

## Urban heritage varieties

Suzanne Aalberse, *University of Amsterdam*

Many immigrant languages discussed during WILA started out as rural community languages where the heritage languages could be used in many different domains including in stores and in schools. Processes like urbanization and industrialization are often associated with language shift and language loss (see references Brown and Salmons forthcoming). The main question in this talk is if the urban context in combination with social media, global markets and transnational contacts can also give heritage languages a boost. Three additional questions are (1) whether potentially boosting factors in the city only boost global languages such as Mandarin and Spanish or heritage languages more generally and (2) what type of heritage language use is boosted. Is the heritage language used like the homeland variety, do we find a mix of different heritage languages, a converged variety or a restricted variety (following Muysken 2013) and (3) what conditions support the use of different languages alongside each other over multiple generations, such as in Suriname?

To find out about the possibilities of the city as a booster for heritage language maintenance I investigate language use possibilities in five domains. These five domains are based on the five central functions of communities as described in the Verticalization Model of language shift, proposed by Salmons (2005a,b). The main five functions of communities distinguished are Production-distribution-consumption (1), Socialization (2), Social control (3), Social participation (4) and mutual support (5).

One researcher who attests that cities can support heritage language maintenance is Wing Chee Chau. Chau (2011) observes that Cantonese heritage speakers in Amsterdam and the smaller Dutch location of Venlo differ in their level of Cantonese media consumption. The speakers in Amsterdam have Cantonese peers with whom they listen to Cantopop and watch Cantonese soaps. They are more likely to meet Cantonese speaking peers via clubs such as the dragon boating club, whereas Cantonese speakers from Venlo hang out with Dutch speaking peers. Chau finds that the media peer contact and media consumption affects the language of her participants on a lexical as well as on a grammatical level. Her participants from Amsterdam use colloquial, informal hip words like *tiu4 jau5\*2* 條友, ('guy') whereas speakers from the smaller town of Venlo use more neutral terms like: *naam4 jan4\*2* 男人 'man' and *naam4 zai2* 男仔 'boy' .

## References

- Borges, R. D. (2014). The life of language: Dynamics of language contact in Suriname. PhD dissertation: Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Brown, Joshua R., and Joseph Salmons. "A Verticalization Theory of Language Shift." In *The Verticalization Model of Language Shift: The Great Change in American Communities*.
- Muysken, Pieter. (2013). Language contact outcomes as the result of bilingual optimization strategies. *Bilingualism: Language and cognition*, 16(4), 709-730.
- Chau, Wing Chee (2011). The influence of Dutch on Cantonese in the Netherlands. Rural versus Urban areas. Master Thesis, Leiden University.
- Salmons, Joseph. 2005a. "Community, Region and Language Shift in German-speaking Wisconsin." In *Regionalism in the Age of Globalism: Volume 1: Concepts of regionalism*, ed. Lothar Hönnighausen et al., 129–138. Madison: CSUMC.
- Salmons, Joseph. 2005b. "The Role of Community and Regional Structure in Language Shift." In *Regionalism in the Age of Globalism Volume 2: Forms of regionalism*, ed. Lothar Hönnighausen, et al., 133–144. Madison:CSUMC.