

LANGUAGE, DIALECT AND SOCIETY

MALCAH YAEGER-DROR

Peter Trudgill, *On Dialect: Social and Geographical Perspectives*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1983.
240 pages.

Trudgill's book is of wide interdisciplinary interest, since Trudgill is one of the most articulate scholars in the field today: his prose is clear, and his arguments are generally self-contained and eloquent. Although one might want a more thorough discussion of his methodological infrastructure, almost every chapter reveals a new methodological *technique* to extend the horizons of a field already charted by Labov's ingenious plays.

For this book Trudgill has 'revised, updated and edited' carefully chosen articles to present them as 'a coherent text.' While some such texts focus on 'secular' linguistic topics, and others focus on specific communicative aspects of linguistics, Trudgill has chosen a broad cross-section of papers which run the entire gamut of foci. The first papers are of primary concern to the linguist who realizes that the inclusion of sociological parameters can extend a purely linguistic analysis, and as the book progresses, the articles increasingly emphasize the social variables. Given that the intention was for the book to be read as a coherent text, in a couple of instances more work should have been done to integrate and update the papers. However, on the whole, the volume flows well.

While Trudgill has clearly read all the American literature, he uses a primarily British or European data base, and draws conclusions which appear to imply that influences on speech in the U.K. are universal. Since the organization of British society is quite different from that in many other parts of the world, not surprisingly, the hypotheses which Trudgill presents as sociolinguistic 'universals' frequently are contradicted by sociolinguistic data gathered elsewhere. Consequently, students must be especially skeptical of Trudgill's theoretical positions when they appear to contradict the data. Thus, articles cannot be accepted at face value, but can motivate students to compare Trudgill's data with other published data. If students are careful, studying work like this can lead to new breakthroughs.

Since an introduction places a book's chapters in a specific perspective, this reviewer felt the introduction called for a special comment, in light of the fact that it appears to propose a frame which Trudgill himself would clearly reject. The 'Introduction' (pp. 1-7) outlines the range of interests which have been considered sociolinguistic, and moves from this to focus attention on *dialect* from a sociolinguistic perspective. Trudgill demonstrates language teaching us about language *and* about society. Trudgill has presented a framework for such a 'cross-disciplinary' understanding before (1978, pp. 1-18); however, Trudgill's condensation of that discussion here maintains that work which is transparently concerned with 'improving linguistic theory and . . . developing our understanding of the nature of

Correspondence relating to this paper should be addressed to M. Yaeger-Dror, Linguistics Department, Université de Montréal.

language' (p. 3) is sociolinguistic (let us call it socio-*linguistics*, while 'linguistics as a social science' (or *socio-linguistics*)—i.e. where the theoretical and practical objectives are not narrowly linguistic—is outside the bounds of our concerns as linguists. This introduction also specifies a transitional area comprised of the ethnography of speaking, social psychology of language, and discourse analysis. Since almost half of the present volume uses linguistic data to teach us about society, we conclude that Trudgill merely misrepresented his position in the condensation of his introduction. However, since the introduction proposes a frame for the succeeding chapters, the effect is disconcerting.

The best example of the potential harm this oversimplification can cause is provided by Trudgill's discussion of ethnomethodology. Here Trudgill presents very forcefully the argument that research should be judged by the degree to which the researcher appears to take linguistic *goals* or *objectives* as primary to his analysis. He further emphasizes that the ethnomethodologists' misfocus is evident even in their choice of terminology. One would think that the rules of discourse posited by Grice (1975) should be compared with those of Labov and Fanshel (1977), or Sacks *et al.* (1974, 1977), with each set of rules being judged by reference to its adequacy in accounting for the data, rather than on its philosophical point of departure or the felicity of its terminology. Had Trudgill attacked 'socio-linguists' who analyse no 'speech' or 'talk', only their own introspections in their quest of linguistic truths I would have been less surprised than to see such an extended discussion (polemic?) of why ethnomethodological conversation analysis is not 'linguistic'. While one infers from reading this version of the introduction that Trudgill accepts no form of analysis based on ethnomethodological premises, in the longer introduction (1978), Trudgill clarifies that the bulk of 'conversational analysis' would be included in his framework¹ and even this abridged discussion is capped off with a quote from Hymes (1974) showing that he feels the drawing of boundaries between the disciplines 'may well be unimportant, unnecessary, and unhelpful'. The quote is consistent with Trudgill's earlier introduction (1978) and may be considered as consistent with the position maintained throughout the papers which follow here!

While the longer version of the paper which Trudgill used as an introduction in 1978 neatly clarifies a continuum of interest from primarily linguistic (e.g. universals of language change) to primarily social (e.g. kinship terminology) which would make this chapter pedagogically very useful, the 1983 version omits hedges, and (worse) reduces some discussions to the point where the argument can no longer be followed.² This 'bowdlerized' introduction is far from representative of the overall quality of the articles which it introduces. Either it should be reexpanded to present Trudgill's actual position, which would provide a frame for this book, or else it should be omitted.

Chapter 1, 'Sociolinguistics and linguistic theory: polylectal grammars and cross-dialectal communication', pp. 8–30, first printed in 1982. Inauspiciously, Chapter 1 presents snippets of data to disprove that speakers of a language have (at least) passive polylectal competence. It follows that n years after an argument against this hypothetical position (where n can be as many as 15) the debate appears even less necessary than it did on first publication. While Bailey (1972, 1973) did propose that a single hypothetical panlectal or polylectal grammar should be constructed to encompass all dialects of a given language, no linguist has ever maintained—as Trudgill implies—that such a grammar would have any psychological validity. In a review of Chambers and Trudgill (1980), Feagin (1982, p. 691) has called Trudgill to task for this same error of interpretation.

Given that no researchers appear to seriously hold the position which Trudgill attributes to Bailey, it is a shame that many lexical, morphological, and syntactic dialect features which are relatively little known to the west of the Atlantic are merely vaguely sketched to disprove that position. The discussion is further marred by his insistence on accepting self-report (introspective, questionnaire) data at face value. This is inconsistent with Trudgill's and Labov's well based understanding that introspective data is unreliable because speakers often are equally incapable of recognising their own local pattern or glossing it correctly.³ On the other hand, Trudgill himself (1973, reprinted in this volume as chapter 10) has elegantly shown that evidence gleaned from 'self-report' questionnaires *can* be used to great effect, when contrasted with what speakers actually do. Yet here he is, building his argument on tables of self-report data which show that foreigners may appear to have a more realistic appraisal of where different dialectal features occur in England than do British students and teachers of linguistics. These results confirm Trudgill's and Labov's earlier evidence that even under the best conditions linguists should not trust self-conscious 'native intuitions' gleaned from questionnaire data. On the other hand, while it is undoubtedly true that speakers do not have a psychological deep structure polylectal grammar, it is certainly not because (when formally tested) British linguists display a lack of cross-dialectally valid intuitions. In 1983, a researcher of Trudgill's refinement should refrain from presenting such an analysis.

One of Trudgill's strong points is his ability to collect data from unlikely but telling sources. Just as the beginning student is 'turned on' by the department store survey (Labov, 1966) for its unorthodoxy (only coming to appreciate its results later), I project that recent work of Trudgill's (including Chapter 8; see below) are classroom classics for their ability to tap unorthodox data sources. In this chapter, Trudgill bases part of his argument against panlectal grammars on the fact that even speakers of single urban dialect cannot mimic speakers of other sub-varieties of the same community dialect (10–11). His ingenuity in tapping this data source, and using it to best advantage here and elsewhere can hopefully prompt the beginning student to greater interest and the advanced student to greater flexibility in field-methods.

The first half of Chapter 2, 'Sociolinguistics and dialectology: geolinguistics and English rural dialects', pp. 31–51, is devoted to a somewhat bombastic plea for sociolinguists to pay closer attention to the data of traditional dialectologists. Both dialectologists and prescriptive grammarians have much to teach us, if we use their data with proper caution and respect. They can help us focus on potentially rich nodes of linguistically variable data, and (used with proper caution) can add time-depth to the analysis. This point is well taken, but is presented as if someone would disagree with it. While we often forget or are too lazy to follow the advice Trudgill proposes, I doubt that anyone ever was not *taught* to make use of these dialectological and historical prescriptive resources. Consequently, had the article been couched as a *reminder* to researchers, or as a *blueprint* for a future researcher to follow, it would have been most useful, as well as appropriate for the text which this claims to be. In its present format, it is abrasive to the researcher, and inappropriately worded for the beginner.

The other half of the chapter presents the other face of the same argument: the traditional dialectologists ought to learn from the sociodialectologist. Here Trudgill presents clear evidence that dialectologists could be saved a great deal of unnecessary fruitless work if they were to take advantage of sociolinguistic information on the heterogeneity of a speech community, and style variation within a speaker's repertoire.

In the section on 'Gradience and variability', pp. 46–51, Trudgill shows some weaknesses in the traditional dialectological tool of isogloss placement. The fact is that 'isoglosses usually mark transition zones rather than discrete breaks' (p. 47). Even the dialectologists of the LAE (Lexical Atlas of England) admit this, while ignoring the fact that 'a different informant, a different sentence, or a different day might produce a different [variable] response.' Trudgill advises dialectologists to adopt sociolinguistic standards of *taping*, and comparative-listening or acoustic transcription to verify consistency before isoglosses are placed on a map. He might well have added that, as Douglas-Cowie has pointed out (1978), the further a field-worker's dialect is from the local dialect, the more dialect speakers will *accommodate* their speech, invalidating the data thus obtained.

Thus, while his section addressed to sociolinguists summarizes a first sociolinguistics course, his section addressed to socio-dialectologists is quite helpful in warning the sociolinguist of the care which must be taken in extracting information from dialect publications. From this chapter Trudgill leads elegantly into the next, his 1974 proposal for a marriage of socio- and geo-linguistic resources.

Chapter 3, 'Linguistic change and diffusion: description and explanation of geolinguistics', pp. 52–87, first presents isogloss maps to show how inadequate they are. Then, based on the work of cultural-geographers, he shows how a division of geographic areas using small uniform hexagons might in fact clarify our understanding of linguistic spread. He refers to this as a *gravity* model, with change dripping 'down' slowly to adjacent areas, working its way out from individual population centers. Unfortunately, within a few pages Trudgill is positing epicycles on epicycles in order to maintain his hypothesis that the geographic area is *primary* for linguistic as well as geographic data. While we learn a great deal from reading Trudgill's paper, in the end, at least this reader was more convinced than ever that if we have to weight our results relative to all the factors in his list, we might better use a different model of linguistic change:

- (a) population density in different hexagonal areas in the vicinity;
- (b) networking between a given hexagon and the larger population areas;
- (c) the geographical location of the *origin* of an innovation;
- (d) the social group among whom an innovation has arisen;
- (e) social psychological attitudes toward a given variety (p. 83, fn. 5);
- (f) linguistic distance between/among varieties;
- (g) 'the *linguistic system* . . . as a resistance factor' (p. 83).

Trudgill's discussion of the influence of urban centers on the *gravitational* flow of linguistic change is greatly enhanced by the description of the expansion of 'uvular' *r* throughout Europe in recent centuries. Trudgill makes his point by comparing a 'traditional' geographic dialectal map for this feature, with a modified map, displaying major population centers and how the changes appear to radiate from these centers. As always, Trudgill's discussion is articulate and linguistically elegant. If anyone has missed the discussion in Chambers and Trudgill, s/he will find the point made very clearly here. However, map for map (a relevant comparison for a new approach to dialectology), the discussion in Chambers and Trudgill is if anything somewhat more to the point: Chambers and Trudgill present more detailed maps of expansion of 'uvular' (r) frontier areas of Scandinavia, as well as a set of age graded maps of Brunlanes, Norway for (sj), which is more to Trudgill's point than the maps of (æ) presented here. Thus, this chapter is *more* thorough than

Chapter 10 of Chambers and Trudgill only in its expansion on the mathematical rules used for the specific geolinguistic analysis which Trudgill purposes.

This chapter could well have been updated from the 1974 article to integrate Milroy's (1980) concept of an interactional network into the concept of differential geographical distance between areas, based on different degrees of networking between the two groups of speakers. By the time Trudgill adds in all the social factors, his model appears like a macro-model which might take the best advantage of Milroy's insights; but we are left wondering how Trudgill would compare, much less integrate, the two models.

I would also have been grateful for discussion of the articles which have used Trudgill's model. While Vincent and Sankoff (1975) tried to adapt Trudgill's model to an analysis of some Montreal data which is stereotyped to be geographic in nature, the results were very disappointing; discussion of this paper and any others which made use of Trudgill's model might help others to avoid what might be misinterpretation of his model.

Trudgill is quite right in concluding that attention to geographical models can force us to ask questions which need answering. Certainly the data which Trudgill used to frame his model and explore it was often very interesting. Whether the answers which are generated by Trudgill's model are as useful as answers generated by other models at our disposal is not clear to me even after a close reappraisal of the article.

Chapter 4, 'The sociolinguistics and geolinguistics of vowel mergers: dialect contact in East Anglia', pp. 88–101, was written with Tina Foxcroft, and published in 1978. It is a good example of the type of socio-*linguistic* work that Trudgill does best. The article discusses a merger of vowels (a *linguistic* change) with a *geographic* and *social* context. Based on an East Anglian merger of /Uu/ and /Au/ (cf. Trudgill, 1974a), Trudgill and Foxcroft discuss factors in our understanding of sound change as *gradual* rather than *abrupt*. Trudgill and Foxcroft point out that in some subareas there is a *transfer*; i.e., the change is geographically and lexically *gradual*, but phonetically *abrupt*. In other areas there is *approximation* of the two variants; that is, that the change is *phonetically* gradual. While these two options may seem totally different from the perspective of linguistic theory, it is clear that within the context provided by the fact that there are two different local 'prestige' dialects, the same social forces have been operative in both *transfer* and *approximation*. The same 'change from above' is *transfer* in an area where speakers are adapting towards an [öu] target, but *approximation* where they are adapting toward a [əu] target. The article makes its point quite clearly, but it is the chapter where I most critically miss the application of acoustic analysis to the data: Trudgill and Foxcroft acknowledge that an apparent merger may often be a pseudo-merger as described in Labov *et al.* (1972, Ch. 6), Labov (1975), Nunberg (1975), and Yaeger (1974, p. 97) (pp. 97–98); they admit that perceptual data is inconclusive in determining whether a merger is genuine (pp. 98–99); they demonstrate that even when the change is 'from below'—like Norwich /Iə/ /Eə/ (better known to Americans as (ihr) (Ehr)—the locals may be wrong in their understanding that a merger has occurred (p. 98). But they do not even propose, much less perform, an acoustic spot-check, to see that /Uu/ and /Au/ are actually merged! Whether or not an actual merger has taken place, the article presents a classic example of an analysis using the technology of Labov (1966) to teach us about the British sociolinguistic situation in particular, and sound change in general.

Chapter 5–7 move further toward the no man's land which Trudgill has posited between socio-*linguistics* and *socio-linguistics*. An old friend of mine used to say, 'Only a child

or a fool asks ‘Why?!’ As Trudgill leads from a more linguistic focus to a more sociological focus, he asks ‘why’ more often. Fool that I am, I think any linguist should find Trudgill’s questions important, even if the answers are not always fully satisfying.

These chapters deal with language contact. Consistent with the book’s pattern, the first is the most purely linguistic, and is very ambitious for a researcher who had always published work on sound change in British English, with some support from other Germanic systems. Chapter 5, ‘Language contact and language change: on the rise of the creoloid’, pp. 102–107, was first delivered in 1979, and makes an interesting point about sound change. Like Kroch (1979), Trudgill assumes that sound change is relatively ‘natural’ or ‘non-natural’. Kroch hypothesizes that ‘natural’ sound changes will develop ‘from below’ the community speakers’ level of awareness, while ‘non-natural’ changes will be more conscious.⁴ Similarly, Trudgill proposes that linguistic changes will be more ‘natural’ in a situation which is less influenced by language contact. He reminds us of the well-known fact that language changes more slowly in peripheral areas than in central areas. Researchers believe that the peripheral areas are less innovative. In this study Trudgill presents Scandinavian data to demonstrate that linguistic contact creates ‘creoloid’, ‘non-natural’ changes, while isolation permits perhaps overall fewer changes, but linguistically ‘natural’ ones. While Kroch’s theory explored phonetic or phonological data, Trudgill’s is concerned more with morphological, and morpho-syntactic changes. Trudgill’s hypothesis is thought provoking, but like Kroch’s it runs the risk of being confirmed by circular reasoning. What can be regarded as ‘non-natural’ in morpho-syntactic change? Trudgill proposes that reduction of redundancy, the move from synthetic to analytical structure, is non-natural. Why? Because the tendency in language contact situations is to simplify: less redundancy provides easier learning for the non-natives. Conversely, Trudgill hypothesizes that a move from analytical structure to a more synthetic structure is ‘natural’. Now, perhaps it is true that English is the most analytical, grammatically least redundant language in Western Europe, and also the most creolized of these languages. Trudgill presents this as evidence for his position; he also presents data from Faroese (with changes he has defined as ‘natural’), comparing it with Norwegian data (with data he has defined as ‘creoloid’). Whether or not we accept the position that analytical structure is less ‘natural’ than synthetic structure, Trudgill’s hypothesis that language contact will only influence a language in this direction is an interesting one, well presented, and certainly well worth more comparative study.

Chapter 6, ‘Language contact in Greece: Reduction and simplification in the Albanian dialects of Attica and Biotia’, pp. 108–126, explores a language contact situation for which the data was collected with George Tzavaras in an Arvanitika-speaking area of Greece. (*Arvanites* are the Albanian speakers of Attica and Biotia; their dialect is *Arvanitika*.) Trudgill contrasts *reduction*—the loss of vocabulary or morphosyntactic units—with *simplification*—increased morphological regularity, simpler morphophonemics, more fixed word order, less need for redundant morphosyntax concord, and a shift from marked to unmarked structures. He also proposes that there can be *simplification* with compensation: where, for example, case endings are replaced by a preposition which does not require concord. Then Trudgill tries to show that creolizing influences *simplify* the linguistic structure (as we saw in the previous chapter), while language contact in which one of the languages is dying [as in Dorian’s Gaelic (1973), or the present example], does not *simplify*, but does *reduce* linguistic structure. In the Arvanitika data, Trudgill presents evidence that the imperfect and certain relational words are lost: this is *reduction*. In addition, there

is *simplification*—a loss of syntactic redundancy—and '*simplification with cost*'—synthetic cases are replaced by analytic forms. They conclude that 'while the distinction between reduction and simplification might appear to be a useful one . . . it is by no means a clear-cut distinction, or one that is easy to apply in practice' (p. 124).

Chapter 7, 'Language contact, language shift, and identity: Why Arvanites are not Albanians', pp. 127–140, co-authored with George Tzavaras, was first published in 1977 and is an article on Arvanites, rather than on Arvanitika. Using the language contact situation discussed in the preceding article, Trudgill and Tzavaras discuss how the speakers' attitude toward their speech influences speech. For a sociolinguist it is fascinating to see one of 'our own' who comfortably bridges the attitudinal 'gap' between socio-*linguistics* and social psychology of language. Looking at the two articles, it is clear that the two research goals go hand in hand, and one helps the other. It is also clear that either work done independently would be poorer, and that both done together take little more field time than either one alone would have taken. How strange it is in this case to have Trudgill's polemical introduction apparently contradicting what he says in the book; the introduction is clearly disproved by his own example, which is well worth emulating. If only the polemic were redirected to focus on linguistic researchers' need to integrate a social psychological perspective, and implement it with their 'purely linguistic' field-work, since, as the book demonstrates, the theoretical and practical 'payoff' is so high.

Once again, Trudgill and Tzavaras's analysis is based on questionnaire responses. While it is true that responses to questionnaires focussing on language attitudes are as vulnerable to criticism as other self-report data (Bourhis, 1984), Trudgill and Tzavaras manage to learn as much as one dares from the questions which they have posed.⁵ However, it is true that reading Trudgill and Tzavaras's argument, one has misgivings which Trudgill might be able to answer, but does not. Consider Tables 7.1–7.4 (pp. 132–134), which report the results of Trudgill and Tzavaras's questions:

- (7.1) Do you like to speak Arvanitika?
- (7.2) Do you think speaking Arvanitika is a good thing to do?
- (7.4) Is it an advantage to speak Arvanitika?
- (7.3) Do/would you like your children to speak Arvanitika?

We find that only 1% of those over 35 answered the first two questions in the negative; 8% of those aged 35–49 felt it was a disadvantage to speak it, but none of those over 49 did; nevertheless, over 35% of that age group did not want their children to talk Arvanitika! Why? Self-report will not 'match' reality, but such significant inconsistency between two answers should be dealt with!

On the other hand, despite the fact that the majority of that younger speakers answered all four of these questions in the negative, a more covert sense of group pride is revealed by the fact that young (male) speakers run the risk 'of being called *eksipno* "clever boy" or *pustis* "queer"' (p. 134) if they try to code-switch into Greek. Trudgill and Tzavaras explain that this tendency is related to the phenomenon which Trudgill discusses elsewhere, that although a non-prestige variant (here Arvanitika) may have negative social connotations attached to it—especially among women—at least the men feel there are strong positive connotations attached as well: here toughness, friendliness and extroversion, among other attributes. We are then left to hope that eventually attitudinal data can be supplemented by data on language choice, like that presented in Gal (1978), for example. Is it actually the case that younger men use Arvanitika a great deal more than women? In what situations? Presumably, the inconsistency in answering questions (7.1)–(7.4) stems from the ambivalence

and sense of dual identity which seems to be common to the Arvanites, and the social attitudes revealed here engender (or at least foster) the linguistic changes which have just been discussed in the previous chapters. Would the authors agree?

Trudgill and Tzavaras then compare the Arvanite social attitudes with those in French Canada; doing so, inadvertently they show us that, helpful as social psychology may yet become to the linguist, it is still at the taxonomic stage: Hymes (1966) pointed out that we had no theoretical tools to explain why one Indian group will give up its land to maintain its linguistic identity, while another group will give up its linguistic identity with no qualms, while holding tightly to its ancestral lands. Unfortunately, for all the advances in social psychology since then, this question can still not be answered. Until recently, French Canadian responses to questions like those posed here, or more sophisticated questionnaires using W. Lambert's twin-guise technique (Fasold, 1984, pp. 152ff.), were no less ambivalent than the Arvanite answers; however, today the French Canadians apparently use their minority tongue more extensively. Trudgill and Tzavaras (p. 139) trace that to their claim that the Arvanites appear to attach less importance to their language as a symbol of ethnic group membership. Comparing the two groups' responses, I feel such claims are too strong, especially in light of the fact that this analysis also ignores other variables which have elsewhere been found to be important (cf. Giles and St. Clair, 1979, especially Ryan's article there): the Arvanites have been in Greece since the eleventh century and have maintained their ethnic identity there almost solely by retaining their home language, while the French Canadians and English have shared the same area only since the seventeenth century, and the non-linguistic markers of cultural identity are much stronger (religion being a major one). Albanian is a (geographically and politically) restricted language, while French is a prestigious world language, with a literature, popular and classical singing, movies, etc. Thus, I feel that while studies like those reported in Chapters 5–7 are very important, they merely provide the data—comparing attitudes and language usage—for a model which is yet in the development stages.

As the book has developed, Trudgill has leaned heavily on a model of social-psychological influence on speech variation proposed by Giles. He has used Giles' model to articulate our understanding of language change. In the next chapter Trudgill makes use of a 'classic' Labovian analysis of sound-change-in-progress in a specific style of British English in order to articulate a different social-psychology model, in this case proposed by Le Page. By doing so, he manages to explore both the model itself, and the underlying motivation of the speaker-singers which the data reveals. In the process, he explores both linguistic and social-psychological issues, using a unique data base. In fact, Chapter 8, 'Acts of conflicting identity: the sociolinguistics of British pop-singer pronunciation', pp. 141–60, presents one of the most enjoyable reads in the entire book. While most dialect studies have analysed primarily the word list style speech of non-mobile, older, rural men (NORMs of Chambers and Trudgill, 1980, p. 33), and most sociolinguistic dialect studies have relied on a casual style speech of lower working class to lower middle class city dwellers, Trudgill analyses speakers of a specific non-casual style, to teach about linguistic and social psychological theory, as well as linguistic fact. He uses this data to show how the techniques pioneered by Labov can help reveal social psychological forces at work within the speech community, at a level more micro-analytical than has been attempted since Labov's work in Martha's Vineyard (1963); while Coupland's work in Cardiff (1980, 1984) and Hindle's work in suburban Philadelphia workplaces (1979) have the same thrust, as do many other studies in Giles (1984), most of these analyse data from the perspective of individual 'private

citizens'. Trudgill's analysis in this chapter explores the social psychology of pop culture, as reflected in the phonetic variables found in popular song recordings. Trudgill has tapped a new, very revealing source of data, but makes no point of his choice of data base, allowing students to think it is merely idiosyncratic, rather than theoretically motivated; nor does he place the article squarely inside the framework provided in the introduction. In fact, Trudgill is using Labov's techniques to reveal the value judgements of the popular singers and presumably of their subculture. This is a virtuoso *socio-linguistic* analysis. He uses these data to discuss a model presented by Le Page as a counter-proposal to Giles'; he thus provides a new *socio-linguistic* perspective.

Trudgill has included two papers in which he collaborated with Giles, and which reveal the data gathering and analysis techniques for language accommodation theory; in this chapter he presents four 'riders' to sum up Le Page's position.

According to these 'riders' on Le Page's theory, our performance in modifying our speech is constrained by:

- (i) The extent to which we are able to identify our model group (p. 145).
- (ii) The extent to which we have access to the model groups (p. 148).
- (iii) The extent to which we have sufficient analytical ability to work out the rules of their speech (p. 148).
- (iv) The extent to which we have sufficient [physical?] ability to accommodate speech to a given model (p. 149).
- (v) The relative strength of different motivating factors toward conflicting models (p. 154).

Although Trudgill nowhere explicitly compares Le Page's model with Giles', perhaps he intends Le Page's model to be regarded as an expansion of Giles', with a greater exploration of the contrastive-linguistic influence on a speaker's accommodation to another dialect (ii, iv), and an explicit focus on the fact that there are *many* conflicting motives which influence a speaker's accommodation to or divergence from a given dialect at any given moment (iii). A comprehensive text should compare various models which have been proposed. An integrated text should explicitly compare and contrast the models presented in different chapters. Here Trudgill has omitted to draw the needed links integrating his chapters.

In spite of this weakness, Trudgill's analysis in this chapter is very impressive. He demonstrates, using the singer's use of (r) and other phonetic variables, how each of Le Page's 'riders' influence the data. He shows that up until 1964, when the Beatles became an international rock influence in their own right, the role model for British singers was presumably American Blacks, who had been the pioneers of pop music (i). He shows that the incomplete understanding of the linguistic system of these speakers led British singers to mistaken 'hyperdialectalisms' such as using r-ful ('American') speech, when the model has r-less speech (ii). After 1964, the different singing groups had split loyalties—emulating both a local working class British and a Southern U.S. Black model (iii). Trudgill shows punk groups to be less ambivalent, with more local (i.e. working class British) linguistic pride; in addition, some singers (like Mick Jagger) are better capable of accommodating to the role model (iv), and have been around long enough for the change in their singing style to reflect the change in the relative strength of the different models. Trudgill makes telling use of his sociophonetic analytical tools, to draw some interesting sociocultural conclusions.

It is revealing that it is not until Chapter 8, which is no longer really a 'secular' linguistic

chapter, that Trudgill feels a need to differentiate between ‘accent’ and ‘dialect’; only here would Labov’s terminological distinction of ‘markers’ as separate from ‘stereotypes’ have been useful. I say this not to denigrate the book, but to show what it is *not*. It is a very interesting book of advanced readings. In its present format it is *not* usable as a course book, except at a fairly advanced level.

Chapter 9, ‘Social identity and linguistic sex differences: explanations and pseudo-explanations for differences between women’s and men’s speech’, pp. 161–168, was apparently first published in Norwegian. This chapter asks a question to which it then propose a few answers, and to which Chapter 10 provides Trudgill’s now classic answer; Why do men and women speak differently?

The proposed answers are:

- (1) There is no difference (false) (p. 162).
- (2) Men are more casual (true) because interviewers are men (false) (p. 162).
- (3) Language, like dress, should be ‘sex appropriate’ (a non-answer even if you agree) (pp. 162 ff.).
- (4) Language usage (politeness, deference, ect.) and linguistic usage (more prestigious variants) are both similarly motivated; women in most cultures studied appear to feel that more polite, standard options are most appropriate to their role [Brown’s (1980) explanation] (pp. 164 ff.).
- (5) Men and women have different interactional networks which influence their speech (pp. 166 ff.).
- (6 (or 4’?)) Women are more status conscious
 - (a) because they do child rearing (p. 167)
 - (b) because their social position is less secure
 - (c) because men are placed by their job roles, (p. 167) while women are not (pp. 167 ff.).

Therefore, women use a more Standard linguistic model.

- (7) Men have a ‘macho’ role model which influences their dialect choice (p. 168).

Experience shows that this chapter generates active interest in understanding *what* linguistic differences are between the sexes, and *why* similar variation occurs so systematically; it helps students to focus on the issue of male–female speech differences when it is encountered in a more data-laden article like the one reprinted in the next chapter. However, the chapter should be used cautiously, since Trudgill does not deal with all the flaws in the hypotheses which he presents, nor does he clarify the interaction among them. Trudgill also assumes that the pattern found in his data is universally valid. One hopes that soon Trudgill, or someone with his vision, will present us with a model for understanding why men and women speak so differently. While this paper does not present such a model, it goads us all to try harder to do so.

Chapter 10, ‘Sex and covert prestige: linguistic change in the urban dialect of Norwich’, pp. 169–185, is a reprint of Trudgill’s now classical article on what he refers to as ‘covert prestige’ in Norwich. His point of departure, already sketched in Chapter 9, is that men and women behave differently. In most cases—in the British data Trudgill analyses—women accommodate their speech toward the prestige dialect (RP) more than men, and perceive themselves—or wish to be perceived—as accommodating more than they actually do, while the men have the opposite tendency, since they have a covert role model which is working class, and consequently ‘macho’. In this important article, Trudgill correlates phonetic variation and the apparently aberrant self-report data with the difference between men

and women speakers in his corpus. Labov (1966) pioneered the use of a questionnaire to determine how people believe themselves to talk. He found that linguistically insecure speakers were more likely to over-correct, or 'hypercorrect', their speech in more formal styles. Trudgill added a twist, using it to judge which of two speech models a speaker uses as a target dialect, and drawing conclusions based on the results. Trudgill assumes that if a speaker uses a prestige variant 50% of the time or more, s/he is accurate in reporting him/herself as doing so. Since the small amount of research in this area reveals that self-report reflects social psychological attitudes more than actual speech production, Trudgill's 50% convention is no more arbitrary than any other choice for a cut-off. If a speaker claims to a certain usage, but uses it less than half the time, s/he is over-reporting; if the speaker maintains that s/he does not use the prestige variant, but does so *more* than half the time, s/he is under-reporting. Trudgill found that women are by far most likely to over-report, men are most likely to under-report, and young people of both sexes are far less likely to over-report (and somewhat *more* likely to under-report) than their elders. All the men have a tendency to under-report, even the middle class speakers. From this data Trudgill deduces that women have a standard role model, while men have a vernacular role model, but that today even the younger women are beginning to prefer the local vernacular as their target. The presentation of the evidence is deceptively simple and direct. One might wish Trudgill would help the non-local to understand why one marker becomes a stereotype for this community while others become less stereotyped. One might wish that some statistical analysis were performed on the data. Trudgill specifies that the upper working class men are initiating the changes in this community (p. 180). Although the data and analysis are fascinating and instructive, the method's simplicity is deceptive: in the 13 years since the article first appeared, to my knowledge only Woods (1984) has used Trudgill's technique on a different corpus. Apparently, in the Ottawa English-speaking community both men and women over-report their speech. Looking at Trudgill's article today, the only things which one could hope to change are trivial beside the importance of the tool which Trudgill has provided us for the analysis of the *socio-linguistics* of urban dialects.

Here, as in Chapter 9, the student must be warned that Trudgill overgeneralizes from his results. Trudgill proposes, or implies, that *universally* men's speech will be innovative, while women's speech will be anachronistic. To say that women 'overwhelmingly' speak 'better' (p. 162) while men are on the vanguard of linguistic change may be true of his British, Norwegian and Arvanitika data, but is inconsistent with evidence reported in Labov's and other U.S. and Canadian studies showing women to be in the 'forefront' or 'vanguard' of linguistic change, while men's speech either follows, or remains anachronistically tied to an earlier (more rural) model. (To list only a few examples: Cedergren, 1973; Labov, 1966, 1975; Woods, 1984; Yaeger, 1974, 1986.) It is also inconsistent with Milroy (1980) and Ochs (1974), to cite only two non-New World analyses. Thus, as with other articles reprinted here, Trudgill has presented issues which should become central to our understanding of dialect, and has analyzed the issues using revolutionary techniques. The fact that his conclusions only lead us to further effort can be seen as an advantage.

Chapter 11, 'Standard and non-standard dialects of English in the United Kingdom: attitudes and policies', pp. 186–200, was first published in a special issue of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* devoted to the attitudes and policies toward the use of the vernacular in different countries. This article was included here to give a perspective of the broad range of sociolinguistic factors relevant to a study of dialect. The article follows

the now standard route, pointing out that teachers and employers negatively reinforce regional ‘accent’ and dialect, but that they should not do so. If only Trudgill had gone a step further, to integrate a political perspective into the discussion and propose solutions to the problems which we all know exist, the level of this article would have been more appropriate for the present technical volume. Looking at the journal issue it appears in, it is clear that Trudgill’s article stands out for its ability to call a spade a spade, and to recognize that discrimination occurs, while the article on Germany (for example) insists that non-standard dialect speakers there are only urged to accommodate to the standard so that they can be understood, not because anyone is prejudiced against them or their dialect. I do not wish to denigrate the contribution that this article has to make, presenting tables and explanations of the range of dialect usage present in the U.K., and integrating a social psychology perspective into the discussion. I only question whether an article with primarily a social impact belongs in a book of articles which attempt to answer theoretical challenges.

Chapter 12, ‘Sociolinguistics and linguistic value judgements: Correctness, adequacy and aesthetics’, pp. 201–225, was published with Giles in 1978. It presents a more theoretical perspective on some of the issues raised in Chapter 11. It also tries to integrate some of the information accessible on other speech communities. The authors deal directly with the ‘correctness’ issue, as well as taking a position on the deficit hypothesis, aesthetic judgements of the vernacular, and the ‘inherent value’ and ‘imposed norm’ positions. This chapter seems more appropriate for the present text than the overlapping article which precedes it.

Given that the present book is similar in focus to Trudgill (1978), and that the two books share versions of the same introduction, it seems fair to contrast them. The 1978 volume discusses only British data. Each study is self-contained, written by a different author or authors, and analyses a specific dialect or dialect area in Britain. Most of the 1978 articles are specifically concerned with linguistic issues first explored in Labov (1963 or 1966) ‘in some cases representing refinements, in others a narrowing of focus’ (1978, p. 16). In fact, one could easily consider the book a *Festschrift* in honor of early Labov. All of the articles are purely socio-*linguistic*. Half of the articles are based on the now ‘classical’ urban corpus of interviews: of Reading (Chapter 3), Liverpool (Chapter 5), West Yorkshire (Chapter 6), and Glasgow (Chapters 9–11). Two more are based on more traditional dialect survey material: from East Anglia (Chapter 4), and Tyneside (Chapter 7). The first and second papers represent refinements on these two data gathering techniques: with the Milroys (Chapter 1) and Douglas (Chapter 2) showing us (the first less directly than the second) how more extended contact with the interviewees can meaningfully influence the speech to be analysed. Many of the papers focus only on the vernacular dialect, ignoring class as a variable. Perhaps because these papers are not all Trudgill’s, he is much clearer about specifying (p. 18) how each work pioneers an innovation which should be attended to, rather than assuming the reader will focus on the innovative aspect of the work reported.

Given that procedural techniques for speaker groupings are under great debate among variationists (cf. Guy 1980a, b), the 1978 book includes papers which focus on different techniques for grouping speakers. Like most work since 1966, and in agreement with Trudgill’s avowed purpose in his introduction, the chapters focus on the *linguistic* constraints on linguistic variability and linguistic change in apparent time. The papers presented in the book complement the publications on North American dialects with data from British English; they also focus on the aspects of Labov’s work which have been developed in different parts of the U.K. It is true that not one of the studies in this volume appears

to take into consideration the technology of work that has been done in the U.S. sociolinguistic community since 1968. Given that the studies present advances on those aspects of socio-*linguistic* technology which have not been resolved in either community of scholars, that is a small defect. The book is neatly focused, and each article presents a clear socio-dialectal analysis which is still important to look at in 1986.

We could also compare the present text with Romaine (1982), which investigates the concept *speech community*. There the tightly coordinated papers in the Romaine volume explore several ramifications of a specific unresolved problem in *socio-linguistics*. Each paper is self-contained, and can be read out of context, but the whole book read together presents a set of factors which must be considered when attempting to determine the boundaries of a speech community, or the relevance of the concept 'speech community' to the analysis. These articles attempt to integrate and coordinate the analysis of social and linguistic information as equally critical to our ultimate understanding of sociolinguistic phenomena. Since it is clear that any one macro-community has social patterns which will affect the analysis and understanding of the sociolinguistic situation, the book presents data from the Caribbean (Chapter 7), Iran (Chapter 4), Sweden (Chapter 5) and Mombasa (Chapter 8) as well as from Ireland (Chapter 3, 9), Scotland (Chapter 2), and Britain (Chapter 6, 10). Read as a whole, the book lends perspective to a critical transition area in sociolinguistic understanding.

In contrast, while the book under review includes one of the papers from Trudgill (1978), and is introduced by a somewhat bowdlerized version of the original introduction, its advantages and disadvantages are very different. The data base includes a wider range of communities: Scandinavia, Britain and the Albanian sections of Greece. While Trudgill's earlier book is entirely socio-*linguistic*, and Romaine (1982) also has a narrow theoretical locus, albeit a socio-*linguistic* one, the book under review presents a wider gamut of both *socio* and *linguistic* studies which are relevant to an analysis of dialect. In fact, if we consider Kuhn's (1962) analysis of 'revolution' in science, we find that some of the papers included here are revolutionary. Since the most recent major revolution in dialect studies, some of our tidy understandings about language have been transformed into intractable problems which can only be resolved by reframing our concept of isogloss, language contact, motivation or 'cause' of speech variation, inter alia. While many of the chapters reviewed here present analyses in the Labovian tradition, Chapters 3, 6 and 10 propose revolutionary changes to our standards of dialect conceptualization and analysis.

On the other hand, while *no* papers in the earlier books should be ignored, the present volume would be more impressive without the 'bowdlerized' introduction and Chapter 1. If some of the polemic of those papers were redirected to highlight the innovations in other papers from the volume, and the polemical papers were omitted, the 1983 book reviewed here would be more effective as the classroom text which it claims to be. Bearing this claim in mind, while some chapters are well integrated, any future edition should include more integrative analysis. What are the relative merits of Giles' and Le Page's models? Of Trudgill's and Labov's more recent analytical (and statistical) techniques for the study of sound change? How does Milroy's recent work on networking affect Trudgill's geolinguistic theory? If it *is* our job to explore or investigate the social motivation for community variation in linguistic usage, cross-community comparisons, like those attempted in Chapter 5-7, should integrate present theories into the analysis. Although the book's shortcomings do not permit me to recommend it as a textbook, it can be highly recommended to all advanced students of the field who can use it with discretion.

Acknowledgements—Thanks to Crawford Feagin, Barbara Rosenstein and William Bright for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. While they have greatly improved the paper's clarity, all remaining infelicities and indiscretions are clearly my own.

NOTES

¹Relative to his focus in the chapters which are being introduced, in the 1978 introduction (to an entirely socio-linguistic book) Trudgill presents an even more disproportionate emphasis on the heterogeneity of studies of speech in an interactional context, and one might quibble with this emphasis on one or another example of a type of sociolinguistic data. The longer discussion includes three pages on Turner; two pages on Fishman's macrosociological perspective; one page on a fine but relatively little known, non-representative article of Wolfram's (possibly leaving students with the belief that Wolfram, like Turner, is an ethnomethodologist with no linguistic background or interests); in contrast, half a page or less is devoted to Giles (with whom Trudgill has coauthored papers), Goffman, Hymes, Labov, Sacks and Schegloff.

²One example displays Trudgill's overzealous cutting unambiguously: Trudgill discusses the use of 'cheers' in British speech. While in the present introduction it was totally unclear what Trudgill was trying to do with his 'cheers' example, the earlier version of the introduction presented the data more clearly, integrated it into the ongoing discussion of discourse/conversational analysis, and made theoretical points which are neither given in nor deducible from the 1983 introduction.

³To cite only one feature from each side of the Atlantic: Labov (1973) discovered that speakers recognise dialect features from higher-prestige dialects more readily (even if both contact and linguistic considerations are held constant); in addition, they often inappropriately self-report their own understanding! I myself had a number of 'informants'—some of whom were themselves linguists—who maintained, with the best will to help answer the social dialect questionnaire, that they had never heard locutions used, when they themselves used them. Trudgill (1978, pp. 13–14) deplors the use of questionnaire data, and mentions a case in which he himself categorized a syntactic locution that his own parents use as one which no native would ever use (1978, p. 14, fn. 7)! Thus, as Labov and Trudgill have shown in previous studies, it seems clear that speakers' lack of 'native introspections' invalidates an analysis base on questionnaire responses rather than some specific cognitive model.

⁴Bailey (1982, pp. 76–80) similarly presents a dichotomy between 'connatural' and 'abnatural' change. The largest difference between Bailey's position and Kroch's or Trudgill's appears to be that Bailey's terminology does not prejudice contact phenomena.

⁵I believe Fasold (1984, p. 160) errs in assuming that Trudgill and Tzavaras's self-report data presents a 'more accurate picture of the function of language as an indicator of group identity than more sophisticated matched guise research does'. The matched guise technique was developed in order to avoid the pitfalls (discussed earlier) which are inherent in the analysis of introspective data.

REFERENCES

- BAILEY, Ch.-J.N. 1972 The integration of linguistic theory: internal reconstruction and the comparative method in descriptive analysis. In Stockwell, R. P. and Macaulay, R. K. S. (Eds) *Linguistic Change and Generative Theory*, pp. 11–22. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN.
- BAILEY, Ch.-J.N. 1973 *Variation and Linguistic Theory*. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.
- BAILEY, Ch.-J.N. 1982 *On the Yin and Yang Nature of Language*. Karoma, Ann Arbor, MI.
- BAILEY, Ch.-J.N. and MAROLDT, K. 1977 The French lineage of English. In Messel, J. M. (Ed.). *Langues en contact*, 21–53. Narr, Tübingen.
- BOURHIS, R. Y. 1984 Cross-cultural communication in Montreal: two field studies since Bill 101. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46, 33–48.
- BROWN, P. 1980 How and why women are more polite: some evidence from a Mayan community. In McConnel-Ginet, S., Barker, R. and Furman, N. (Eds). *Women and Language in Culture and Society*, pp. 111–149. Praeger, New York.
- CEDERGREN, H. 1973 Interplay of social and linguistic factors in Panama. Cornell University dissertation.
- CHAMBERS, J. K. and TRUDGILL, P. 1980 *Dialectology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- COUPLAND, N. 1980 Style-shifting in a Cardiff work setting. *Language in Society* 9, 1–12.
- COUPLAND, N. 1984 Accommodation at work: some phonological data and their implications. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46, 49–70.
- DORIAN, N. 1973 Grammatical change in a dying dialect. *Language* 49, 413–38.

- DOUGLAS-COWIE, E. 1978 Linguistic code-switching in a Northern Irish village: social interaction and social ambition. In Trudgill, P. (Ed.) *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English*, pp. 37–51. Arnold, London.
- FASOLD, R. 1984 The sociolinguistics of society. *Introduction to Linguistics I* (Language in Society series, 5) Blackwell, Oxford.
- FEAGIN, C. 1982 Review of Chambers & Trudgill 1980. *Language* 58, 690–693.
- GAL, S. 1978 Variation and change in patterns of speaking: language shift in Austria. In Sankoff, D. (Ed.) *Linguistic Variation: Models and Methods*, pp. 227–238. Academic Press, New York.
- GILES, H. 1984 Speech accommodation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46.
- GILES, H., BOURHIS, Y. and TAYLOR, D. 1977 Toward a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In Giles, H. L. (Ed.) *Language Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*, pp. 307–349. Academic Press, London.
- GILES, H. and ST. CLAIR, R. (Eds) 1979 *Language and Social Psychology*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- GRICE, H. P. 1975 Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P. and Morgan, S. *Speech Acts* (Syntax and Semantics 3), pp. 43–58. Academic Press, New York.
- GUY, G. 1980a Variation in the group and in the individual: the case of final stop deletion. In Labov, W. *Locating Language in Time and Space*, pp. 1–36. Academic Press, New York.
- GUY, G. 1980b Syntactic and phonetic variation in Carioca Portuguese. University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- HACKING, I. 1986 Science turned upside down. *The New York Review of Books* 33, 21–25.
- HINDLE, D. 1979 The social and situational conditioning of phonetic variation. University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- HYMES, D. 1966 Two types of linguistic relativity. In Bright, W. (Ed.) *Sociolinguistics*, pp. 114–165. Mouton, The Hague.
- HYMES, D. 1974 *Foundations of Sociolinguistics*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- KROCH, A. 1979 Toward a theory of social dialect variation. *Language in Society* 7, 17–36.
- KUHN, T. 1962 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- LABOV, W. 1963 The social motivation of a sound change. *Word* 19, 273–309.
- LABOV, W. 1966 *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.
- LABOV, W. 1973 Where do grammars stop? In Shuy, R. (Ed.) *Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects* (Georgetown Round Table in Languages and Linguistics 25) pp. 43–88. Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC.
- LABOV, W. 1975 On the use of the present to explain the past. *Proceedings of the 7th International Congress of Linguistics*, pp. 826–851. Mulino, Bologna.
- LABOV, W. and FANSHEL, D. *Therapeutic Discourse*. Academic Press, New York.
- LABOV, W., YAEGER, M. and STEINER, R. 1972 *A Quantitative Study of Sound Change in Progress*. U.S. Regional Survey, Philadelphia.
- LE PAGE, R. B. 1975 Polarizing factors: political, social, economic, operating on the individual's choice of identity through language use in British Honduras. In Saward, J.-G. and Vigneault, R. (Eds) *Les états multilingues: problèmes et solutions*, pp. 537–551. Laval University Press, Quebec.
- MILROY, L. 1980 *Language and Social Networks*. Blackwell, Oxford, University Park Press, Baltimore.
- NUNBERG, G. 1975 A falsely reported merger in 18th century English. (Pennsylvania working papers in linguistic change and variation, 1:2) Philadelphia.
- OCHS, E. 1974 Norm makers and norm breakers in Malagasy society. In Baumann, R. and Sherzer, J. (Eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, pp. 125–143. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- ROMAINE, S. 1982 *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities*. Arnold, London.
- RYAN, E. B. 1979 Why do low prestige language varieties persist? In Giles, H. and StClair, R. N. (Eds) *Language and Social Psychology*, pp. 145–157. Blackwell, Oxford, University Park Press, Baltimore.
- SACKS, H., SCHEGLOFF, E. and JEFFERSON, G. 1974 A simplest systematics for turn taking in conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.
- SCHEGLOFF, E., JEFFERSON, G. and SACKS, H. 1977 The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53, 361–382.
- TRUDGILL, P. 1974a *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- TRUDGILL, P. 1974b *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction*. Penguin, Harmondsworth.

- TRUDGILL, P. 1978 (Ed.) *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English*. Arnold, London.
- VINCENT, D. and SANKOFF, D. 1975 The geographic dimension of phonological variation within an urban speech community, CRMA Technical Report CRM-574, 15pp.
- WOODS, H. B. 1984 *The Ottawa Survey of Canadian English*. Didier, Montreal.
- YAEGER, M. 1974 Speaking style: Some etic realizations and their significance. (Pennsylvania working papers in linguistic change and variation I:1) Philadelphia.
- YAEGER, M. 1986 (to appear) Variable data and the neogrammarian vs diffusionist hypotheses. In Eckert, P. (Ed.) *Quantitative Analyses of Linguistic Structure*, Vol. 2, Academic Press, New York.