also contains two hamlets, viz. Kleit (2,634 inhabitants) to the south and Donk (1,060 inhabitants) to the west of the centre. Administratively, Maldegem belongs to the district of Eeklo (East-Flanders).

Maldegem, which is a relatively large municipality, has a population density of 236 inhabitants per km². The age distribution in Maldegem is as follows: 21.67% are 0- to 19-

¹ Source: NIS (Nationaal Instituut voor de Statistiek 'National Institute of Statistics'), February 2007.

year-olds, 59.44% are 20- to 64-year-olds and 18.89% are 65-year-olds and older. Furthermore, the population consists of 1.61% of foreigners.

Maldegem is situated in a rural area, but (light) industry is also well-represented (e.g. metallurgical industry, food industry, building industry, clothing manufacture). The municipality has some important facilities, such as two schools (both for 3- to 18-year-olds), several supermarkets, many small shops and catering industry. Nevertheless, for higher education (18 years and older), the Maldegem youth must turn to cities like Ghent or Bruges.

6.3. Linguistic situation of Maldegem

In this section we present the linguistic situation of Maldegem. In section 6.3.1, we first discuss the functional distribution (in Maldegem) of the three language varieties that occur in Flanders, viz. dialect, *tussentaal* (i.e. substandard) and Standard Dutch (section 6.3.1.1). Next, we focus on the question how these varieties relate to each other and how they relate to the different components of language (section 6.3.1.2). In section 6.3.2 we discuss the Maldegem dialect from a geographical perspective, successively dealing with the tertiary (section 6.3.2.2), secondary (section 6.3.2.3) and primary (section 6.3.2.4) features of the Maldegem phonology.

6.3.1. The three language varieties in Flanders

According to Geeraerts (1999, 2001:338), southern Dutch can be divided into three layers (which together form a continuum). The top layer is the Belgian variant of Standard Dutch, which is also called *VRT-Nederlands* (i.e. the language of newsreaders on radio and television). The bottommost layer is constituted by the Flemish dialects. In between, there is an intermediate layer, which is called *tussentaal*. *Tussentaal* is, for example, the variety that is used in Flemish soap operas. It is also increasingly often used for supra-regional communication. Geeraerts (1999, 2001) points out that these three layers of Dutch also exist in the Netherlands, but the distances between the different layers are smaller than those in Belgium. Especially the distance between the highest and the medial layer (i.e. the most formal Standard Dutch vs. *tussentaal*) is considerably larger within southern Dutch.

6.3.1.1. Functional distribution of the three varieties in Maldegem

The linguistic situation in Maldegem resembles that of other places in East-Flanders: different language varieties, which cover the whole spectrum from dialect to Southern Dutch (i.e. so-called ‘Belgian Dutch’), are spoken in Maldegem.

First, it should be noted that the Maldegem dialect is still spoken by many people in everyday communication. With respect to the vitality of the local dialect as opposed to the

standard language, we can say that Maldegem occupies a transitional position between West-Flemish places (e.g. Zedelgem), where dialect generally is extremely well represented (see Sabbe 2005), and East-Flemish places (e.g. Melle), where dialect usually has a relatively weak position compared to more standardized varieties (see Strijkers 1990).

The second variety that is spoken in Maldegem, as in all other Flemish places, is the substandard variety called *tussentaal*. This language variety is spoken both among the middle-aged and the young generation in Maldegem. In the case of the middle-aged generation, *tussentaal* is generally the result of the ‘inability’ to speak Standard Dutch. This often concerns parents who want to raise their children in the standard variety, but who do not reach the standard. In the case of the young generation, however, *tussentaal* is usually the result of the unwillingness to speak Southern Dutch (i.e. standard language), which is perceived as being too formal.

The media play an important role in the rapid spread of *tussentaal* in Flanders. *Tussentaal* has spread to all social classes: it is used both by higher-educated people – who, according to Taeldeman (1992:37), consciously try to lower the standard – and by the lower-educated ones. According to De Caluwe (2000:49), this is one of the reasons why *tussentaal* shows a certain degree of internal variability.

The third variety which is spoken in Maldegem is ‘Belgian Dutch’, which is the southern variant of Standard Dutch. We should note that there are differences between Standard Dutch as it is spoken in the Netherlands (i.e. Northern Dutch) and Standard Dutch as it is spoken in Belgium (i.e. Southern Dutch) at all linguistic levels (cf. Taeldeman 1989b, 1992; Haeseryn 1996; De Caluwe 2000:51-52). Phonological differences, however, are the most numerous and the most salient differences between the two varieties of Dutch (cf. Taeldeman 1992:39). Most pronunciation differences between Northern and Southern Dutch are due to developments which have taken place in the Netherlands during the last sixty years (cf. Van de Velde 1996; Van Hout et al. 1999), and which originate in the colloquial speech of the *Randstad*.² Examples are the devoicing of voiced fricatives in the onset (e.g. *vijf* ‘five’ → [fɛɪf], *zes* ‘six’ → [sɛs]), the uvularization of *g* (e.g. *zeggen* ‘to say’ → [sɛχə]) and the diphthongization of the long vowels /e:/ and /o:/ (e.g. *zee* ‘sea’ → [sɛ:¹], *lopen* ‘to run’ → [lɔ:¹pə]). Southern Dutch has not adopted these features. There are also differences in the pronunciation of *w* (labiodental in Northern Dutch vs. bilabial in Southern Dutch) and of postvocalic *r* (mostly retroflex in Northern Dutch vs. mostly alveolar in Southern Dutch). Furthermore, there are differences in assimilation processes, insertion processes (e.g. svarabhakti in the northern pronunciation of *melk* ‘milk’ → [mɛlək], which is now declining) and word-final *n*-deletion (resulting in a gradual difference between

² The *Randstad* is a urbanized area consisting of the four largest Dutch cities (i.e. Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, and Utrecht) and the surrounding areas.

Northern and Southern Dutch). Finally, there are also prosodic differences, such as the resyllabification across morpheme boundaries in Southern Dutch (see Noske 2006): e.g. a word like *bergachtig* ‘mountainous’ /bɛrɣ+ɑxtəx/ is parsed as ['bɛrɣ . , ʔɑx . təx] in Northern Dutch but is resyllabified in Southern Dutch, due to influences from French, and is parsed as ['bɛr . , ɣɑx . təx].

In Maldegem, as in all other Flemish places, Southern Dutch is the norm at school. It is also the variety which is spoken in formal situations. The model of ‘ideal’ Standard Dutch in Flanders is the variety spoken by newsreaders on the official Flemish radio and television (VRT). This ‘ideal’ Standard Dutch, however, is generally experienced by many Flemish people as too formal for everyday (spoken) usage. Therefore, many people opt for *tussentaal*.

6.3.1.2. Relationships between the three varieties and the different components of language

In this section we discuss how the three language varieties spoken in Flanders relate to each other and how each of them relates to the different components of language, i.e. phonology, lexicon and morpho-syntax. Note that here we are concerned with spoken language use only.

The three varieties, i.e. dialect, *tussentaal* and Southern Dutch, can be situated on a continuum from informal to (relatively) formal. When Flemish people (try to) speak the standard language (i.e. Southern Dutch), traces of their dialectal background usually occur. Quite a few dialectal characteristics infiltrate the substandard variety (i.e. *tussentaal*), and some features even infiltrate the standard language. The degree to which different dialect features infiltrate the ‘higher’ varieties strongly depends on the language component to which they belong. Below, we deal with morphosyntactic, lexical and phonological dialect features, respectively, and we discuss the degree in which they infiltrate the ‘higher’ varieties (see also Rys & Taeldeman, forthcoming).

Morphosyntactic dialect features are to a large extent preserved in the substandard variety of Flemish speakers (i.e. *tussentaal*) (cf. Lebbe 1996; Roggeman 1998). However, they usually do not infiltrate the standard variety. That morphosyntactic dialect constructions are so well represented in *tussentaal* is mainly due to the low degree of awareness of these features (cf. Taeldeman 1991; Van Bree 2000). Below, we list a number of morphosyntactic dialect features that can be found in *tussentaal* (this list is not exhaustive; we refer the reader to Lebbe (1996) and Roggeman (1998) for a full description; see also Geeraerts 1999:232; De Caluwe 2000:50):

- the use of 2nd ps./sg. *gij* ‘you’ instead of SD *jij*
- dialectal conjugation such as *ik gaan* ‘I am going’ instead of SD *ik ga*
- dialectal diminutives such as *boekske* ‘little book’ instead of SD *boekje*

- dialectal inflection of adjectives and of possessive and demonstrative pronouns (i.e. a three-gender system) such as *mijne vriend* ‘my friend’ instead of SD *mijn vriend*, or *nen dikken tak* ‘a thick branch’ instead of SD *een dikke tak*
- subject-doubling in constructions like ‘*k heb ekik* ‘I have’ (cf. De Vogelaer 2005)
- double negation as in *hij en hoort nie goe nie meer* ‘he does not hear well anymore’
- the use of *dat* ‘that’ in combination with subordinating words: *ik weet nie wie da ze zien* ‘I don’t know who they are seeing’
- etc.

The degree to which lexical dialect features infiltrate the substandard and standard varieties strongly depends on the geographical distribution of the relevant elements. That is, very local lexical items (e.g. typical Maldegem dialect words like *redekiël* ‘shopping bag’, *krabbekeuning* ‘date (fruit)’) do not infiltrate the ‘higher’ varieties, whereas widely distributed lexical items are preserved in the *tussentaal* of Flemish speakers and even in their (spoken) Standard Dutch (i.e. Belgian Dutch); examples are *goesting* for SD *zin* ‘liking’, *velo* for SD *fiets* ‘bicycle’, *appelsien* for SD *sinaasappel* ‘orange (fruit)’, *kleed* for SD *jurk* ‘dress’, *schoon* for SD *mooi* ‘beautiful’, *ambetant* for SD *vervelend* ‘bothersome’, etc. These words are, for example, often used by Flemish parents who have the intention of raising their children in Standard Dutch.

According to Taeldeman (1991), language users are more aware of phonological dialect features than of morphosyntactic features. This may explain why phonological features infiltrate *tussentaal* or Southern Dutch to a (much) smaller extent. Phonological dialect features also mutually differ from each other with respect to the degree of awareness: primary dialect features are the most conscious ones, whereas tertiary features (i.e. accent) are the most unconscious ones (see also Taeldeman 2006a).

Recall from section 4.2.7 that, traditionally, a distinction is made between primary and secondary dialect features. However, the distinction between primary features on the one hand and secondary features on the other, should not be considered as an abrupt division between two kinds of features. This point is made clear by Taeldeman (2006a), who argues that the dichotomy of primary vs. secondary is gradual and must therefore be considered as a continuum. In order “to point out more or less stationary phases on that continuum” (Taeldeman 2006a:246), Taeldeman proposes to add a third or *tertiary* kind of features to the dichotomy. These *tertiary features* “constitute what we commonly call a ‘local’ or ‘regional’ *accent*” (Taeldeman 2006a:246). An example of accent is the (extremely) open realization of the short vowels /ɪ/, /ɛ/ and /ʌ/ in West- and East-Flemish dialects. Taeldeman assigns different characteristics to the tertiary, secondary and primary features. These characteristics are summarized in table 6.1.

TERTIARY (accent)	SECONDARY	PRIMARY
- a relatively big area - gradual transitions - very stable - if any changes, then very slowly, gradually in all respects (distance, lexically, intermediate forms) - a very low degree of awareness (if any) - no attitudinal engagement with respect to the home form - no <i>Ortsloyalität</i>	- intermediate - intermediate - changes are possible - changes are more gradual in nature - an intermediate degree of awareness - no attitudinal engagement with respect to the home form - (almost) no <i>Ortsloyalität</i>	- a relatively small area - sharp transitions - strong liability to change - changes are absolute in all respects (distance may be big, no intermediate forms) - a very high degree of awareness - a high attitudinal markedness - high (chance of) <i>Ortsloyalität</i>
↓	↓	↓
difficult to suppress	not difficult to suppress	easy to suppress

Table 6.1: Inventory of the characteristics of tertiary, secondary and primary features (Taeldeman 2006a:247).

Actually, the distinction between primary, secondary and tertiary dialect features can be considered as the most decisive parameter for infiltration into the other language varieties. We can generalize as follows:

- * Tertiary dialect features are preserved in *tussentaal* as well as in (spoken) Southern Dutch. It concerns features which are characteristic of a speaker's accent. In section 6.3.2.2, we will list a number of tertiary dialect features which occur in *tussentaal* and in Southern Dutch.
- * Secondary dialect features (e.g. SD /o: / ~ Maldegem dialect /uə / in words such as *brood* 'bread') do not infiltrate the substandard or standard varieties of Flemish speakers. Even people who do not reach the standard, but who want to raise their children in Standard Dutch, do not use these secondary dialect features in interaction with their children.
- * Primary dialect features (e.g. SD /ɛi / ~ Maldegem dialect /ø / in words like *wijn* 'wine') are characterized by a high degree of awareness (e.g. language users know these features serve as shibboleths) and are therefore not preserved in *tussentaal* or in Southern Dutch.

Recall that our informants are children who are raised in Standard Dutch (i.e. Southern Dutch) or *tussentaal*. Because the tertiary dialect features also occur in these language varieties, the production of tertiary dialect features by our informants cannot be considered as evidence of second dialect acquisition. Therefore, we have not introduced tertiary dialect features in this study (see section 6.4 for a description of the phonological variables in this

study). This also implies that the fact that we do not distinguish between children raised in *tussentaal* and those raised in Standard Dutch (both are classified in the group of second dialect learners) is not problematic: since we focus entirely on the acquisition of secondary and primary dialect features and since these features do not occur in *tussentaal* or Southern Dutch, both groups of children have to acquire the dialect features involved as part of a second language. There is therefore no reason to assume that the children raised in *tussentaal* have a lead (in dialect acquisition) on those who are raised in Standard Dutch.

In the next section, we discuss the phonology of the Maldegem dialect from a geographical perspective and we will point out whether the features discussed can be classified as primary, secondary or tertiary features.

6.3.2. The Maldegem dialect phonology from a geographical perspective

6.3.2.1. Introduction

Its geographical position in the outer northwest of the province of East-Flanders, close to the border with the province of West-Flanders, bears on the position which the Maldegem dialect occupies at the phonological level. As pointed out in Taeldeman (1976:559) and Versieck (1989:4), the Maldegem dialect occupies a transitional position in the phonological contrast dominating the Flemish dialects, viz. southwestern (with West-Flanders as epicentre) versus southerly central (with Brabant as epicentre, but involving a number of East-Flemish dialects). Following Taeldeman (1976), Versieck (1989:4) argues that the southern Dutch dialect landscape was originally divided into a Flemish and a Brabantic region, but that this situation changed during the late Middle Ages. Whereas western Flemish dialects (i.e. the dialects of West-Flanders, French-Flanders and western Zeeland-Flanders) structurally stagnated in their development, the Brabantic dialects were subject to considerable structural changes, which caused an absolute split between the southwest and the southerly central area. The basis of this enormous change in the Brabantic dialects was the diphthongization of Wgm. *î* and *û*, which started a process of several other vocalic changes (leading to a ‘drag chain’). This drag chain probably first arose in southern Brabant, but from there it spread to the rest of Brabant, to (almost entire) East-Flanders and to eastern Zeeland-Flanders. It moved from east to west with a decreasing intensity, and as a result, it did not affect the dialects of West-Flanders, French-Flanders and western Zeeland-Flanders. This resulted in a contrast between southwestern and southerly central dialects. This contrast is particularly present in the vowel system (cf. Taeldeman 1976:559). As a consequence, the transitional position of the Maldegem dialect is best revealed in the vowel system. Put differently, it is the vowel system which distinguishes the Maldegem dialect most from surrounding dialects. Moreover, the structural distance between the Maldegem dialect and Standard Dutch is also largest at the

vocalic level (Taeldeman, p.c.).³ There are also a small number of consonantal features, however, which are shared by almost all southwestern Flemish dialects, but which do not occur in the southerly central dialects.

In this section we discuss the phonological features of the Maldegem dialect (i.e. the dialect of the locality of Maldegem) from a geographical perspective.⁴ Since the distinction between tertiary, secondary and primary dialect features is closely related to geographical distribution (tertiary features are the most widely distributed ones and primary features are the most limited, see table 6.1), this section is organized as follows. In section 6.3.2.2, we discuss a number of tertiary dialect features which the Maldegem dialect shares with most of the southwestern Flemish dialects. Typical of these features is that they occur in the substandard and standard varieties of western Flemish speakers as well. Next, we show how several secondary vocalic features of the Maldegem dialect indicate its transitional position between the surrounding West- and East-Flemish dialects (see section 6.3.2.3). Finally, we discuss some idiosyncratic and thus primary phonological features of the Maldegem dialect (see section 6.3.2.4).

6.3.2.2. Tertiary features of the Maldegem dialect

As mentioned above, most features investigated in this study concern the Maldegem vowel system. The main reason for this is that the Maldegem vowel inventory differs much more from that of Standard Dutch than the consonant inventory. At the underlying level there are almost no differences between the consonant system of Standard Dutch and that of the Maldegem dialect (see section 6.5, table 6.5). There are a number of differences, however, at the surface level (e.g. in terms of assimilation processes). These concern tertiary features with a relatively large geographical distribution: they occur in most Flemish dialects except for the dialects of the easternmost East-Flanders, which have a number of Brabantic features. Typical of these features is that they infiltrate the *tussentaal* as well as the standard variety of Flemish speakers. In what follows, we list a number of these tertiary features of the Maldegem dialect (and of most of the southwestern Flemish dialects; see section 6.3.2.1).⁵ The majority of the features discussed below are consonantal.

³ For these reasons, we mainly selected vocalic dialect features in this study of secondary acquisition of the Maldegem phonology.

⁴ The dialect of the locality of Maldegem (see section 6.2.1) differs from the dialects spoken in the other localities (i.e. Adegem and Middelburg) of the municipality and even from the dialects spoken in the hamlets of Kleit and Donk. The Adegem dialect is entirely different from the other ones, in that its phonology is completely oriented to the dialects of East-Flanders. The dialect of Middelburg has adopted a few Zeeland-Flemish features. The dialect of Donk shows more West-Flemish features than that of Maldegem. Finally, the Kleit dialect most closely approximates the Maldegem dialect (see Taeldeman 1976).

⁵ This summary is not exhaustive; for a full description see Taeldeman (1976) and Versieck (1989).

- (i) Just like Standard Dutch, the Maldegem dialect normally has final devoicing (e.g. *'t is goed* 'it's good' [tɛs 'χut]), but word-final *-d* is not devoiced when the following word starts with a vowel:
 e.g. *goed eten* 'to eat well' → Mald. DIA ['hude . tɪ]
- (ii) In Standard Dutch, final voiceless fricatives can be (and mostly are) voiced when the following word starts with a vowel, as in: *ze is oud* 'she is old' [zəɪz 'out]. In the Maldegem dialect, like in all western Flemish dialects, voice assimilation also takes place between a vowel and any sonorant segment (cf. De Schutter & Taeldeman 1986):
 e.g. *vijfjaar* 'five years' → Mald. DIA ['vøvjɔ̞r]
 e.g. *is nat* 'is wet' → Mald. DIA [ɛz 'nɑt]
- (iii) Laryngealization of word-initial or word-medial /ɣ/ to [h], which is typical of western or *Ingvaeonic* dialects (cf. Taeldeman 1996:153):
 e.g. *goed* 'good' → Mald. DIA [hut]
 e.g. *zeggen* 'to say' → Mald. DIA [zəhə̞]
- (iv) Progressive place assimilation of *n* in the suffix *-en* with deletion of ə (cf. Taeldeman 1976:475):
 e.g. *kopen* 'to buy' → Mald. DIA [kuəpɪ]
 e.g. *blijven* 'to stay' → Mald. DIA [blɔ̞vɪ]
 e.g. *werken* 'to work' → Mald. DIA [wə̞r ɪ]
- (v) Deletion of the final consonant in words such as *dat* 'that', *wat* 'what', *niet* 'not' or *goed* 'good' before words beginning with a consonant.
- (vi) Deletion of initial *h-* (e.g. *ik heb* 'I have' → *ik eb*), which occurs in the *tussentaal* and Southern Dutch of Flemish as well as Brabantic speakers.
- (vii) A tertiary feature occurring in all Flemish and Brabantic dialects (and infiltrating the standard and substandard varieties) is the resyllabification across morpheme boundaries, as in *oneens* 'at odds', which is parsed as [ɔ̞ 'nɛ : nɛ] (as opposed to Northern Dutch [ɔ̞n 'ʔɛ : nɛ], cf. Noske 2006; see also section 6.3.1.1).
- (viii) Deletion of word-final schwa before words starting with a vowel, e.g. *grote appels* 'big apples' → *groot appels*.

(ix) Typical of the substandard and standard variety of people from Maldegem (and from West-Flanders and the western part of East-Flanders) is the very open realization of the short vowels /ɪ/, /ʌ/ and /ɛ/ as /ɛ̃/, /œ/ and /æ̃/.

All the above dialect features (i-ix) can be considered as tertiary dialect features: all have a (relatively) large geographical distribution. Furthermore, these features are very hard to suppress for speakers, so that they also occur in *tussentaal* and Southern Dutch.

6.3.2.3. Secondary features of the Maldegem dialect

In the previous section we argued that the Maldegem dialect has a number of tertiary features in common with the southwestern Flemish dialects, i.e. the dialects of entire West-Flanders and of a large part of East-Flanders (except for *Waasland* and *Denderstreek*). Recall that all of these features can infiltrate the substandard and standard varieties of western Flemish speakers.

In the present section, we present some features which the Maldegem dialect shares with either the surrounding West-Flemish or the neighbouring East-Flemish dialects. These are a number of vocalic dialect features which are characterized by a relatively large geographical spread, although less widely than the tertiary features discussed above. These features do not occur in *tussentaal* or Southern Dutch and can be considered as secondary dialect features since they reveal the transitional nature of the Maldegem dialect phonology.

We present these secondary features of the Maldegem dialect in table 6.2 (see also Versieck 1989:6-7). The arrows indicate whether the Maldegem dialect pronunciation follows the West- or the East-Flemish variant. A ‘full’ arrow indicates that the Maldegem dialect variant almost coincides either with the West-Flemish variant or with the East-Flemish variant. Interrupted arrows pointing in two directions indicate that the Maldegem dialect variant is phonetically an intermediate variant between the West- and the East-Flemish variant. An interrupted arrow pointing in one direction indicates that the Maldegem dialect variant also takes an intermediate (i.e. transitional) position between the West- and East-Flemish variant, but that it more closely approximates one of these dialect variants.

	West-Flemish ⁶		Maldegem dialect		East-Flemish ⁷
1. Wgm. \check{i} + η in <i>vinger</i> ‘finger’	[ɪ̯]	←	[e]		[ɛ̥:]
2. Wgm. \check{u} (without umlaut) in <i>boter</i> ‘butter’, <i>noot</i> ‘nut’	[ø:]	←	[ø]		[ɔ̥]
3. Wgm. \check{e} in <i>aarde</i> ‘earth’, <i>peer</i> ‘pear’	[ɛ̥:]	<-----	[ɪ̯]	----->	[ɛ̥ə]
4. Wgm. \check{u} with umlaut in <i>put</i> ‘pit’, <i>stuk</i> ‘piece’	[ɛ̥]	←	[ɛ̥]		[æ]
5. Wgm. \check{a} in <i>darm</i> ‘intestine’	[æ]	←	[æ̥]		[ɔ̥ə]
6. Wgm. \hat{i}/\hat{u} in coda <i>bij</i> ‘near’/ <i>nu</i> ‘now’	[i]/[y]		[ɛ̥i]	----->	[æ̥i]/[œ̥y]
7. Wgm. \hat{u} in <i>huis</i> ‘house’, <i>uit</i> ‘out’	[y]	<-----	[ø]	----->	[œ̥ ⁽ⁱ⁾]
8. Wgm. \hat{i} in between two labial consonants <i>wijf</i> ‘wife’, <i>pijp</i> ‘pipe’	[y]	←	[ø]		[ɛ̥i]
9. Wgm. \hat{i} + velar C <i>rijk</i> ‘rich’, <i>slijk</i> ‘mud’	[i]	<-----	[e]	----->	[ɛ̥]
10. Wgm. \check{a} in <i>maart</i> ‘March’, <i>water</i> ‘water’	[ɔ:]	<-----	[ɔ̥ ^c]	----->	[oə]
11. Wgm. αi in <i>klein</i> ‘small’	[eə]	<-----	[iə]		[æi]
12. Wgm. $\check{a}/\check{o}l$ + <i>d</i> in <i>hout</i> ‘wood’, <i>zout</i> ‘salt’	[u]		[ɑi]	----->	[æi]

⁶ The data in table 6.2 on the West-Flemish vowel system are based on the dialect spoken in Oedelem.

⁷ The data in table 6.2 on the East-Flemish vowel system are based on the dialect spoken in Adegem.

13. Wgm. $\check{a}/\check{o}l + d$ in <i>oud</i>					
‘old’, <i>koud</i> ‘cold’	[u]		[ɔu]	→	[ɔu]
14. Wgm. $\hat{\alpha} + w$					
<i>blauw</i> ‘blue’	[ɔu]	<-----	[ɔu]	----->	[æu]
15. Wgm. αu in <i>groot</i>					
‘large’, <i>boom</i> ‘tree’	[oə]	<-----	[uə]		[yə]

Table 6.2: The transitional status of the Maldegem dialect phonology (taken from Versieck 1989:6-7)

Apart from its transitional status between West- and East-Flemish dialects, the Maldegem dialect has also developed some idiosyncratic phonological features. These features are most typical of the Maldegem dialect. People of neighbouring villages often recognize that a person comes from Maldegem on the basis of these features (i.e. they serve as so-called shibboleths). We discuss these primary features of the Maldegem dialect in the next section.

6.3.2.4. Primary features of the Maldegem dialect

The Maldegem dialect is characterized by a few phonological features that do not occur anywhere else in Flanders. These are the primary features of the Maldegem dialect, which often function as shibboleths. An example is the shibboleth $v[\emptyset]venv[\emptyset]ftig [\emptyset]zderen v[\emptyset]zen$ ‘fifty-five iron screws’, which refers to the primary feature of the Maldegem dialect that / \emptyset / corresponds to SD / εi / (from Wgm. \hat{i}) in positions before an anterior consonant. Consider also the following shibboleth: ‘*k zeun van M[\alpha:]degem* ‘I’m from Maldegem’. This phrase refers to another typical feature of the Maldegem dialect, viz. the deletion of /l/ with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel.

In this section we present the phonological features that are most typical of the Maldegem dialect. This implies that these features have a very narrow geographical distribution. Typical of these primary features (as well as of secondary features) is that they do not occur in *tussentaal* or Southern Dutch. Versieck (1989:9-10) mentions the following primary Maldegem dialect features:

- (i) The systematic unrounding of all palatal vowels, except for / \emptyset /:
 - (a) unrounding of */y/ (from Wgm. *iu* or Wgm. \hat{u}) to /i/:⁸

⁸ In this case, the asterisk (*) indicates the ‘Old Flemish’ variant.

e.g. *muur* 'wall' [mi.r]

e.g. *minuut* 'minute' [mɛnit]

(b) unrounding of */ʌ/ (<umlaut or 'spontaneous' palatalization of Wgm. *ǔ*):

e.g. *rug* 'back' [rɛhə]

e.g. *zuster* 'sister' [zɛstərə]

e.g. *borstel* 'brush' [bɛstələ]

e.g. *bok* 'buck' [bɛk]

(c) unrounding of */œy/ (from Wgm. *û*) to /ɛi/:

e.g. *buien* 'showers' [bɛiɰ:]

e.g. *luiden* 'to ring' [lɛiɰ:]

e.g. *nu* 'now' [nɛi]

Types (a) and (c) have almost completely disappeared from the contemporary Maldegem dialect; only the unrounding in (b) is still used by the Maldegem youth. The only remnant of a type (c) unrounding is found in the highly frequent word *nu* 'now'. The decline of the unrounded variants (a) and (c) in the Maldegem dialect was already observed and described by Versieck (1989:189-190). Because of the fact that even the control group (in the present study) hardly produced unrounded variants of type (a) or (c), these variables were removed from the data processing.

(ii) Rounding of */e/ (from Wgm. *î*) to /ø/ before an anterior consonant:

e.g. *prijs* 'price' [prøɰ]

e.g. *wijn* 'wine' [wøn]

e.g. *bijten* 'to bite' [bøtɰ]

(iii) Deletion of /l/, with concomitant compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel before C or pause:

e.g. *balk* 'beam' [bɑ:ʔə]

e.g. *bal* 'ball' [bɑ:]

(iv) Deletion of /n/, with lengthening and nasalization of the preceding vowel before alveolar fricatives:

e.g. *mensen* 'people' [mɛ̃:sɰ]

e.g. *onze* 'our' [õ:zə]

Apart from features (i_a) and (i_c), the above primary dialect features are all examined in the present study. We also entered a number of the secondary features which are represented in table 6.2. In the next section, we give a detailed description of each phonological dialect feature which was entered as a variable in the present study.

6.4. Phonological variables in the present study

In this section, we discuss a number of phonological features of the Maldegem dialect, which were elicited by means of our word list (see appendix 6). Our study includes a total number of 34 different dialect features, 10 of which concern lexical exceptions. Originally, the words of our word list investigated about fifty different features. Later, however, we decided not to process all of these features. We left out, for example, those features that are characteristic of the accent of speakers (i.e. tertiary features), such as the open or close realization of particular vowels as in the following examples:

- (a) SD /ɪ/ (from Wgm. *ĩ*) ~ DIA /ɛ̃/ (e.g. in *dik* ‘thick’)
- (b) SD /ɛ/ (from Wgm. *ě*) ~ DIA /æ̃/ (e.g. in *bed* ‘bed’)
- (c) SD /ɛi/ (from Wgm. *î*) ~ DIA /ɛ̃i/ (e.g. in *blij* ‘glad’)
- (d) SD /ɔ/ (from Wgm. *ō*) ~ DIA /o/ (e.g. in *pot* ‘pot’)
- (e) SD /ɪ/ (from Wgm. *ĩ*) + /ŋ/ ~ DIA /e/ + /ŋ/ (e.g. in *ding* ‘thing’)
- (f) SD /ɛ/ (from Wgm. *ě*) + /ŋ/ ~ DIA /e/ + /ŋ/ (e.g. in *brenge* ‘to bring’)

We decided not to process the above features because they are all characteristic of the substandard variety that is spoken in the western Flemish area. In other words, these features are far from unique to the Maldegem dialect. Recall that we have argued that these tertiary features are most likely present in the L1 of the dialect learners as well. This implies that if a child realizes one of the above features, this is not necessarily the result of secondary dialect acquisition. Very likely, these features are part of the child’s accent.

Another dialect feature that we originally intended to include in our study, but was not processed in the end, is the unrounding of */y/ (from Wgm. *iu* or Wgm. *û*) to /i/ (e.g. *muur* ‘wall’ [mi . r]) (see section 6.3.2.4). The reason for removing this feature was the fact that this type of unrounding hardly ever occurred in the dialect of the control group. Naturally, a dialect feature which has almost disappeared among native dialect speakers, will not be acquired by second dialect learners. The fact that this feature was hardly observed in the

speech of our control group proves that this type of unrounding has been almost completely lost in the current Maldegem dialect.⁹

The 34 Maldegem dialect features which were ultimately processed are discussed in the following sections. We represent these features as correspondences between a Standard Dutch variant *x* and a dialect variant *y* (i.e. SD *x* ~ DIA *y*). In addition, a brief description of the historical background of the vocalic features will be given. For each dialect feature, we also illustrate the implementation of the linguistic factors ‘productivity’, ‘conditioning environment’ and ‘competing variants’. We refer the reader to appendices 1 and 2 for data about the incidence (UL/TL, respectively), to appendix 3 for data about the token frequency on the level of the word and appendix 4 for the average token frequency for every dialect feature, and to appendix 4 for data about the geographical distribution of the features involved.

In the following sections, we first discuss the three postlexical features that were involved in our study (sections 6.4.1–6.4.3). All three features are consonantal features. Section 6.4.4 is devoted to the only consonantal feature with lexical status (i.e. *r*-deletion). The remaining sections discuss the vocalic variables in our study, which are all lexical features.

6.4.1. Deletion of /l/ and compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel

One of the primary features of the Maldegem dialect is the deletion of /l/ before a consonant or a pause (but not before a vowel), accompanied by the compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel (see Taeldeman 1976:458; Versieck 1989:38, 123). This vowel lengthening results in extra-long vowels, which do not exist on the underlying, phonological level (see Taeldeman 1969), but are allophones of their short equivalents. This feature is one of the postlexical features involved in this study (cf. section 6.2.1.3). Evidence of the fact that there is a phoneme /l/ underlyingly, comes from forms such as *balletje* ‘little ball’ [bɑləkə], in which the underlying /l/ occurs at the phonetic surface. Consider the following examples:

e.g. *bal* ‘ball’ DIA [bɑ:]

but: *balletje* ‘little ball’ DIA [bɑləkə]

e.g. *de bal pakken* ‘take the ball’ DIA [dəm’bɑ:pɑʔə]

but: *de bal is...* ‘the ball is ...’ DIA [dəm’bɑlɛs]

Below, we give some examples of *l*-deletion in different environments:

⁹ Versieck (1989:189) shows that the decline of the unrounding of [y] to [i] was already in progress in the dialect of previous generations.

(a) Before a pause:

e.g. *pijl* ‘arrow’ [pø:]

e.g. *vol* ‘full’ [vɛ:]

e.g. *gevoel* ‘feeling’ [høvu:]

(b) Before a consonant:

e.g. *melk* ‘milk’ [mæ:k]

e.g. *wolk* ‘cloud’ [wo:ʔə]

e.g. *melken* ‘to milk’ [mæ:ʔə]

e.g. *vuilbak* ‘dustbin’ [vø:bɔk]

Apart from the above environments, *l*-deletion also applies when /l/ precedes the suffix *-en*, as in *ballen* ‘balls’, *rollen* ‘to roll’. Taeldeman (p.c.) proposes the following historical development: first, forms like [bǎlən] were subject to schwa-deletion, resulting in [bɔl̩n]. Through this development, the [l] appeared in a position preceding a consonant (i.e. [n]), which triggered *l*-deletion and compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, yielding [bɔ:l̩]. Later, the *n* was deleted and this was compensated for by the (compensatory) nasalization of the preceding vowel, giving [bɔ̃:]. Consider the following examples:

(c) Before the suffix *-en*:

e.g. *ballen* ‘balls’ [bɔ̃:] (plural) (vs. sg. *bal* ‘ball’ DIA [bɔ:])

e.g. *rollen* ‘to roll’ [rɔ̃:]

e.g. *gevoelens* ‘feelings’ [høvũ:s]

In chapter 3 (section 3.2.3.1), we already showed that *l*-deletion is one of the few postlexical features involved in the present study. We also argued that *l*-deletion is very typical of the Maldegem dialect (e.g. the feature is used in shibboleths).¹⁰ In other words, it is one of the first features that will strike someone who is unfamiliar with the Maldegem dialect.

As mentioned above, data about the incidence, token frequency and geographical distribution of the phonological features involved, can be found in appendices 1, 2, 3, and 4. In what follows, we briefly discuss the implementation of the other three feature-related factors with respect to *l*-deletion.

¹⁰ Except for the Maldegem dialect, the feature of *l*-deletion also occurs in the dialect of the hamlet Kleit (see Taeldeman 1976).

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

In section 5.2.1.5, we argued that all postlexical features are fully productive. We illustrated the productivity of *l*-deletion (in all three environments) in the Maldegem dialect. It was shown that the feature of *l*-deletion applies to new words, such as loanwords (e.g. *Rock & Roll*, *grill*, *small*, *body-building*, *bulldozer*, *full-time*), brand names (*Opel*, *Aldi*, *Golf*) and proper names (e.g. *Michel*, *Rachel*, *Chantal*, *Ilse*, *Elvis*).

* Conditioning environment:

- (a) The deletion of /l/ before a pause (+ compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel) (i.e. SD V + /l/ + pause ~ DIA V: + pause) is restricted to positions after a vowel and preceding a pause, which is the conditioning environment. This means that all words which in Standard Dutch have ‘vowel + /l/ + pause’ – except for a few feminine words (e.g. *wol* ‘wool’) – correspond to Maldegem dialect variants with ‘extra-long vowel + pause’.¹¹ Hence, the feature of *l*-deletion is restricted to a specific environment (= 1).¹²
- (b) The deletion of /l/ before a consonant (+ compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel) (i.e. SD V + /l/ + C ~ DIA V: + C) is environmentally conditioned (= 1): each word that has ‘vowel + /l/ + consonant’ in Standard Dutch (e.g. *melk* ‘milk’ [mɛlk]), corresponds to a dialect variant with ‘extra-long vowel + consonant’ (e.g. [mæ:k]).
- (c) The deletion of /l/ before the suffix *-en* (+ compensatory lengthening and nasalization of the preceding vowel) (i.e. SD V + /l/ + -ən ~ DIA \tilde{v} : + pause) always occurs in Standard Dutch words that end in ‘/l/ + *-en*’ (e.g. *vallen* ‘to fall’ [vɑlən]). This means that there is a conditioning environment (= 1).

* Competing variants:

In section 5.2.1, we pointed out that the number of competing dialect variants is one of the factors which determines the predictability of a correspondence between a Standard Dutch element x and a dialect element y. The fact that the feature of *l*-deletion is restricted to the environment in which /l/ follows a vowel and precedes (a) a pause, (b) a consonant, or (c)

¹¹ In the Maldegem dialect, feminine nouns have not undergone schwa-apocope (e.g. *kat* ‘cat’ [kɑtə]). This implies that a word like *wol* ‘wool’ is pronounced with word-final schwa, i.e. as [wɛlə]. As a result, the /l/ in [wɛlə] is intervocalic, so that there is no context for *l*-deletion.

¹² As pointed out in chapter 5 (section 5.4.4), this factor is scored binomially in the present study: it is coded as 1 if there is a conditioning environment and as 0 if there is not.

the suffix *-en*, will most likely increase the predictability of the dialect feature. As we pointed out (see section 5.2.1), however, we do not discount the other factors in our implementation of each of the sub-factors (i.e. incidence, conditioning environment, competing variants, productivity, and average token frequency). Since we want to find out which factor contributes most to the degree of learnability of features, we ignore environmental restrictions when ‘counting’ the competing variants. Only when we exclude the impact of all other factors from the implementation of a particular factor can we be sure to gain an understanding of the individual effect of this factor.¹³ We obtain the following results for *l*-deletion:

(a) If we ignore any environmental restrictions, the segment /l/ in a Standard Dutch form may correspond to one of two possible dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 2):

(1) to an extra-long vowel (compensating for a deleted /l/)

e.g. SD [bɑl] ~ DIA [bɑ:] ‘ball’

e.g. SD [nʌl] ~ DIA [nœ:] ‘nill’

e.g. SD [bɑlk] ~ DIA [bɑ:ʔə] ‘beam’

(2) to DIA [l]

e.g. SD [wɔl] ~ DIA [wɛlə] ‘wool’

e.g. SD [za:l] ~ DIA [zɔ̥˚lə] ‘hall’

e.g. SD [bɑlətʃə] ~ DIA [bɑləkə] ‘little ball’

e.g. SD [dəˈbɑlɪs] ~ DIA [dəmˈbɑlɛs] ‘the ball is’

We assume that the child will gradually learn that the possible dialect variants corresponding to SD /l/ are restricted when that segment occurs in a given environment. Put differently, the factor ‘conditioning environment’ will start to interact with the factor ‘competing variants’. Furthermore, the impact of the productivity of this dialect feature, will also increase as dialect acquisition proceeds.

We think that the learnability of a dialect feature might not only be influenced by the number of competing dialect variants that correspond to a particular Standard Dutch segment, but that the number of competing Standard Dutch variants that correspond to the relevant dialect segment might also have an effect (see section 4.2.2). In other words, not only the transparency of the correspondence SD *x* ~ DIA *y* is important to the degree of predictability, but also the transparency of the correspondence DIA *y* ~ SD *x* (see also

¹³ Interaction effects between the factors that contribute to the degree of predictability of dialect features, viz. incidence, conditioning environment, competing variants, productivity, and average frequency, will be computed in chapter 7 by means of statistical techniques.

section 4.2.2). That is, an extra-long (non-nasalized) vowel in a dialect form can only correspond to one Standard Dutch variant (i.e. number of competing SD variants = 1), viz. to SD ‘V + [l]’. Consider the following correspondences:

e.g. DIA [bɑ:] ~ SD [bɑl] ‘ball’

e.g. DIA [mɛ:] ~ SD [mɛ:l] ‘flour’

e.g. DIA [bɑ:ʔə] ~ SD [bɑlk] ‘beam’

e.g. DIA [mæ:k] ~ SD [mɛlk] ‘milk’

- (b) The results of the implementation of this factor with respect to *l*-deletion before a consonant are identical to the ones described in (a), i.e. the number of competing dialect variants equals 2 and the number of competing Standard Dutch variants is 1.
- (c) For *l*-deletion before the suffix *-en*, the results of the implementation of the factor ‘competing dialect variants’ are identical to the ones described in (a) (i.e. the number of competing dialect variants is 2). On the other hand, an extra-long, nasalized vowel in a dialect form, may – if we ignore the environmental restrictions – correspond to one of two Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 2):

(1) to SD /l/ (following vowel and preceding the suffix *-en*)

e.g. DIA [vɑ̃:] ~ SD [vɑlən] ‘to fall’

(2) to SD /n/ (following vowel and preceding alveolar fricative)

e.g. DIA [õ:zə] ~ SD [ɔnzə] ‘our’

6.4.2. Deletion of /n/ and compensatory lengthening and nasalization of the preceding vowel

Another consonantal feature that was entered as a linguistic variable in the present study is the deletion of /n/ before an alveolar fricative, accompanied by the compensatory lengthening and nasalization of the preceding vowel (i.e. SD V + /n/ + s/z ~ DIA \tilde{v} : + s/z) (cf. Taeldeman 1976:473; Versieck 1989:46, 125). This is also one of the postlexical features involved in the present study. The extra-long, nasalized vowels resulting from this alternation are allophones of their short(er), non-nasalized counterparts (see Versieck 1989:71). As is characteristic of a postlexical feature, it can apply across word boundaries. Consider the following examples:

e.g. *een bon* ‘a bill’ DIA [nəm'bon]

een bon drukken ‘print a bill’ DIA [nəm'bondrɛʔə̃]

But: *een bon zoeken* ‘search a bill’ DIA [nəm'bō:zuʔə̃]

e.g. *gaan ze hem vangen?* ‘are they going to catch him?’ DIA [,hə̃^c:zə̃m'vɑŋ:]

The fact that the Maldegem phoneme inventory does not contain extra-long, nasalized vowels, means that the feature of *n*-deletion is not structure-preserving. Besides, there are no words with ‘vowel + /n/ + alveolar fricative’ which are not subject to *n*-deletion in the Maldegem dialect. Thus, *n*-deletion is an exceptionless, postlexical rule. Below, we give some more examples illustrating the feature:

e.g. *spons* ‘sponge’ [spō:sə]

e.g. *mens* ‘human being’ [mē:s]

e.g. *onze* ‘our’ [ō:zə]

e.g. *dansen* ‘to dance’ [dã:sŋ]

e.g. *ganzen* ‘geese’ [hã:zŋ]

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

In section 5.2.1.5, we showed that *n*-deletion is a (fully) productive dialect feature, since it can be applied to new words, such as loanwords (e.g. *dancing* ‘disco’, *jeans*), brand names (e.g. *Lancia*) and proper names (e.g. *Lindsey*, *Nancy*).

* Conditioning environment:

The feature of *n*-deletion is restricted to a particular conditioning environment (= 1): if the condition ‘vowel + /n/ + alveolar fricative’ is satisfied in Standard Dutch, the dialect sequence ‘extra-long, nasalized vowel + alveolar fricative’ will appear.

* Competing variants:

If we ignore the environmental restrictions, the segment /n/ in Standard Dutch forms may correspond to either of two Maldegem dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 2):

(1) to an extra-long, nasalized vowel (compensating for deleted /n/)

e.g. SD [mɛns] ~ DIA [mē:s] ‘human being’

(2) to DIA [n]

e.g. SD [hɑnt] ~ DIA [ɑnt] ‘hand’

Reversely, each dialect form with an extra-long, nasalized vowel (irrespective of its context) may correspond to one of two Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 2):

(1) to SD [n] (following a vowel and preceding an alveolar fricative)

e.g. DIA [mē:s] ~ SD [mɛns] ‘human being’

(2) to SD [ɫ] (following a vowel and preceding the suffix *-en*)

e.g. DIA [vɑ̃:] ~ SD [vɑɫən] ‘to fall’

6.4.3. Laryngealization of *k*

Another consonantal feature involved in the present study is the laryngealization of /k/ to glottal stop [ʔ]. This postlexical feature of the Maldegem dialect is restricted to the following environments (see Versieck 1989:119):

(a) /k/ following a stressed and preceding an unstressed vowel (i.e. schwa) within the same word:

e.g. *dikker* ‘thicker’ [dɛʔər]

e.g. *tikkertje* ‘tag’ [tɛʔərkə]

e.g. *kijken* ‘to watch’ [kɛʔɛ]

e.g. *melken* ‘to milk’ [mæ:ʔɛ]

(b) Across a word boundary, when /k/ follows a stressed vowel and precedes a word starting with a stressed vowel or a sonorant consonant (*l, r, m, n* or *w*):

e.g. *eekhoorn* ‘squirrel’ [‘iəʔuərn]

e.g. *ze komt ook alleen* ‘she is also coming alone’ [zəkɔmd‘uəʔɑliənə]

e.g. *stukriem* ‘piece of belt’ [stɛʔ‘rim]

e.g. *pak mij* ‘catch me’ [‘pɑʔmɛi]

e.g. *kakmadam* ‘toffee-nosed woman’ [‘kɑʔmɑdɑm]

But not in *broekzak* ‘trouser pocket’ [‘bruksɑk]

The glottal stop in the above words is a surface variant of an underlying /k/. In other words, the glottal stop is an allophone of the phoneme /k/.¹⁴ Thus, laryngealization of /k/ is not structure-preserving, which is an indication that it is a postlexical feature. Further evidence of its postlexical status comes from the above examples, which reveal that it can apply across word boundaries. Furthermore, there are no lexical exceptions. And finally, laryngealization of /k/ should be ordered after the postlexical feature of *l*-deletion, which implies that laryngealization must be postlexical too. Consider the following case. In *melken* ‘to milk’, the rule of *l*-deletion + compensatory lengthening is applied first. This results in a stressed vowel followed by /k/ + schwa (i.e. *[mæ:kən]), which is the required environment for laryngealization of /k/ to apply (→ [mæ:ʔ̤]). Thus, there is a *feeding* order between *l*-deletion and laryngealization of /k/ in *melken*, since the deletion of /l/ creates the required input for laryngealization of /k/.

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

In section 5.2.1.5, it was argued that the feature of laryngealization of /k/ is still (fully) productive in the Maldegem dialect, because it applies to new words, such as loanwords (e.g. *Rock & Roll*, *aerobicen* ‘to do aerobics’, *mountainbiken* ‘to mountainbike’, *playbacken* ‘to playback’, *black out*, *sticker*).

* Conditioning environment:

A glottal stop is realized in the Maldegem dialect if the corresponding Standard Dutch form exhibits one of the following (conditioning) environments: (a) ‘/k/ following a stressed and preceding an unstressed vowel (i.e. schwa) within the same word’ or (b) ‘/k/ following a stressed vowel and preceding a word with a stressed vowel or a sonorant consonant (*l*, *r*, *m*, *n* or *w*) in the onset’. Thus, there are strict environmental conditions (= 1) under which a glottal stop appears.

¹⁴ Further evidence of the allophonic status of the glottal stop in the Maldegem dialect is the fact that [k] and [ʔ] are in complementary distribution.

* Competing variants:

If we ignore the environmental restrictions described in (a) and (b), the segment /k/ in a SD form may correspond to one of two dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 2):

(1) to glottal stop

e.g. SD [streikən] ~ DIA [streʔə̃] ‘to iron’

(2) to dialect [k]

e.g. SD [streikt] ~ DIA [strekt] ‘(he) irons’

Reversely, a Maldegem dialect form with a glottal stop can only correspond to a Standard Dutch form with /k/ (number of competing SD variants = 1):

e.g. DIA [streʔə̃] ~ SD [streikən] ‘to iron’

6.4.4. Deletion of /r/ before an alveolar fricative in monomorphemic words

The only consonantal feature involved in the present study which does not operate on the postlexical level is the deletion of /r/ before an alveolar fricative in monomorphemic words (e.g. in *vers* ‘fresh’, *dorst* ‘thirst’). This deletion does not take place, however, when the alveolar fricative belongs to a suffix (e.g. *zwaarst* ‘heaviest’, *smeersel* ‘ointment’) (see also Taeldeman 1979:102-103). Hence, the application of *r*-deletion depends on morphological information (i.e. only in monomorphemic words; not when *s/z* belongs to a suffix), which is typical of lexical rules. The fact that there are many lexical exceptions to *r*-deletion (e.g. French loanwords such as *mars* ‘march’, *fors* ‘sturdy’, *koers* ‘cycling contest’) is another indication of the lexical status of this alternation.

The feature of *r*-deletion is very widely distributed. According to Taeldeman (1979:102), *r*-deletion before an alveolar fricative occurs throughout Flanders (see also De Schutter & Taeldeman 1994). The following correspondences are examples of *r*-deletion:

e.g. SD [kɛrs] ~ DIA [kɛzə] ‘cherry’

e.g. SD [ka:rs] ~ DIA [kɛsə] ‘candle’

e.g. SD [wɔrst] ~ DIA [wɔst] ‘sausage’

e.g. SD [dɔrst] ~ DIA [dɛst] ‘thirst’

e.g. SD [vɛrs] ~ DIA [vɛs] ‘fresh’

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

Like all lexical features in this study, *r*-deletion is no longer productive in the Maldegem dialect (= 0). It does not apply, for example, to French loanwords such as *mars* ‘march’, *fors* ‘sturdy’, *farce* ‘joke, farce’ or *koers* ‘cycling contest’, or to exogenous proper names such as *Lars* or *Morse*.

* Conditioning environment:

In Standard Dutch, the segment /r/ is deleted when it occurs ‘before an alveolar fricative within the same morpheme’. So the rule of *r*-deletion is restricted to a specific conditioning environment (= 1). The rule does not apply, however, to a number of loanwords.

* Competing variants:

Irrespective of its context, Standard Dutch /r/ may correspond to one of two dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 2):

(1) to DIA [r]

e.g. SD [fors] ~ DIA [fors] ‘sturdy’

e.g. SD [hart] ~ DIA [art] ‘hard’

(2) to DIA ∅

e.g. SD [kers] ~ DIA [kɛzə] ‘cherry’

e.g. SD [dorst] ~ DIA [dɛst] ‘thirst’

Oppositely, a dialect form with ‘V + ∅ + s/z’ may correspond to one of two Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 2):

(1) to SD ‘V + ∅ + s/z’

e.g. DIA [mɔst] ~ SD [mɔst] ‘mast’

e.g. DIA [vɔs] ~ SD [vɔs] ‘fox’

(2) to SD ‘V + [r] + s/z’

e.g. DIA [wɔst] ~ SD [wɔrst] ‘sausage’

e.g. DIA [vɔs] ~ SD [vɛrs] ‘fresh’

To summarize, in the above sections (sections 6.4.1-6.4.4), four alternations operating on the Maldegem consonant system have been presented. These are the only consonantal variables involved in the present study. The reason is that the Maldegem consonant system does not deviate strongly from that of Standard Dutch, as opposed to the vowel system. Therefore, the other 30 variables that were examined are all phonological alternations affecting vowels. These variables are discussed in the remaining sections.

6.4.5. SD /ɛi/ (from Wgm. *î*) ~ DIA /e/ before velar or laryngeal consonant

The Maldegem dialect has two different segments in words with West Germanic (and Middle Dutch) *î*, viz. Maldegem dialect /ø/ and /e/. The positional distribution of these segments is as follows: /ø/ (< Wgm. *î*) occurs in positions before an anterior consonant, whereas /e/ (< Wgm. *î*) occurs in positions before a velar or laryngeal consonant. This might look as if the two segments are in complementary distribution and are therefore allophones of one underlying phoneme, but this is no longer the case in the contemporary Maldegem dialect. The rounding of West Germanic *î* to [ø] before an anterior consonant must have taken place before *î*, through widening to [e], merged with Middle Dutch (*zachtlange*) *ee* (Johan Taeldeman, p.c.). If it had been the other way around, a word like *beet* ‘bite’ (with *zachtlange ee*) would also have been rounded to [ø]. This was not the case, however: the word *beet* is realized in the Maldegem dialect as [betə], not as [bøtə].¹⁵

Later, [e] and [ø] were phonemicized due to another historical process: from Middle Dutch *zachtlange ee* the variant /e/ developed, which occurred in all positions (also before anterior consonants) (e.g. *beet* ‘bite’, *dreef* ‘lane’, *weer* ‘weather’, *teek* ‘tick’, *tegen* ‘against’) and from Middle Dutch *eu* (< Wgm. *ũ* with or without former umlaut) the variant /ø/ developed, which could also occur in all positions (also before a velar or laryngeal consonant) (e.g. *reuk* ‘smell’, *deugen* ‘be good’, *neus* ‘nose’, *heup* ‘hip’).¹⁶ As a result, the variants [e] and [ø] (from Wgm. *î*) merged with the phonemes /e/ and /ø/, so that both variants received a ‘full’ distribution, i.e. they became two separate phonemes (see also appendix 8 for a schematic overview of this historical development).

Consider the following examples illustrating the correspondence between Standard Dutch /ɛi/ and dialect /e/:

e.g. SD [rɛik] ~ DIA [rɛʔə] ‘rich’

¹⁵ [bøtə] = (*ik*) *bijt* ‘I bite’.

¹⁶ Phonemes which are marked by the annotation ‘with former umlaut’ have developed from Wgm. vowels that occurred in an environment which triggered umlaut.

e.g. SD [kɛikən] ~ DIA [kɛʔə̃] ‘to look’

e.g. SD [zweɪɪyən] ~ DIA [zwehə̃] ‘to be silent’

e.g. SD [vɛiχ] ~ DIA [fɛhə] ‘fig’

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

As we argued in section 4.2.4, all lexical features in this study are unproductive. This holds for the feature SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /e/ as well: DIA /e/ before a velar or laryngeal consonant (corresponding to SD /ɛi/) does not occur in words which were recently introduced in the Maldegem dialect (e.g. *hijgen* ‘to gasp’, *blijken* ‘to appear’). This implies that the feature is not productive (= 0). If, for example, an exogenous proper name like *Rijswijk* is used in a Maldegem dialect context, this name will retain its Standard Dutch pronunciation (at least as far as the pronunciation of the vowel is concerned) (i.e. [rɛ̃iɪzwɛ̃ik]), or put differently, it will not be adapted to the Maldegem dialect vowel system (which would yield *[røzwek]).

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /e/ is restricted to positions before velar or laryngeal consonants (i.e. conditioning environment = 1). This does not mean that this environment only allows for the correspondence SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /e/. In the same environment, for example, SD /ɛi/ may correspond to DIA /iə/ (e.g. in *eik* ‘oak’, *dreigen* ‘to threaten’), as well as to DIA /æi/ (e.g. in *eigen* ‘own’), and to DIA /i/ (in the lexical exception *tijger* ‘tiger’).¹⁷

* Competing variants:

Irrespective of its environmental restrictions, the segment /ɛi/ in a Standard Dutch form may correspond to any of six different dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 6):

(1) to DIA /e/ (Incidence = 9; average frequency = 517; [+cond.env.]; [-productive])

e.g. *strijken* ‘to iron’: SD [strɛikən] ~ DIA [streʔə̃]

e.g. *zwijgen* ‘be silent’: SD [zweɪɪyən] ~ DIA [zwehə̃]

¹⁷ Note that the conditioning environment of the postlexical features discussed in sections 6.4.1 to 6.4.3 is more ‘compelling’ than it is in the case of the lexical features: the conditioning environment of lexical features may be a *possible* environment of other features as well, whereas this is not true for the conditioning environment of the postlexical features.

- (2) to DIA /i/ (Incidence = 2; average frequency = 2; [-cond.env.]; [-productive])
 Lex. exc.: *tijger* ‘tiger’: SD [tɛiɣər] ~ DIA [tihərə]
 Lex. exc.: *bij* ‘bee’: SD [bɛi] ~ DIA [bi]
- (3) to DIA /iə/ (Incidence = 2; average frequency = 488; [-cond.env.]; [-productive])
 e.g. *eik* ‘oak’: SD [ɛik] ~ DIA [iək]
 e.g. *dreigen* ‘to threaten’: SD [drɛiɣən] ~ DIA [driəhə̃]
 e.g. *klein* ‘small’: SD [klein] ~ DIA [kliənə]
 e.g. *geit* ‘goat’: SD [ɣɛit] ~ DIA [hiətə]
 e.g. *sprei* ‘bedspread’: SD [sprɛi] ~ DIA [spriə]
- (4) to DIA /ɛi/ (Incidence = 8; average frequency = 88; [-cond.env.]; [-productive])
 e.g. *eigen* ‘own’: SD [ɛiɣən] ~ DIA [ɛihə̃]
 e.g. *reiger* ‘heron’: SD [rɛiɣər] ~ DIA [rɛihər]
 e.g. *prei* ‘leek’: SD [prɛi] ~ DIA [prɛijə]
 e.g. *de Leie* (= a Belgian river): SD [lɛijə] ~ DIA [lɛijə]
- (5) to DIA /ø/ (Incidence = 40; average frequency = 263; [+cond.env.]; [-productive])
 e.g. *prijs* ‘price’: SD [prɛis] ~ DIA [prøs]
 e.g. *bijten* ‘to bite’: SD [bɛitən] ~ DIA [bøtɲ]
 e.g. *wijn* ‘wine’: SD [wɛin] ~ DIA [wøn]
- (6) to DIA /ɛi/ (Incidence = 34; average frequency = no data; [+cond.env.]; [-productive])
 e.g. *blij* ‘happy’: SD [blɛi] ~ DIA [blɛijə]
 e.g. *tijd* ‘time’: SD [tɛit] ~ DIA [tɛit]
 e.g. *lei* ‘slate’: SD [lɛi] ~ DIA [lɛijə]

Note that the Standard Dutch phoneme /ɛi/ is orthographically represented in two different ways in these correspondences, viz. as <ij> or <ei>. We decided, however, to ignore the difference between the two spelling variants of Standard Dutch /ɛi/, because we have reason to believe that this spelling difference is not very important to children learning the Maldegem dialect as a second language. If children clearly distinguished between correspondences (SD~DIA) involving SD /ɛi/ written as <ij> and those involving SD /ɛi/ written as <ei>, we would expect that no overgeneralizations ‘across the border’ of <ij> and <ei> would occur. We do, however, find such overgeneralizations (see also section 4.4.3): the word *eikel* ‘acorn’, for example, was realized by some informants as *[øʔəɪ] or *[øʔəɪ], which are overgeneralizations ‘across the border’ because they introduce correspondences that are relevant to the orthographic variant <ij> (i.e. the correspondences in (1) and (5), respectively). Furthermore, we found overgeneralizations like *[priəs] or

*[præis] for *prijs* ‘price’, which introduce correspondences that are relevant to the orthographic variant <ei> (i.e. the correspondences in (3) and (4), respectively). Therefore, we assume that the difference in spelling between the two variants of SD /ɛi/ plays no or only a minor role in second dialect acquisition.

By way of illustration, in the above representation of competing variants we have indicated the figures for the incidence of the relevant features (SD x ~ DIA y), their average token frequency, whether the features are restricted to a conditioning environment or not, and whether the features are productive or not. As we have mentioned before, these are the factors which – in combination with competing variants – are supposed to determine the degree of predictability of a correspondence. The correspondence in (5) has the highest value for incidence. This implies that dialect learners will be frequently exposed to this correspondence in the lexicon, which may result in a higher degree of predictability of this correspondence. On the other hand, the incidence of the correspondence in (2) is so low (only two lexical exceptions are involved), that this factor will most likely interfere with the predictability of the correspondence. Furthermore, the feature represented in (1) has the highest value for average token frequency. As a result, language users will be frequently exposed to this feature as well, which makes the feature more predictable. Finally, features (1), (5) and (6) may be more predictable than the other features because the former are restricted to a conditioning environment. Note that all features represented above (1 to 6) have constant values for the factor productivity, viz. [-productive]. As pointed out in the previous chapter (section 4.2.1), the combined effect of all of these factors can be computed by entering interaction terms in our statistical models. Apart from the interaction effects, however, we are also interested in the individual effect of each single factor. Therefore, we do not *a priori* compute a measure of predictability that discounts the contribution of each factor separately.

Irrespective of its context, DIA /e/ may correspond to any of four different Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 4):

(1) to SD /ɛi/

e.g. DIA [reʔə] ~ SD [rɛik] ‘rich’

e.g. DIA [lək] ~ SD [lɛik] ‘corpse’

e.g. DIA [fəhə] ~ SD [vɛiχ] ‘fig’

(2) to SD /e:/

e.g. DIA [reʔənən] ~ SD [rɛ:kənən] ‘to do maths’

e.g. DIA [ləχ] ~ SD [lɛ:χ] ‘empty’

(3) to SD /ɪ/

e.g. DIA [zɛʔ:] ~ SD [zɪŋən] ‘to sing’

(4) to SD /ɛ/

e.g. DIA [brɛŋ:] ~ SD [brɛŋən] ‘to bring’

As shown above, there are five more correspondences involving Standard Dutch /ɛi/, four of which were also entered as variables in the present study. In the following sections (sections 6.4.6-6.4.9), we discuss these correspondences.

6.4.6. SD /ɛi/ (from Wgm. *î*) ~ DIA /ø/ before an anterior consonant

Recall from the previous section that the Maldegem dialect has two different segments in words with West Germanic (and Middle Dutch) *î*: Maldegem dialect /ø/ (< Wgm. *î*) occurs in positions before an anterior consonant, whereas /e/ (< Wgm. *î*) occurs in positions before a velar or laryngeal consonant. These variants are two separate phonemes of the Maldegem dialect (see section 6.4.5). Standard Dutch has the closing diphthong /ɛi/ in words with Wgm. *î*. So, SD /ɛi/ (from Wgm. *î*) corresponds to DIA /ø/, when it precedes an anterior consonant except for underlying /d/. This correspondence is illustrated by the following examples:

e.g. SD [wɛin] ~ DIA [wøn] ‘wine’

e.g. SD [ɛis] ~ DIA [øʂ] ‘ice’

e.g. SD [bɛitən] ~ DIA [bøtŋ] ‘to bite’

e.g. SD [lɛim] ~ DIA [løm] ‘glue’

But not in:

e.g. *tijd* ‘time’: SD [tɛit] ~ DIA [tɛit] (< underlying /d/: cf. pl. *tijden* ‘times’)

e.g. *rijden* ‘to drive’: SD [rɛidən] ~ DIA [rɛiȝ:]

Taaldeman (1976:344) points out that the rounding of Old Flemish /e/ (< widening of Wgm. *î*) into /ø/ is a peculiar feature of the Maldegem dialect, since the Maldegem dialect is generally characterized by the unrounding of palatal vowels (except for /ø/) (see section 6.3.2.4) (e.g. unrounding of /y/ to /i/; unrounding of /ʌ/ to /ɛ/; unrounding of /œy/ to /ɛi/). The rounding of Old Flemish /e/ to /ø/ is a so-called ‘primary feature’ of the Maldegem dialect. Evidence comes from the shibboleth (which is used by people from surrounding villages to mock the Maldegem dialect) *vijfenvijftig ijzeren vijzen* (i.e. DIA [vøvŋ'vøftɛχøzdərɛnvøzŋ]) ‘fifty-five iron screws’, which refers to this feature of rounding.

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The rounding to /ø/ (in words with Wgm. *i*, which corresponds to SD / ϵi /) is no longer productive in the Maldegem dialect, since it is not applied to new words. Put differently, when words are adopted in a Maldegem dialect context which are normally used in a Standard Dutch context, such as *bijna* ‘almost’, *chagrijn* ‘chagrin’ or *nijverheid* ‘industry’, they will not be adjusted to the Maldegem dialect vowel system (i.e. *[$b\theta n\alpha$]; *[$\int\alpha\chi r\theta n$]; *[$n\theta v\theta r\epsilon i t$]), but they will (more or less) retain their Standard Dutch pronunciation (i.e. [$b\epsilon i n\alpha$]; [$\int\alpha\chi r\epsilon i n$]; [$n\epsilon i v\theta r(h)\epsilon i t$]). The same holds for exogenous proper names like *Rijswijk* ‘Rijswijk’ (i.e. [$r\epsilon i z w\epsilon i k$] instead of *[$r\theta z w\epsilon k$]).

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD / ϵi / ~ DIA /ø/ is restricted to positions before an anterior consonant and we can therefore conclude that there is a conditioning environment (= 1). It is, however, not the only correspondence that can occur in this environment. That is to say, the correspondences SD / ϵi / ~ DIA / $i\theta$ / (e.g. in *klein* ‘small’, *geit* ‘goat’), as well as SD / ϵi / ~ DIA / $\ae i$ / (e.g. in *reis* ‘journey’), and SD / ϵi / ~ DIA / ϵi / (e.g. in *tijd* ‘time’) can occur before an anterior consonant as well.

* Competing variants:

If we ignore any environmental restrictions, Standard Dutch / ϵi / may correspond to one of six different dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 6). These variants were described in section 6.4.5.

Conversely, DIA /ø/ (irrespective of its context) may correspond to one of five different Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 5):

(1) to SD / ϵi /

e.g. DIA [$b\theta t\eta$] ~ SD [$b\epsilon i t\theta n$] ‘to bite’

(2) to SD / θ :/

e.g. DIA [$\theta p\theta$] ~ SD [$h\theta:p$] ‘hip’

e.g. DIA [$r\theta s$] ~ SD [$r\theta:s$] ‘giant’

(3) to SD / $\ae y$ /

e.g. DIA [$b\theta t\eta$] ~ SD [$b\ae y t\theta n$] ‘outside’

e.g. DIA [øɜ] ~ SD [hæys] ‘house’

e.g. DIA [sløp̃] ~ SD [slæypən] ‘to sneak’

(4) to SD /o:/

e.g. DIA [bøtərə] ~ SD [bo:tər] ‘butter’

e.g. DIA [zønə] ~ SD [zo:n] ‘son’

(5) to SD /y/

e.g. DIA [døw̃:] ~ SD [dywən] ‘to push’

6.4.7. SD /ɛi/ (from Wgm. *ai*) (with former umlaut) ~ DIA /iə/

West Germanic *ai* (with former umlaut) developed into SD /ɛi/, but the Maldegem dialect has two different phonemes originating from this West Germanic vowel, viz. DIA /iə/ (e.g. in *geit* ‘goat’) and DIA /æi/ (e.g. in *meisje* ‘girl’). Both dialect phonemes can occur in all positions. We discuss the latter phoneme in the next section; in the present section, we focus on the Maldegem dialect phoneme /iə/ (from Wgm. *ai*). Consider the following correspondences:

e.g. SD [klein] ~ DIA [kliənə] ‘small’

e.g. SD [γɛit] ~ DIA [hiətə] ‘goat’

e.g. SD [sɣɛidən] ~ DIA [sɣiən] ‘to divorce’

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The correspondence SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /iə/ only applies to a small number of words in the Maldegem dialect. The feature is completely lexicalized and is therefore no longer productive (like all lexical features in this study). Obviously, it is no longer introduced in new words with SD /ɛi/.

* Conditioning environment:

There is no specific environment (= 0) to which the correspondence SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /iə/ is confined. On the contrary, the occurrence of DIA /iə/ is purely lexically determined.

* Competing variants:

As pointed out above, the segment /ɛi/ in Standard Dutch forms may correspond to one of six different dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 6), which were described in section 6.4.5.

On the other hand, the dialect segment /iə/ – irrespective of environmental conditions – may correspond to one of three Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 3):

(1) to SD /ɛi/

e.g. DIA [kliənə] ~ SD [klein] ‘small’

e.g. DIA [hiətə] ~ SD [vɛit] ‘goat’

(2) to SD /e:/

e.g. DIA [biən] ~ SD [be:n] ‘leg’

e.g. DIA [bliək] ~ SD [ble:k] ‘pale’

(3) to SD /œy/

Lex. exc. DIA [spiətə] ~ SD [spæyt] ‘syringe’

6.4.8. SD /ɛi/ (from Wgm. *ai*) (with former umlaut) ~ DIA /æi/

As pointed out in the previous section, the Maldegem dialect has two variants of Wgm. *ai* (with former umlaut), that is, DIA /iə/ (see section 6.4.7) and DIA /æi/. Consider the following examples, illustrating the correspondence SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /æi/:

e.g. SD [rɛis] ~ DIA [ræizə] ‘journey’

e.g. SD [kɛi] ~ DIA [kæi] ‘boulder’

e.g. SD [rɛiyər] ~ DIA [ræihər] ‘heron’

e.g. SD [lɛijə] ~ DIA [læijə] (= Belgian river) (vs. SD [lɛi] ~ DIA [lɛijə] ‘slate’)

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The occurrence of the Maldegem dialect phoneme /æi/ is lexically determined and only applies to a limited set of words. This implies that words with SD /ɛi/ (i.e. <ei>), which were introduced only later in the Maldegem dialect, are never pronounced with DIA [æi].

An example is the word *lei* ‘slate’, which is a word with educational connotations and which therefore retained the Standard Dutch vowel in the Maldegem dialect (i.e. DIA [lɛ̃i jə]).

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /æ̃i/ is not conditioned by any environmental restrictions (= 0). Instead, it is completely lexically determined.

* Competing variants:

The six dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 6) to which SD /ɛi/ may correspond were already discussed in section 6.4.5.

On the other hand, the dialect segment /æ̃i/ may correspond to one of two SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 2):

(1) to SD /ɛi/

e.g. DIA [æ̃ihə̃] ~ SD [ɛiɣən] ‘own’

(2) to SD /æy/ (only in two lexical exceptions)

Lex. exc. DIA [spæ̃itə̃] ~ SD [spæyt] ‘syringe’

Lex. exc. DIA [fə̃rnæ̃is] ~ SD [fornæys] ‘stove’

6.4.9. SD /ɛi/ (from Wgm. *î*) ~ DIA /i/ in the lexical exceptions *tijger* ‘tiger’ and *bij* ‘bee’

In the previous sections (sections 6.4.5-6.4.8), we discussed the different correspondences involving SD /ɛi/. This section is dedicated to two lexical exceptions which also involve SD /ɛi/. The word *tijger* ‘tiger’ is realized in the Maldegem dialect as [ti hərə̃], and is a lexical exception to the correspondence SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /e/ before a laryngeal (or velar) consonant (e.g. *zwijgen* ‘be silent’ DIA [zwehə̃]). On the other hand, the word *bij* ‘bee’, realized as [bi] in the Maldegem dialect, is a lexical exception to the correspondence (which was not investigated in the present study) SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /ɛ̃i/ in the coda or before an underlying /d/ (e.g. *blij* ‘happy’, DIA [blɛ̃i jə]).

Obviously, the correspondence SD /ɛi/ ~ DIA /i/ is not productive. Furthermore, lexical exceptions are, by definition, lexically determined (no conditioning environment = 0). Therefore, only the factor ‘competing variants’ remains to be discussed.

* Competing variants:

The six dialect variants to which SD / ϵi / may correspond were already described in section 6.4.7 (number of competing dialect variants = 6).

On the other hand, DIA / i / (irrespective of its context) may correspond to one of four SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 4):

(1) to SD / ϵi /

Lex. exc. DIA [bi] ~ SD [b ϵi] ‘bee’

Lex. exc. DIA [ti \hbar er \hbar] ~ SD [t ϵi y \hbar er] ‘tiger’

(2) to SD / i /

e.g. DIA [mir \hbar] ~ SD [mi:r] ‘ant’

e.g. DIA [zin] ~ SD [zin] ‘to see’

(3) to SD / y /

e.g. DIA [mir] ~ SD [my:r] ‘wall’

e.g. DIA [dir \hbar] ~ SD [dy:r] ‘expensive’

(4) to SD / $\ae y$ /

Lex. exc. DIA [kiʔ \hbar] ~ SD [k $\ae y$ k \hbar n] ‘chick’

Lex. exc. DIA [riʔ \hbar] ~ SD [r $\ae y$ k \hbar n] ‘to smell’

In sections 6.4.5 to 6.4.9, we discussed correspondences involving SD / ϵi /. In the next three sections we discuss correspondences involving SD / $\ae y$ /.

6.4.10. SD / $\ae y$ / (from Wgm. \hat{u}) ~ DIA / \emptyset /

West Germanic \hat{u} (except when preceding $-r$ or in the coda) developed into SD / $\ae y$ / or into Maldegem dialect / \emptyset /. Thus, SD / $\ae y$ / normally corresponds to Maldegem dialect / \emptyset /. This correspondence is illustrated in the following examples:

e.g. SD [m $\ae y$ s] ~ DIA [m \emptyset s] ‘mouse’

e.g. SD [b $\ae y$ t \hbar n] ~ DIA [b \emptyset t \hbar n] ‘outside’

e.g. SD [d $\ae y$ m] ~ DIA [d \emptyset m] ‘thumb’

e.g. SD [kr $\ae y$ p \hbar n] ~ DIA [kr \emptyset p \hbar n] ‘to creep’

e.g. SD [$\ae y$ l] ~ DIA [l \emptyset :] ‘owl’ (+ l -deletion and compensatory lengthening)

The dialect variant /ø/ as an equivalent to SD /œy/ is typical of the Maldegem dialect (and of that of Kleit). As could be seen in table 6.2, the neighbouring West-Flemish dialects have the variant [y()], whereas the surrounding East-Flemish dialects have [œy] or [œ].

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The dialect variant /ø/ does not occur in words which were recently introduced in the Maldegem dialect. In other words, the feature is no longer productive (= 0). For example, the following words, which are normally used in a more formal context, are not adapted to the Maldegem dialect vowel system: *duidelijk* ‘clear’, *puin* ‘rubble’, *puik* ‘great’. None of these words is pronounced with the ‘authentic’ Maldegem dialect variant /ø/, but instead the SD variant /œy/ (usually pronounced a bit more closed, i.e. [œy]) is used. The same holds for exogenous proper names like *Duivendrecht*, *IJmuiden* or *Muide*.

* Conditioning environment:

SD /œy/ corresponds to Maldegem dialect /ø/ ‘in all environments other than the coda’. Thus, there are environmental restrictions (= 1) on the occurrence of this feature.

* Competing variants:

If we do not take into account any environmental restrictions (in this case: “not in the coda”), the segment /œy/ in a Standard Dutch form may correspond to one of five dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 5):

(1) to DIA /ø/

e.g. SD [mœys] ~ DIA [møʂ] ‘mouse’

(2) to DIA /æi/

Lex. exc. SD [spœytən] ~ DIA [spæitn̩] ‘to squirt’

Lex. exc. SD [fœrnœys] ~ DIA [fœrnæis] ‘stove’

(3) to DIA /i/

Lex. exc. SD [kœykən] ~ DIA [kiʔə] ‘chick’

Lex. exc. SD [rœykən] ~ DIA [riʔə] ‘to smell’

(4) to DIA /iə/

Lex. exc. SD [spœyt] ~ DIA [spiətə] ‘syringe’

(5) to DIA /æy/

e.g. SD [læy] ~ DIA [læy] ‘lazy’

e.g. SD [træy] ~ DIA [træy] ‘sweater’

Reversely, dialect /ø/ (irrespective of its context) may correspond to one of five SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 5). These variants were already described in section 6.4.6.

6.4.11. SD /æy/ (from Wgm. *û*) ~ DIA /i/ in the lexical exceptions *kuiken* ‘chick’ and *ruiken* ‘to smell’

The words *kuiken* and *ruiken*, which are pronounced as [kiʔǝ̃] and [riʔǝ̃] in the Maldegem dialect, are lexical exceptions to the correspondence discussed in the previous section.

Obviously, this correspondence is not productive. The possible dialect variants of SD /æy/ were already given in the previous section (section 6.4.10) (number of competing dialect variants = 5) and the possible SD variants of dialect /i/ were discussed in section 6.4.9 (number of competing SD variants = 4).

6.4.12. SD /æy/ (from Wgm. *û*) ~ DIA /æ̃i/ or DIA /iə/ in the lexical exception *spuut* ‘syringe’

The other lexical exception to the correspondence SD /æy/ ~ DIA /ø/, which was elicited in our word list, is the word *spuut* ‘syringe’, which can be realized as Maldegem dialect [spæ̃itə] or [spiətə] (the same holds for the word *spuuten* ‘to squirt’). Both forms are ‘correct’ pronunciations in the Maldegem dialect.

The possible dialect variants of SD /æy/ were discussed in section 6.4.10 (number of competing dialect variants = 5). The possible Standard Dutch variants of dialect /æ̃i/ were discussed in section 6.4.8 (number of competing SD variants = 2) and those of dialect /iə/ were presented in section 6.4.7 (number of competing dialect variants = 3).

6.4.13. SD /o: / (from Wgm. *ǔ* in open syllable) (without former umlaut) ~ DIA /ø/

In this and the following section we present two Maldegem dialect features which are related to Standard Dutch /o: /.

In open syllables, West Germanic \ddot{u} (without former umlaut) developed into SD /o: / (so-called ‘*zachtlange oo*’), whereas in the Maldegem dialect this West Germanic variant could develop into /ø / (by so-called Ingvaemonic palatalization). This implies that SD /o: / corresponds to Maldegem dialect /ø / in some words. This correspondence is illustrated by the following examples:

e.g. SD [vo:ʏəl] ~ DIA [vøhəl] ‘bird’

e.g. SD [zo:n] ~ DIA [zønə] ‘son’

e.g. SD [bo:tər] ~ DIA [bøtər] ‘butter’

e.g. SD [no:t] ~ DIA [nøtə] ‘nut’

As can be derived from table 6.2, the Maldegem variant in the above words (i.e. /ø /) is the same as in the neighbouring West-Flemish dialects, whereas the East-Flemish dialects have the variant /o: / in most of these words.

There are only a few words displaying the correspondence SD /o: / ~ DIA /ø /: *zoon* ‘son’, *vogel* ‘bird’, *boter* ‘butter’, *noot* ‘nut’, *schotel* ‘dish’, *door* ‘through’, *blozen* ‘to blush’, *koning* ‘king’, *molen* ‘mill’, *wonen* ‘to live’, and *mogen* ‘may’.

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

As pointed out above, the correspondence SD /o: / ~ DIA /ø / applies to about 11 words, (most of which originally had Wgm. \ddot{u} without former umlaut). Today, this correspondence is completely lexicalized. Newly introduced words with SD /o: / will never be pronounced with DIA /ø /. An exogenous proper name like *Boterman*, for example, is not realized with the Maldegem dialect variant /ø / (as in *boter* ‘butter’), but retains its Standard Dutch pronunciation (i.e. [bo:tərman]).

* Conditioning environment:

There is no conditioning environment (= 0) in which SD /o: / generally corresponds to DIA /ø /. Instead, the correspondence is completely lexically determined.

* Competing variants:

SD /o: / may correspond to one of three dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3):

(1) to DIA /ø /

e.g. SD [zo:n] ~ DIA [zøne] ‘son’

e.g. SD [no:t] ~ DIA [nøte] ‘nut’

(2) to DIA /uə /

e.g. SD [sxo:n] ~ DIA [sxuəne] ‘clean’

e.g. SD [bro:t] ~ DIA [bruət] ‘bread’

(3) to DIA /o /

e.g. SD [zo:mər] ~ DIA [zoməre] ‘summer’

e.g. SD [yo:t] ~ DIA [hotə] ‘gutter’

e.g. SD [bo:χ] ~ DIA [bohə] ‘bow’

Dialect /ø / may correspond to one of five Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 5). These variants were already discussed in section 6.4.6.

In this section, we have discussed one of the three possible correspondences involving SD /o: /, viz. SD /o: / ~ DIA /ø /. There are two more correspondences involving SD /o: /: on the one hand, there is the correspondence SD /o: / ~ DIA /o /, which was not part of the present study, and on the other hand, there is the correspondence SD /o: / ~ DIA /uə /, which is discussed in the next section.¹⁸

6.4.14. SD /o: / (from Wgm. *au*) ~ DIA /uə /

Both Wgm. *ũ* (without former umlaut) and Wgm. *au* merged into the Standard Dutch phoneme /o: /.¹⁹ The Maldegem dialect, however, has three distinct phonemes in this case, viz. DIA /ø / and /o / (< Wgm. *ũ*) and DIA /uə / (< Wgm. *au*). Therefore, SD /o: / may

¹⁸ The correspondence ‘SD /o: / ~ DIA /o /’ was not part of the present study because we decided to leave out tertiary dialect features. The feature ‘SD /o: / ~ DIA /o /’ can be considered as a tertiary feature: it is characteristic of the dialects of a larger part of East-Flanders, which have no systematic distinction between short and long vowels (see Taeldeman 1979:85) and it infiltrates the substandard and standard varieties of East-Flemish speakers (due to a low degree of awareness).

¹⁹ Probably, Wgm. *ũ* developed into so-called ‘*zachtlange oo*’ and Wgm. *au* developed into ‘*scherplange oo*’ before merger of *ũ* and *au* took place (Johan Taeldeman, p.c.).

also correspond to Maldegem dialect /uə/. This so-called *scherplange oo* (i.e. ‘originally diphthongal, half-close oo’) can occur in any environment in the Maldegem dialect and in a number of other transitional dialects as well (see Taeldeman 1979:71). In most dialects of French- and West-Flanders, however, this type of oo is restricted to positions before alveolar consonants, whereas other positions have so-called *zachtlange oo* (i.e. ‘originally short but lengthened, half-close oo’). On the other hand, the majority of the East-Flemish dialects have a rounded, front vowel (i.e. [y:ə]). Consider the following examples that illustrate the correspondence between SD /o: / and DIA /uə/:

e.g. SD [bo:t] ~ DIA [buət] ‘boat’

e.g. SD [ro:s] ~ DIA [ruəzə] ‘rose’

e.g. SD [bo:m] ~ DIA [buəm] ‘tree’

e.g. SD [o:r] ~ DIA [uərə] ‘ear’

e.g. SD [ko:l] ~ DIA [kuələ] ‘cabbage’

e.g. SD [o:χ] ~ DIA [uəhə] ‘eye’

The fact that this correspondence applies to many more words (see appendices 1 and 2) than the correspondence discussed in the previous section (i.e. SD /o: / ~ DIA /ø/) does not change the fact that this correspondence is word-specific as well. Put differently, whether SD /o: / corresponds to the dialect variant /uə/ or to the alternatives /o/ or /ø/ is lexically determined.

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The correspondence SD /o: / ~ DIA /uə/ no longer applies to words that are newly introduced in the Maldegem dialect, such as words which are normally used in more formal contexts and exogenous words: e.g. *klonen* ‘to clone’, *popelen* ‘to quiver’, *narcose* ‘narcosis’, *psychose* ‘psychosis’, *antilope* ‘antelope’, *symbol* ‘symbol’. All these words are generally pronounced with [o]. Thus, the correspondence SD /o: / ~ DIA /uə/ is not productive (= 0) anymore.

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /o: / ~ DIA /uə/ is not restricted to a specific (conditioning) environment (= 0); instead, it is completely lexically determined. In a similar environment (e.g. before [t]), SD /o: / may correspond to DIA /uə/ (e.g. *groot* ‘large’ DIA

[hruət]), as well as to DIA /o/ (e.g. *goot* ‘gutter’ DIA [hotə]), and to DIA /ø/ (e.g. *boter* ‘butter’ DIA [bøtər]).

* Competing variants:

SD /o:/ may correspond to one of three dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3). These variants were already discussed in the previous section (section 6.4.13).

Reversely, DIA /uə/ can only correspond to one Standard Dutch variant, viz. SD /o:/ (number of competing SD variants = 1). In other words, there is a one-to-one relationship (in one direction) between DIA /uə/ and SD /o:/, which will probably add to the degree of predictability of the correspondence.

6.4.15. SD /ʌ/ (from Wgm. *ǔ* with former umlaut) ~ DIA /ɛ̃/

West Germanic *ǔ* in a closed syllable developed into SD /ʌ/, either due to (former) umlaut or to so-called ‘spontaneous palatalization’ (e.g. *bok* ‘buck’, see section 6.4.16). In the Maldegem dialect the variant became unrounded, resulting in /ɛ̃/. As a result, SD /ʌ/ systematically corresponds to Maldegem (and also to Kleit) dialect /ɛ̃/. The same correspondence occurs in the West-Flemish dialects as well, but not as systematically as in the Maldegem (and Kleit) dialect; it only occurs in a few words with SD /ʌ/ (e.g. *put* ‘pit’, *dun* ‘thin’, *stuk* ‘piece’, *rug* ‘back’, *kruk* ‘crutch’). The neighbouring East-Flemish dialects have a rounded variant (i.e. /œ/). In a few words (e.g. *stuk* ‘piece’), however, this unrounding – which is an Ingvaemonic phenomenon – has spread further to the east, affecting most East-Flemish dialects as well. The correspondence between SD /ʌ/ and Maldegem dialect /ɛ̃/ is illustrated by the following examples:

e.g. SD [mʌs] ~ DIA [mɛ̃sə] ‘sparrow’

e.g. SD [pʌt] ~ DIA [pɛ̃t] ‘pit’

e.g. SD [stʌk] ~ DIA [stɛ̃k] ‘piece’

e.g. SD [dʌn] ~ DIA [dɛ̃nə] ‘thin’

e.g. SD [vʌlən] ~ DIA [vɛ̃:] ‘to fill up’ (+ *l*-deletion and compensatory lengthening)

e.g. SD [prʌts] ~ DIA [prɛ̃ts] ‘prul’

According to Versieck (1989:189), this type of unrounding is very resistant to dialect loss (as opposed to the other types of unrounding, see section 6.3.3.3). In our data as well, the unrounding to /ɛ̄/ (from Wgm. *ǔ*) appears most frequently.

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The unrounding to dialect /ɛ̄/ is a lexicalized feature of the Maldegem dialect (i.e. productivity = 0). Evidence is the fact that unrounding is no longer applied to loanwords, such as *dumpen* ‘to dump’, *dug-out* or *pulp*, or to words that were borrowed from Standard Dutch more recently, such as *kus* ‘kiss’, *nul* ‘nil’, *kust* ‘coast’, *kunst* ‘art’, *spul* ‘stuff’, *spurten* ‘to sprint’, *gunnen* ‘to grant’, *suf* ‘drowsy’ or *knuffelen* ‘to cuddle’. All these words are pronounced with the rounded variant (i.e. [œ]).

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /ʌ/ ~ DIA /ɛ̄/ is lexically determined instead of being conditioned by environmental restrictions (i.e. conditioning environment = 0). Furthermore, SD /ʌ/ may correspond to DIA /ɛ̄/ (e.g. *mus* ‘sparrow’ [mɛ̄sə]), to DIA /œ/ (e.g. *kus* ‘kiss’ [kœs]) or to DIA /y/ (in some French loanwords, such as *bus* ‘coach’ [bys], *nummer* ‘number’ [nyməro]) in a similar environment.

* Competing variants:

SD /ʌ/ may correspond to three possible dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3):

(1) to DIA /ɛ̄/

e.g. SD [zʌstər] ~ DIA [zɛ̄stər] ‘sister’

(2) to DIA /œ/

e.g. SD [kʌs] ~ DIA [kœs] ‘kiss’

(3) to DIA /y/

e.g. SD [bʌs] ~ DIA [bys] ‘bus’

Irrespective of its context, dialect /ɛ̄/ may correspond to one of five different SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 5):

- (1) to SD /ʌ/
 e.g. DIA [pɛ̃t] ~ SD [pʌt] ‘pit’
- (2) to SD /ɪ/
 e.g. DIA [vɛ̃s] ~ SD [vɪs] ‘fish’
- (3) to SD /ɔ/
 e.g. DIA [pɛ̃pə] ~ SD [pɔp] ‘doll’
- (4) to SD /aː/
 e.g. DIA [pɛ̃rt] ~ SD [paːrt] ‘horse’
- (5) to SD /eː/
 e.g. DIA [bɛ̃r] ~ SD [beːr] ‘bear’

6.4.16. SD /ɔ/ (from Wgm. *ǔ* without former umlaut) ~ DIA /ɛ̃/

In the previous section, we argued that West Germanic *ǔ* in a closed syllable developed into SD /ʌ/ or into Maldegem DIA /ɛ̃/, when there was an umlaut effect. A few words with Wgm. *ǔ* but without umlaut, however, were also subject to the so-called Ingvaemonic palatalization. As a result, words with Standard Dutch /ɔ/ correspond to West-Flemish dialect forms with /œ/. In the Maldegem dialect, however, these palatalised forms (with /œ/) were unrounded (→ Mald. DIA /ɛ̃/). Consider the following examples:

- e.g. SD [pɔp] ~ DIA [pɛ̃pə] ‘doll’
- e.g. SD [sɔpə(n)] ~ DIA [sɛ̃pɪ] ‘to kick’
- e.g. SD [vɔl] ~ DIA [vɛ̃ː] ‘full’
- e.g. SD [bɔk] ~ DIA [bɛ̃k] ‘male goat’, ‘buck’
- e.g. SD [wɔl] ~ DIA [wɛ̃lə] ‘wool’

Versieck (1989:189) points out that this type of unrounding is still very much ‘alive’ in the Maldegem dialect of her informants. Our data point in the same direction.

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The unrounding to DIA /ɛ̃/ applies only to a limited set of words. Most words with SD /ɔ/ are pronounced with [ɔ], which is characteristic of the accent of a large area (e.g. *kort* ‘short’, *mop* ‘joke’, *lomp* ‘clumsy’, *pot* ‘pot’, *stok* ‘stick’, etc.). The correspondence SD /ɔ/

~ DIA /ɛ̃/ has become totally unproductive (it is a lexicalized dialect feature). The word *bok* ‘buck’ in the sense of ‘gymnastic apparatus’, for example, does not receive the Maldegem variant /ɛ̃/ (vs. *bok* ‘buck’ = male goat). This is most probably due to the fact that this word is relatively recent and is mainly used in an educational setting.

* Conditioning environment:

Since the correspondence SD /ɔ/ ~ DIA /ɛ̃/ is lexically determined, there is no conditioning environment (= 0) in which SD /ɔ/ generally corresponds to DIA /ɛ̃/.

* Competing variants:

SD /ɔ/ may correspond to one of three dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3):

(1) to DIA /ɛ̃/

e.g. SD [pɔp] ~ DIA [pɛ̃pə] ‘doll’

(2) to DIA /o/

e.g. SD [pɔt] ~ DIA [pot] ‘pot’

(3) to DIA /ɑ/

Lex. exc. SD [kɔrst] ~ DIA [kastə] ‘crust’

DIA /ɛ̃/ itself may correspond to one of five SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 5), which were already described in the previous section (section 6.4.15).

6.4.17. SD /e: / (from Wgm. *ai* without former umlaut) ~ DIA /iə /

SD /e: / (e.g. in *beek* ‘brook’ SD [bɛ:k]; *bleek* ‘pale’ SD [blɛ:k]) represents two historically distinct phonemes which have merged, viz. Wgm. *ī/ē* and Wgm. *ai*.²⁰ The first one is the so-called *zachtlange ee* (‘originally short but lengthened, half-close *ee*’) (e.g. in *beek*), the latter is called the *scherplange ee* (‘originally diphthongal half-close *ee*’) (e.g. in *bleek*). In the Maldegem dialect, however, the two West Germanic variants did not merge into one single phoneme. Instead, the Maldegem dialect has two distinct phonemes: DIA /e/ (e.g.

²⁰ Probably, Wgm. *ī/ē* developed into so-called ‘*zachtlange ee*’ and Wgm. *ai* developed into ‘*scherplange ee*’ before merger of *ī/ē* and *ai* took place (Johan Taeldeman, p.c.).

beek ‘brook’ DIA [bɛʔə]) and DIA /iə/ (e.g. *bleek* ‘pale’ DIA [bliək]). As a result, SD /e:/ often corresponds to Maldegem DIA /iə/. Consider the following examples:

e.g. SD [te:n] ~ DIA [tiən] ‘toe’

e.g. SD [ze:] ~ DIA [ziə] ‘sea’

e.g. SD [ze:p] ~ DIA [ziəpə] ‘soap’

e.g. SD [ble:k] ~ DIA [bliək] ‘pale’

e.g. SD [de:l] ~ DIA [diə:] ‘part’ (+ l-deletion and compensatory lengthening)

e.g. SD [me:r] ~ DIA [miər] ‘more’

Maldegem shares this variant /iə/ with most East-Flemish dialects, whereas the West-Flemish dialects have the somewhat wider variant /eə/ (cf. Taeldeman 1979:65).

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

Whenever a word with Standard Dutch /e:/ is used in a Maldegem dialect context, it is pronounced with its Standard Dutch pronunciation, but due to features of the (regional) accent, it is realized shorter (i.e. DIA [e]). On the other hand, the dialect variant /iə/ is never introduced in ‘new’ words. Exogenous proper names, for example, like *Beethoven*, *Heeringa* or *Kees*, are never pronounced with /iə/ (instead, they are realized with so-called *zachtlange ee*).

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /e:/ ~ DIA /iə/ is lexically determined and is therefore not conditioned by any environmental restrictions (= 0). Furthermore, SD /e:/ may correspond to DIA /iə/ as well as to DIA /e/ in similar environments: the word *beek* ‘brook’, for instance, is pronounced as DIA [bɛʔə], whereas the word *bleek* ‘pale’ is pronounced as DIA [bliək].

* Competing variants:

SD /e:/ may correspond to one of three dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3):

(1) to DIA /iə/

e.g. SD [be:n] ~ DIA [biən] ‘leg’

e.g. SD [me:r] ~ DIA [miər] ‘more’

(2) to DIA /e/

e.g. SD [ze:vən] ~ DIA [zəvɪ] ‘seven’

e.g. SD [e:tən] ~ DIA [etɪ] ‘to eat’

e.g. SD [me:r] ~ DIA [mɛr] ‘lake’

(3) to DIA /ɛ/

e.g. SD [be:r] ~ DIA [bɛr] ‘bear (*ursus*)’

Dialect /iə/ may correspond to one of three Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 3). These variants were discussed in section 6.4.7.

6.4.18. SD /e:/ (from Wgm. *ī/ĕ + r*) ~ DIA /ɛ/

SD /e:/ is the representative of West Germanic *ī/ĕ* in positions before *-r* (e.g. in *wereld* ‘world’, *kerel* ‘fellow’). These West Germanic variants (before *-r*) developed into the Maldegem dialect phoneme /ɛ/. Hence, SD /e:/ may also correspond to Maldegem dialect /ɛ/, but only in positions before *-r*. This correspondence is illustrated in the examples below:

e.g. SD [pe:r] ~ DIA [pɛrə] ‘pear’

e.g. SD [be:r] ~ DIA [bɛr] ‘bear (*ursus*)’

e.g. SD [ke:rəl] ~ DIA [kɛrəl] ‘fellow’

e.g. SD [we:rəlt] ~ DIA [wɛrəlt] ‘world’

e.g. SD [me:rəl] ~ DIA [mɛrəlɔ̃rə] ‘blackbird’

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The correspondence SD /e:/ ~ DIA /ɛ/ applies to a limited set of words (it is a lexicalized feature) and is not introduced in words with SD /e:/ before *-r* that are not normally used in a Maldegem dialect context, such as *heerlijk* ‘delicious’.

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /e: / ~ DIA /ɛ / is restricted to positions before *-r*. Therefore, we can conclude that the correspondence has a conditioning environment (= 1). It is not the only correspondence occurring in this environment, however. SD /e: / before *-r* may, for example, also correspond to DIA /e / (e.g. in *neer* ‘down’, *meer* ‘lake’), as well as to DIA /iə / (e.g. in *meer* ‘more’).

* Competing variants:

Since the dialect variants /e / and /iə / may also occur in positions before *-r*, SD /e: / may correspond to one of three dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3). These were discussed in the previous section (section 6.4.17).

Conversely, DIA /ɛ / (irrespective of environmental restrictions) may correspond to one of five different SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 5). These variants were already described in section 6.4.15.

6.4.19. SD /ou / (from Wgm. *ǎ/ǒ + l + t/s*) ~ DIA [ɑi]

West Germanic *ǎ/ǒ* before a cluster of *l + t/s* developed into SD /ou /. The Maldegem representative of this West Germanic vowel is [ɑi]. Therefore, SD /ou / corresponds to Maldegem DIA [ɑi] before underlying /s / or /t /. Before underlying /d /, /w / and /z /, however, the same West Germanic variant developed into Maldegem dialect [ɑu]. Versieck (1989:71) argues that [ɑi] and [ɑu] are two allophones of one underlying phoneme /ou /: the two variants are in complementary distribution. The correspondence SD /ou / ~ DIA [ɑu] is discussed in the next section. The correspondence SD /ou / ~ DIA [ɑi] is illustrated by way of the examples below:

e.g. SD [hɔut] ~ DIA [ɑit] ‘wood’ (< underlying /t /: e.g. *houten stoel* ‘wooden chair’)

e.g. SD [zɔut] ~ DIA [zɑit] ‘salt’

e.g. SD [bɔut] ~ DIA [bɑitə] ‘bolt’

e.g. SD [stɔut] ~ DIA [stɑit] ‘naughty’

e.g. SD [kɔus] ~ DIA [kɑisə] ‘sock’ (< underlying /s /: e.g. *kousen* ‘socks (pl.)’)

e.g. SD [sɔus] ~ DIA [sɑisə] ‘sauce’

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The correspondence SD /ɔu/ ~ DIA [ɑi] is no longer productive. Words that were introduced only later in the Maldegem dialect, such as *kabouter* ‘gnome’ or *stout* ‘stout (dark beer)’ do not receive the dialect variant [ɑi], but are realized with the SD variant [ɔu].

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /ɔu/ ~ DIA [ɑi] is restricted to positions before underlying /s/ or /t/. Thus, there is a specific conditioning environment (= 1).

* Competing variants:

If the environmental restrictions are ignored (in this case: ‘before underlying /s/ or /t/’), SD /ɔu/ may correspond to one of two possible dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 2):²¹

(1) to DIA [ɑi]

e.g. SD [hout] ~ DIA [ɑit] ‘wood’

(2) to DIA [ɑu]

e.g. SD [out] ~ DIA [ɑut] ‘old’

Conversely, dialect [ɑi] can only correspond to SD /ɔu/, except for the word *maïs* ‘maize’ (number of competing SD variants = 1).

6.4.20. SD /ɔu/ (from Wgm. *ǎ/ǒ* + *l* + *d/z/w*) ~ DIA [ɑu]

West Germanic *ǎ/ǒ* before a cluster of *l* + *d/z/w* developed into SD /ɔu/, just like Wgm. *ǎ/ǒ* before a cluster of *l* + *s/t*. In the Maldegem dialect, however, the West Germanic variant developed into (dialect) [ɑu] in this environment.²² Therefore, SD /ɔu/ may also correspond to DIA [ɑu], as in the examples below:

²¹ Support for our decision to implement the number of dialect variants independently from conditioning environment comes from overgeneralizations ‘across the border’ between the features SD /ɔu/ ~ DIA [ɑu] and SD /ɔu/ ~ DIA [ɑi] (i.e. overgeneralizations within the /ɔu/-paradigm) (see table 7.30).

²² Maldegem dialect [ɑu] also occurs in words with Wgm. *â* + *w* (e.g. *blauw* ‘blue’, *nauw* ‘narrow’). We have not included such words in our study, though.

- e.g. SD [ɔut] ~ DIA [ɑut] ‘old’ (< underlying /d/: e.g. *oude man* ‘old man’)
- e.g. SD [ɣɔut] ~ DIA [hɑut] ‘gold’ (< underlying /d/: e.g. *gouden ring* ‘golden ring’)
- e.g. SD [kɔut] ~ DIA [kɑut] ‘cold’ (< underlying /d/: e.g. *koude nacht* ‘cold night’)
- e.g. SD [pɔus] ~ DIA [pɑus] ‘pope’ (< underlying /z/: e.g. SD [pɔuzən] ‘popes (pl.)’)

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

Since this correspondence only applies to words originating from Wgm. $\check{a}/\check{o} + l + d/z/w$, it applies to a very limited set of words (it is lexicalized) and it is no longer productive.

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /ɔu/ ~ DIA [ɑu] is restricted to positions before underlying /d/, /z/ or /w/. So, there is a conditioning environment (= 1).

* Competing variants:

The two dialect variants to which SD /ɔu/ can correspond (irrespective of its context), were discussed in the previous section (number of competing dialect variants = 2).

DIA [ɑu] always corresponds to SD /ɔu/ (number of competing SD variants = 1).

6.4.21. SD /a: / (from Wgm. \check{a}/\hat{a} in open syllable) ~ DIA /ɔ̥^o/

West Germanic \check{a} (in an open syllable) and \hat{a} developed into Standard Dutch /a:/. The Maldegem dialect representative of these Wgm. variants is /ɔ̥^o/. Hence, SD /a: / corresponds to Maldegem DIA /ɔ̥^o/. This correspondence is illustrated in the following examples:

- e.g. SD [ma:n] ~ DIA [mɔ̥^onə] ‘moon’
- e.g. SD [la:t] ~ DIA [lɔ̥^otə] ‘late’
- e.g. SD [ra:r] ~ DIA [rɔ̥^or] ‘strange’
- e.g. SD [ba:s] ~ DIA [bɔ̥^os] ‘boss’
- e.g. SD [ja:ɣər] ~ DIA [jɔ̥^ohər] ‘hunter’

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

One might – wrongly – decide that the correspondence SD /a:/ ~ DIA /ɔ̥^o/ is productive, on the basis of the fact that the words *schaatsen* ‘to skate’, *laatste* ‘last one’ (both elicited in our word list), *plaats* ‘place’ and *kaatsen* ‘to bounce’, which were originally pronounced with DIA [ɑ], are, to an increasing extent, ‘regularized’ and thus pronounced with DIA [ɔ̥^o]. However, this is the result of the overgeneral use of the phoneme /ɔ̥^o/, which is not quite the same as the application of a correspondence due to its productivity. By definition, a correspondence is productive when it is applied to ‘new’ words, such as loanwords, proper names, etc. On the basis of this definition, we have to decide that the correspondence SD /a:/ ~ DIA /ɔ̥^o/ is not productive. It does not apply, for example, to the following exogenous words (when used in a Maldegem dialect context): *avocado* ‘avocado pear’, *gitaar* ‘gitar’, *radio* ‘radio’, *banaan* ‘banana’, and it also does not apply to proper names like *Nevada* or to brand names like *Lada*.

* Conditioning environment:

SD /a:/ can correspond to DIA /ɔ̥^o/ in all possible environments. Thus, there are no environmental restrictions on the occurrence of this feature (= 0).

* Competing variants:

SD /a:/ may correspond to one of three different dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3):

(1) to DIA /ɔ̥^o/

e.g. SD [ba:s] ~ DIA [bɔ̥^os] ‘boss’

e.g. SD [ba:rt] ~ DIA [bɔ̥^ort] ‘beard’

(2) to DIA /ɛ̃/

e.g. SD [pa:rt] ~ DIA [pɛ̃rt] ‘horse’

(3) to DIA /ɑ/

e.g. SD [sχa:tsən] ~ DIA [sχɑtsn̩] ‘to skate’

On the other side, DIA /ɔ̥^o/ may correspond to one of two Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 2):

(1) to SD /a: /

e.g. DIA [mɔ̥^onə] ~ SD [ma:n] ‘moon’

(2) to SD /ɑ/

Lex. exc. DIA [ɔ̥^orm] ~ SD [ɑrm] ‘arm’

6.4.22. SD /a: / (from Wgm. *ǣ* + r + alv. C) ~ DIA /ɔ̥^o /

In our study, we included the correspondence SD /a: / ~ DIA /ɔ̥^o / (see section 6.4.21) as a separate variable when it occurs in positions before a cluster of ‘/r/ + alveolar consonant’. Actually, this is the same correspondence as the one discussed in the previous section. However, we wanted to examine the difference in learnability between the variant in words like *baard* ‘beard’, *maart* ‘March’, etc. on the one hand, and the variant in words like *paard* ‘horse’, *kaars* ‘candle’, etc. on the other. This is why we discuss the correspondence SD /a: / ~ DIA /ɔ̥^o / before a cluster of ‘/r/ + alv. C’ as a separate variable.

SD /a: / only corresponds to Maldegem dialect /ɔ̥^o / in positions before ‘/r/ + alv. C’ when the relevant word originates from West Germanic forms with *ǣ* without umlaut. If there were an umlaut, Wgm. *ǣ* (in this environment) developed into Maldegem dialect /ɛ̥ / (see section 6.4.23). Consider the examples below:

e.g. SD [ma:rt] ~ DIA [mɔ̥^ortə] ‘March’

e.g. SD [ba:rt] ~ DIA [bɔ̥^ort] ‘beard’

e.g. SD [pa:rs] ~ DIA [pɔ̥^ors] ‘purple’

*Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

In section 6.4.21, we argued that the correspondence SD /a: / ~ DIA /ɔ̥^o / is no longer productive.

* Conditioning environment:

As pointed out in the previous section, SD /a: / may correspond to DIA /ɔ̥^o / in all possible environments (thus, not only in positions before ‘/r/ + alv. C’). Therefore, we conclude that there are no environmental restrictions (= 0).

* Competing variants:

The results of the implementation of this factor are identical to the ones in the previous section (section 6.4.21): number of competing dialect variants = 3 and number of competing SD variants = 2.

6.4.23. SD /a: / (from Wgm. \check{a} + r + alv. C, with former umlaut) ~ DIA /ɛ̥ /

As was pointed out in the previous section, Wgm. \check{a} (+ r + alv. C) developed into Maldegem dialect /ɛ̥/, if umlaut could apply. In Standard Dutch, the representative of this West Germanic variant is the same as when there was no umlaut, viz. SD /a: /. So, in positions before /r/ + alveolar consonant, SD /a: / sometimes (i.e. in a few words) corresponds to Maldegem dialect /ɛ̥/. This is illustrated in the following examples:

e.g. SD [pa:rt] ~ DIA [pɛ̥rt] ‘horse’

e.g. SD [sta:rt] ~ DIA [stɛ̥rt] ‘tail’

e.g. SD [ka:rs] ~ DIA [kɛ̥sə] ‘candle’

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The correspondence SD /a: / ~ DIA /ɛ̥ / before r + alveolar consonant is completely lexicalized and is no longer productive.

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /a: / ~ DIA /ɛ̥ / is restricted to positions before a cluster of ‘/r/ + alveolar C’. Therefore, we can conclude that there is a conditioning environment (= 1). However, in the same environment, DIA /ɔ̥^o / can also occur (see section 6.4.22).

* Competing variants:

Irrespective of its context, SD /a: / may correspond to one of three different dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3). These variants were already discussed in section 6.4.21. On the other hand, DIA /ɛ̥ / may correspond to one of five Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 5). These variants were described in section 6.4.15.

6.4.24. SD /a : / ~ DIA /α/ before -ts

In section 6.4.21, we argued that the correspondence SD /a : / ~ DIA /ɔ̣[◦]/ is increasingly applied to the words *schaatsen* ‘to skate’, *laatste* ‘last one’, *plaats* ‘place’ and *kaatsen* ‘to bounce’. The use of the correspondence SD /a : / ~ DIA /ɔ̣[◦]/, however, is due to a process of overgeneralization, because, originally, these words were pronounced with Maldegem dialect [α]. The authentic pronunciation with [α], however, is almost completely lost among young Maldegem dialect speakers. This evolution was already observed by Versieck (1989:29). This implies that forms that were originally due to overgeneralization (i.e. with /ɔ̣[◦]/), have caused a change in the Maldegem dialect phonology, as a result of which irregular forms (i.e. *schaatsen*, *laatste*, *plaats* and *kaatsen*) are increasingly regularized to [ɔ̣[◦]].

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The correspondence SD /a : / ~ DIA /α/ before -ts only occurs in the words *schaatsen*, *laatste*, *plaats* and *kaatsen* and is not productive.

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /a : / ~ DIA /α/ is restricted to positions before -ts. Thus, we may conclude that there is a conditioning environment (= 1).

* Competing variants:

The three dialect variants to which SD /a : / may correspond were already described in section 6.4.21 (number of competing dialect variants = 3).

Oppositely, DIA /α/ (irrespective of its context) may correspond to one of three SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 3):

(1) to SD /α/

e.g. DIA [dɔk] ~ SD [dɔk] ‘roof’

(2) to SD /a : /

e.g. DIA [kɑtsɒ] ~ SD [ka : tsən] ‘to bounce’

(3) to SD /ɔ/

Lex. exc. DIA [kɑstə] ~ SD [kɔrst] ‘crust’

6.4.25. SD /ɪ/ (from Wgm. \tilde{i} in a closed syllable) ~ DIA /æ/

West Germanic \tilde{i} in a closed syllable developed into SD /ɪ/. This West Germanic variant developed into Maldegem dialect /ɛ/ in most words (i.e. with an opener realization than the SD variant), but in a few words it even developed into the extremely open phoneme /æ/. Thus, SD /ɪ/ sometimes corresponds to DIA /æ/, as appears from the following examples:

e.g. SD [lɪkən] ~ DIA [læʔə] ‘to lick’

e.g. SD [rɪp] ~ DIA [ræbə] ‘rib’

e.g. SD [rɪmpəls] ~ [ræmpəls] ‘wrinkles’

* Productivity (lexical vs. postlexical status):

The correspondence SD /ɪ/ ~ DIA /æ/ only applies to a very restricted set of words (i.e. it is a lexicalized feature) and it is not productive. Newly introduced words with SD /ɪ/ are always pronounced with a somewhat more open variant in the Maldegem dialect (i.e. [ɛ]), but never with the extremely open variant [æ].

* Conditioning environment:

The correspondence SD /ɪ/ ~ DIA /æ/ is completely lexically determined instead of being conditioned by any environmental restrictions (= 0).

* Competing variants:

Irrespective of its context, SD /ɪ/ may correspond to one of three dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3):

(1) to DIA /æ/

e.g. SD [lɪkən] ~ DIA [læʔə] ‘to lick’

(2) to DIA /ɛ/

e.g. SD [kɪn] ~ DIA [kɛnə] ‘chin’

(3) to DIA /e/

e.g. SD [dɪŋ] ~ DIA [deŋ] ‘thing’

In turn, DIA /æ/ may correspond to one of three Standard Dutch variants (number of competing SD variants = 3):

(1) to SD /ɪ/

e.g. DIA [ræbə] ~ SD [rɪp] ‘rib’

(2) to SD /ɛ/

e.g. DIA [bædə] ~ SD [bɛt] ‘bed’

(3) to SD /ɑ/

Lex. exc. DIA [vlæhə] ~ SD [vlɑχ] ‘flag’

Lex. exc. DIA [ærtə] ~ SD [hɑrt] ‘heart’

6.4.26. Lexical exceptions

In this section, we deal with the remaining lexical exceptions that were investigated in our word list. They are exceptions to correspondences which were not included in the present study. Obviously, a discussion of the factors ‘productivity’ and ‘conditioning environment’ is redundant in the case of lexical exceptions. Therefore, we only discuss the factor ‘competing variants’.

* SD /ɑ/ ~ DIA /æ/ in *hart*, *slak* and *vlag*

Generally, SD /ɑ/ corresponds to Maldegem dialect /ɑ/ (e.g. in *dak* ‘roof’, *man* ‘man’), but the words *hart* ‘heart’, *slak* ‘snail’ and *vlag* ‘flag’ are pronounced as [ærtə], [slæʔə] and [vlæhə], respectively.

Irrespective of its context, SD /ɑ/ may correspond to four dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 4):

(1) to DIA /æ/ (lex. exc. *vlag* ‘flag’)

(2) to DIA /ɑ/ (e.g. *man* ‘man’, *kar* ‘cart’, etc.)

(3) to DIA /o/ (lex. exc. *barst* ‘fissure’)

(4) to DIA /ɔ̣/ (lex. exc. *arm* ‘arm’)

The correspondences in (1), (3) and (4) above all involve lexical exceptions, whereas the correspondence in (2) is the common one. This means that the incidence of the

correspondence in (2) is much higher than that of any of the other cases. Therefore, the degree of predictability of the correspondence in (2) will be much higher.

Dialect /æ/ may correspond to three SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 3), which were described in section 6.4.25.

*** SD /ɑ/ ~ DIA /o/ in *barst***

Another lexical exception to the correspondence SD /ɑ/ ~ DIA /ɑ/ is the word *barst* ‘fissure’, which is pronounced as [bɑstə] in the Maldegem dialect.

As pointed out above, SD /ɑ/ may correspond to one of four dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 4). Conversely, DIA /o/ may correspond to one of four SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 4):

- (1) to SD /ɑ/ (lex. exc. *barst* ‘fissure’)
- (2) to SD /ɔ/ (e.g. *pot* ‘pot’, *bos* ‘wood’, *snor* ‘moustache’, etc.)
- (3) to SD /o:/ (e.g. *goot* ‘gutter’, *boog* ‘bow’, *over* ‘over’, etc.)
- (4) to SD /u/ (lex. exc. *bloem* ‘flower’)

*** SD /ɑ/ ~ DIA /ɔ̣/ in *arm***

A third lexical exception to the correspondence SD /ɑ/ ~ DIA /ɑ/, is the word *arm* ‘(i) arm, (ii) poor’, which is pronounced as [ɔ̣rm].²³

SD /ɑ/ may correspond to one of four dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 4) and DIA /ɔ̣/ may correspond to one of two SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 2), which were discussed in section 6.4.21.

*** SD /ɔ/ ~ DIA /ɑ/ in *korst***

Generally, SD /ɔ/ corresponds to Maldegem dialect /o/ (e.g. in *pot* ‘pot’, *stok* ‘stick’), and to a much smaller extent also to dialect /ɛ/ (e.g. in *pop* ‘doll’, *schoppen* ‘to kick’) (see section 6.4.16), but the word *korst* ‘crust’ is realized as [kɑstə].

²³ Other words showing the same phonological environment as *arm* ‘arm’ are realized differently in the Maldegem dialect, e.g. *warm* ‘warm’ → DIA [wɑrm] and *darm* ‘intestine’ → DIA [dærm].

SD /ɔ/ may correspond to one of three dialect variants (number of competing dialect variants = 3), which were discussed in section 6.4.16. DIA /ɑ/ may correspond to one of three SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 3), which were described in section 6.4.24.

*** SD /y/ ~ DIA /ø/ in *duwen, schuw, ruw* and *ruzie***

Normally, SD /y/ is realized as Maldegem dialect /y/ (e.g. *juni* ‘June’) or DIA /i/ (e.g. *muur* ‘wall’), but the words *duwen* ‘to push’, *schuw* ‘shy’, *ruw* ‘rough’ and *ruzie* ‘quarrel’ are realized as [døw̃:], [sχøw], [røw] and [røzø], respectively. Although this correspondence mainly occurs in positions before –w, it is not restricted to this environment only (cf. *ruzie*, which is a ‘real’ lexical exception).

SD /y/ may correspond to one of three dialect variants: (1) to DIA /y/, (2) to DIA /i/ or (3) to DIA /ø/ (number of competing dialect variants = 3). In turn, DIA /ø/ may correspond to one of five SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 5), which were discussed in section 6.4.6.

*** SD /u/ ~ DIA /o/ in *bloem***

Generally, SD /u/ corresponds to Maldegem dialect /u/ (e.g. in *boek* ‘book’, *groep* ‘group’, etc.), but the word *bloem* is a lexical exception to this correspondence, since it is pronounced as [blomø].

SD /u/ may correspond to one of two dialect variants: (1) to DIA /u/ or (2) to DIA /o/ (number of competing dialect variants = 2). DIA /o/ may correspond to one of four SD variants (number of competing SD variants = 4), which were discussed above (i.e. SD /ɑ/, /ɔ/, /o:/ or /u/).

*** SD /i/ ~ DIA /ɛi/ in *drie***

SD /i/ normally corresponds to DIA /i/ (e.g. in *zien* ‘to see’, *lief* ‘sweet’, etc.), but the word *drie* ‘three’ is realized as [drɛijø].

SD /i/ may correspond to one of two dialect variants: (1) to DIA /i/ or (2) to DIA /ɛi/ (number of competing dialect variants = 2). On the other hand, DIA /ɛi/ may correspond to one of two SD variants: (1) to SD /i/ (lex. exc. *drie* ‘three’) or (2) to SD

/ɛi/ (e.g. *blij* ‘glad’, *rijden* ‘to drive’, *tijd* ‘time’, etc.) (number of competing SD variants = 2).

6.4.27. Conclusion

In the present section, we have discussed all dialect features which are involved in this study of second dialect acquisition. In sections 6.4.1 to 6.4.4, we dealt with the consonantal variables in our study, whereas the remaining sections were devoted to the vocalic variables. We have presented the results of the implementation of the factors ‘productivity’, ‘conditioning environment’ and ‘competing variants’ for each separate variable.

6.5. The Maldegem phoneme inventory

On the basis of the extensive description of the Maldegem dialect features in the previous sections, we are able to represent the Maldegem phonemes and allophones schematically. The vowels are given in tables 6.3 and 6.4, and the consonants appear in tables 6.5 and 6.6.

	Front		Medial	Back	
	[-rounded]	[+rounded]	[-rounded] [-spread]	[-rounded]	[+rounded]
Closed	/i/ /iə/	/y/			/u/ /uə/
Half-closed	/e/	/ø/			/o/
Half-open	/ɛ̃/ /ɛ̃i/	/œ/	/ə/		/ɔ̃ ^o /
Open	/æ/ /æi/			/ɑ/ /ɑu/	

Table 6.3: The Maldegem phoneme inventory: vowels

Each of the vowels in table 6.3 (apart from /y/, /ə/ and the diphthongs /ɛ̃i/, /æi/ and /ou/) has an extra-long allophone (e.g. [i:] in *wiel* ‘wheel’, [ɑ:] in *bal* ‘ball’, etc.), as well as an extra-long, nasalized allophone (e.g. [ĩ:] in *hielen* ‘heels’, [ã:] in *dansen* ‘to dance’, etc.). This is illustrated in table 6.4.

	Front			Back	
	[-rounded]	[+rounded]		[-rounded]	[+rounded]
Closed	[i] [i:] [ĩ:] [iə] [i ^ə :] [ĩ ^ə :]	[y]			[u] [u:] [ũ:] [uə] [u ^ə :] [ũ ^ə :]
Half-closed	[e] [e:] [ē:]	[ø] [ø:] [ø̃:]			[o] [o:] [ō:]
Half-open	[ɛ] [ɛ:] [ē̃:] [ɛi]	[œ]	[ə]		[ɔ̞ [◌]] [ɔ̞ [◌] :] [ɔ̞ ^{◌̃} :]
Open	[æ] [æ:] [æ̃:] [æi]			[ɑ] [ɑ:] [ã:] [ɑu] [ɑi]	

Table 6.4: The Maldegem allophones: vowels

The consonant system of the Maldegem dialect is presented schematically in the tables below.

Voice	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+
	bilabial		labio-dental		alveolar		palatal	velar		uvular	laryngeal /glottal
Expl.	/p/	/b/			/t/	/d/		/k/			
Fric.			/f/	/v/	/s/	/z/				/χ/	/h/
Nas.		/m/				/n/			/ŋ/		
Liq.						/l/ /r/					
Glide		/w/					/j/				

Table 6.5: The Maldegem phoneme inventory: consonants

Voice	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-
	bilabial		labio-dental		alveolar		pala- tal	velar		uvu- lar	laryngeal/ glottal	
Expl.	[p]	[b]			[t]	[d]		[k]				[ʔ]
Fric.			[f]	[v]	[s]	[z]				[χ]	[h]	
Nas.		[m] [m:]		[ŋ]		[n] [n:]			[ŋ] [ŋ:]			
Liq.						[l] [r]						
Glide		[w] [w̃:]					[j] [j̃:]					

Table 6.6: The Maldegem allophones: consonants

6.6. Summary

In this chapter, we have first discussed the socio-demographic situation of the research location of the present study, i.e. Maldegem. Then, we turned to the linguistic situation of Maldegem. We argued that three different language varieties are spoken in Maldegem, viz. (local) dialect, the substandard variety (i.e. *tussentaal*) and the southern variant of Standard Dutch. The functional distribution of these varieties was discussed. Next, we focused on the degree to which dialect features of the three components of language (i.e. morphosyntax, lexicon, phonology) infiltrate the ‘higher’ language varieties (i.e. substandard and standard). We argued that the degree to which phonological dialect features infiltrate the higher varieties is closely related to the features’ status as primary, secondary or tertiary features. Only the tertiary features occur in *tussentaal* and Southern Dutch as well. Then we passed on to a discussion of the tertiary, secondary and primary features of the Maldegem dialect.

In the second part of this chapter (section 6.4), we discussed the consonantal and vocalic dialect features that were included in the present study. We showed how the feature-related factors discussed in chapters 4 and 5 were operationalized for each separate feature.

In the next chapter, we test the hypotheses – formulated in chapter 4 – with respect to the effects of those factors (and of the speaker-related factors as well) on the success in second dialect acquisition.