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Spatial diffusion models

**NON-HIERARCHICAL**

- wave model / contagion diffusion
- snowball effect model

**HIERARCHICAL**

- gravity model / dialect hopping
- contrahierarchichal model

(Britain, 2002)
Spatial diffusion models

NON-HIERARCHICAL

wave model = contagion diffusion
(Bailey et al., 1993)

• Wave-like spread of changes
  (Holmes, 2008)
• from London to East Anglia:
• fronter realisations of /a/ “cup” [kep-kap]
  (Trudgill, 1986, pp. 51-53)
Spatial diffusion models

NON-HIERARCHICAL

**snowball effect** (Ogura and Wang, 1996)
Regional replacement of -TH by -S in verbs; see examples in Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003)

Latecomer
gathers momentum and speed mid-phase,
takes over other areas in final phase

see behaviour of latecomer Court vs North (innovating area), East Anglia, London
Spatial diffusion models

HIERARCHICAL

**gravity model / dialect hopping** (Trudgill, 1973)

- population size of the respective urban centers,
- the geographic distance between them,
- and the degree of linguistic similarity between varieties used in the two cities.

See examples in Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003)
Spatial diffusion models

- HIERARCHICAL

- gravity model / dialect hopping continued
  - Regional replacement of -TH by -S in verbs;
    see examples in Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003)

Faster spread of innovations
- to urban centres,
- via more central areas, corridors,
- sidestepping remote, outlying, rural areas with less communication
Spatial diffusion models

(map adapted from Britain, 2002, p. 627)

The contrahierarchical diffusion of smoothing in East Anglia

(data from Britain, 2002, p. 627)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>/ˈtɔːər/</td>
<td>/ˈtɔːr/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>/ˈfɛər/</td>
<td>/ˈfɛər/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do it</td>
<td>/ˈdɔːt/</td>
<td>/ˈdɔːt/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player</td>
<td>/ˈplɛər/</td>
<td>/ˈplɛər/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure</td>
<td>/ˈpjuːr/</td>
<td>/ˈpjuːr/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Spatial diffusion models

Rhoticity in the UK;
Map adapted from Denison and Hogg (2006)

Rhoticity in the UK;
Map adapted from Upton and Widdowson (2006)
Social diffusion models

Spread of linguistic innovations through social networks; (Eitler, 2004)
Social diffusion models

- close-knit network: important mechanism of dialect and language maintenance;
- loose-knit network: important mechanism of dialect and language change.

also at society level: Iceland vs England

(Milroy, 2002)
Principles of change

PRINCIPLE OF UNIFORMITY
(Labov, 1972)

past and present factors and processes of language use (variation and change) cannot possibly be radically different

• social class
• gender
Principles of change

• Social aspirers and the Third person singular suffix -S vs -TH.

• 1460-1681:
  • With time, social aspirers producing frequencies more than those of the upper class and middle class
  • for the graphs see Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003)
Variation and change: class

Use of single negation; Male informants, CEEC; Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003, p. 146)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1460-1479</th>
<th>1520-1559</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper 11%</td>
<td>Upper 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social aspirers 0%</td>
<td>Social aspirers 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 4%</td>
<td>Middle 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 0%</td>
<td>Lower 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1480-1519</th>
<th>1560-1599</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper 31%</td>
<td>Upper 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social aspirers 0%</td>
<td>Social aspirers 98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle 7%</td>
<td>Middle 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower 0%</td>
<td>Lower 63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variation and change: class

Third person singular suffix -S vs -TH. Percentage of –S. Male informants, CEEC; for the figure, see Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003, p. 145)

Usage frequencies:

**1580-1599:**
- Upper class 20%
- Social aspirers 22%
- Middle 4%
- Lower 50%

**1600-1619:**
- Upper class 55%
- Social aspirers 69%
- Middle 52%
- Lower 80%
Variation and change: gender

Gender distribution for single negation replacing multiple negation; Figure adapted from Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003, p. 121)
Variation and change: gender

Gender distribution for the replacement of -TH by –S in present tense third person singular; Figure adapted from Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (2003, p. 123)
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