Noun class in Dutch and German diasporic, multiethnolectal, and homeland contexts

Rachyl Hietpas & Joseph Salmons*

Abstract. To provide a new comparison to Polinsky's (2018) discussion of noun class or gender in heritage North Germanic languages, this paper examines changes in noun classes in two West Germanic sister languages, German and Dutch, in essentially mirror-image contexts: first, diasporic, heritage varieties of these languages undergoing shift to English in the United States. At the same time, new varieties are emerging in the relevant homelands as migrant and refugee communities acquire German and Dutch in settings where these are the dominant, standard languages. Changes to German are similar across both communities – with maintenance of the basic system but some specific minor changes – and changes to Dutch are likewise similar across the settings – albeit here with reduction and even loss of the noun-class system. We further compare these settings to patterns of variation and change in the homeland varieties of Dutch and German.

Keywords. heritage languages; homeland languages; urban multiethnolects; noun class; gender; agreement variation and change; German; Dutch; West Germanic

1. Introduction. Noun classes, often called "gender" in traditional grammar, are susceptible to change in heritage language settings.[1] An easy starting point for finding the best views on almost any given issue in heritage language linguistics is Masha Polinsky's seminal 2018 book. As we began to think about noun class or gender in heritage settings, we started there. She provides a detailed review of work on heritage language morphological agreement, and concludes that the main difficulties for "heritage speakers' production are observed in agreement in gender", compared to person and number agreement (Polinksy 2018: 206). She illustrates this with the example of American Norwegian, where the inherited three-class system of the relevant homeland varieties shows overgeneralization of the masculine. Polinsky (2018: 206) rightly describes that system as "fragile and on its way to disappearance", drawing on a long tradition of research by Haugen (1953), Lohndal & Westergaard (2016) and Riksem (2017), along with similar patterns in American Swedish, a closely related North Germanic language in a very similar heritage setting.

This leads us to look at these same questions in West Germanic, namely how noun class systems have or have not changed in their heritage settings. West Germanic languages, as we detail below, show a broad range of developments in this regard, from fundamental maintenance of the three-class system in German to its almost complete loss in English with Dutch occupying a place somewhere between the two in this and many other regards. We examine two related American heritage languages, looking at changes in the basic agreement systems, along with related issues, and compare those to data from European multiethnolects and homeland varieties

* We thank the editors for the invitation to write this contribution in honor of our esteemed colleague, Masha Polinsky. She continues to inspire us. In addition to valuable feedback from two anonymous reviewers, the following have provided comments, suggestions and other help with this project: Rose Fisher, Sam[antha] Litty, Monica Macaulay, David Natvig, and Charlotte Vanhecke. We are grateful to them and stress that all errors are our own.
Authors: Rachyl Hietpas, University of Wisconsin – Madison (rhietpas2@wisc.edu) & Joseph Salmons, University of Wisconsin – Madison (jsalmons@wisc.edu).

[1] Throughout this chapter, we use "gender" and "noun class" interchangeably.

themselves. Our primary data come from Dutch and German spoken in the United States, both reflecting a range of more and less standard-like varieties.

This design also provides an opportunity to build on another point Polinsky (2018: 14) has made:

> The language of first-generation immigrants may differ from the language of speakers in the country of origin (henceforth the *homeland language*) for several reasons. First, both languages change, but since speakers in the homeland and in the diaspora are not part of the same language community, the respective changes may go in different directions.

Changes *are* afoot in the homeland varieties under discussion in this paper, along with patterns of structured variation. They are especially notable in new and still emerging varieties usually described as "urban multiethnolects" in European settings, where languages like German and Dutch are spoken by migrants and refugees and their descendants. These people are often heritage speakers of other languages, e.g., Arabic or Turkish, so that they provide a potentially important comparison to US heritage speakers. This provides a sharp contrast to a typical heritage setting, in terms of the acquisition, use, societal role and so on of Dutch or German. This allows us to make a preliminary three-way comparison across three kinds of communities for each language and, crucially, a comparison of two sides of the heritage language coin:

- Homeland, L1 with institutional support,
- Multiethnolect, in the homeland, new and emerging, heritage connection to L2, and
- Diaspora, L1 but distinctly minority heritage languages.

As we show, there are ongoing changes in both homeland varieties, though they are gradual and mostly around the edges of the systems. Contemporary regional varieties, including traditional dialects, of course show vastly more variation, including both conservative and innovative patterns. However, bigger patterns of change have been documented in both the other settings, multiethnolect and diaspora. Across the board, changes overwhelmingly continue trends with deep historical roots across the Germanic family.

The first group, Homeland speakers, includes both people who use standard languages with strong codification and prescriptive traditions, as well as wider language use in a full range of institutions. As we'll see, looking beyond the standard to colloquial spoken varieties allows us to identify more general patterns of variation and change. The second group, multiethnolectal speakers, includes generations of speakers in German- and Dutch-speaking countries, as well as similar populations across western and northern Europe generally. They or their families typically arrived in the mid-to-late-20th century and many European-born people remain heritage speakers of many different languages. Especially in urban areas, high concentrations of such people have fostered the emergence of distinct varieties of the relevant national languages.[2] In the case at hand, the third group, diaspora or heritage speakers, speak German or Dutch in North America from one to many generations after migration. The two authors have worked with diasporic speakers in the US – Dutch for the first author and German (and other languages) for the second – people who are often descendants of 19th or 20th century immigrants in communities where the language was transmitted at home until roughly the mid-20th century.

[2] We use the term "multiethnolect(al)" for these varieties but stress that the term is imperfect, e.g., as these varieties have spread or are spreading beyond speakers of immigrant background; see Auer & Siegel (2021) and Wiese (2012) for further discussion.

Cross-generational language changes in homeland and diaspora often go in different directions, as Polinsky notes, but they can also move in closely parallel directions. For example, the best studied example of change in diasporic varieties of German (and various other languages) is a reduction of morphological case marking. This is particularly widespread with the reduction or even loss of dative marking. Closely parallel developments are well-attested in homeland varieties across the family, including the historical loss of virtually all case marking in English (see Fulk 2018 for a good broad overview across Germanic).

All this sets up our research questions:

- How variable and vulnerable is gender within these West Germanic languages?
- How do changes in gender in diaspora and multiethnolectal varieties compare with homeland or baseline varieties?

This chapter is organized as follows. In section 2, we give background on the history and morphosyntax of Germanic noun classes for context and more specifically in varieties called "German" and "Dutch". We turn to German in section 3, reviewing changes in homeland, multiethnolectal, and various American heritage varieties of German. For German, we find fundamental maintenance of the gender system but considerable variation and change on a local level. Then in section 4, we provide the same kind of review of Dutch gender in homeland, multiethnolectal, and American heritage settings with new data from a heritage setting. For Dutch, all three settings resemble what is reported for Norwegian: a fragile system that appears to be on its way out. In section 5, we conclude by suggesting a larger generalization, namely that the dynamics of change and stability are very different in German and Dutch but consistent across the three settings for each language. We draw a parallel to the long-term history of Germanic on this front, where members of the family are moving in broadly similar directions. In terms of their historical trajectories, contemporary German and Dutch start at somewhat different points on a cline of historical development, which may be at least one reason why their respective multiethnolectal and diasporic varieties have reached such different states.

Comparative study of two closely related West Germanic languages in these different settings adds a new case study and so provides a basis for comparison with the kind of data Polinsky (2018) reviews for North Germanic.

2. The background: gender in general and in Germanic. Almost half of the world's languages are reported to have "grammatical gender", according to Corbett (2013), and it was historically present across Germanic and is still found across the family, save for English and Afrikaans. While there is some complexity in what to reconstruct for Proto-Indo-European, with questions about whether there were originally two or three classes (Kapović 2017: especially 62), Proto-Germanic and its early daughters clearly had three noun classes, traditionally labeled masculine (M), feminine (F), and neuter (N) (Fulk 2018). These classes correlated in complicated ways with nominal inflectional classes, where many classes contained nouns with two or even all three genders. Gender often correlated with phonological shape, so that *-ō* once usually signaled feminine, but across the whole family, those final vowels reduced to varying degrees, often to schwa or ∅, obscuring some but not all of these connections. Excellent recent overviews of the diachronic and synchronic situation can be found in Audring (2023) and Kürschner (2020).

Most Germanic languages retain class systems where either two or three classes are distinguished. The former is found, for example, in many varieties of Dutch, West Frisian, and Danish

and the latter in German and some North Germanic varieties.[3] Two-class systems have typically merged masculine and feminine while keeping neuter distinct. English has famously gone farthest, having lost morphological marking of grammatical gender, quite possibly connected to its long and intense history of language and dialect contact (Curzan 2003). In diasporic situations, we can find similar patterns: Yiddish has long been spoken in communities with other languages, but the intensity of contact has increased in communities where it continues to be transmitted as a mother tongue. While some varieties of Yiddish have maintained three classes, Belk et al. (2020, 2022) document the rapid loss of gender (and case) in Stamford Hill Hasidic Yiddish, spoken in London.

2.1. GERMAN. Turning to the languages under consideration here, Standard German and many of its dialects retain three classes while Standard Dutch and many of its dialects retain two, though some of its (especially southern) dialects retain three. That is, German varieties have typically been more conservative in this regard and Dutch less so, in line with the general typologies of the languages' nominal morphologies, where German retains more case marking and a more complex plural system. Traditional grammars of these languages often organize discussion of noun classes around the different determiners, like German *der, die das*, the.M, the.F, and the.N, respectively (Table 1), or Dutch *de* versus *het*, the.C (for common: merged class of masculine and feminine) vs. the.N, as illustrated in Table 2.

	masculine	feminine	neuter	plural
nominative	der	die	das	die
accusative	den	die	das	die
dative	dem	der	dem	den
genitive	des	der	des	der

Table 1. Gender marking in Standard German determiner phrases, definite only

Of course there is also the matter of how nouns come to belong to particular classes. Gender assignment is a complex matter across the family, especially in German. In contemporary Standard German, various derivational affixes assign particular genders, like the collective prefix *Ge-* > neuter and the abstract suffix *-ung* > feminine. Semantic correlations have increased over time (Zubin & Köpcke 1984; Salmons 1992, 1993; and much other work by Zubin & Köpcke and others), so that, for example, words meaning 'trash, garbage' are masculine – *der Müll, der Abfall,* etc. – while those meaning 'power' are feminine – *die Macht, die Kraft,* and the borrowing *die Power* (see Salmons 2018: 329–332, elsewhere, and see section 3.1 below for a little more detail). Colloquial spoken German makes little productive use of the genitive for many speakers today and evidence indicates that American-born speakers who acquired it did so in school (Salmons & Lucht 2006; Bousquette 2020).

2.2. DUTCH. Exemplifying two-class systems, Standard Dutch retains only two distinct forms in the definite, *de stad* (the.C city.C) versus *het huis* (the.N house.N), as well as in adjective declension, where adjectives/adnominals in indefinite neuter contexts are distinguished from all other environments, Table 2, adapted from Wyngaerd (2014).

[3] As Sam[antha] Litty notes (p.c.), North Frisian is split between varieties with two and three genders, the former in Island dialects and the latter in Mainland ones.

	common	neuter	plural
indefinite article	een	een	-
adjective ending in indefinite phrase	-e	-ø	-e
definite article	de	het	de

Table 2. Gender marking in determiner phrases in Standard Dutch

Some dialects of Dutch, though, such as those found in the south of the Netherlands and most of Flanders, still retain a three-way gender distinction like that of Proto-Germanic and Modern German, shown in Table 3, again adapted from Wyngaerd (2014; Brabant Dutch). However, the actual appearance of a third category in some dialects is dependent on phonological context, such as the final /n/, which distinguishes the masculine singular definite article from the feminine singular definite article, only occurring prevocalically.

	masculine	feminine	neuter	plural
indefinite article	ne(n)	een	ee(n), een	-
adjective ending in indefinite phrase	-e(n)	-e	-ø	-e
definite article	de(n)	de	het	de

*Instances that include an (n) are phonologically determined. An /n/ is pronounced before a word that starts with a vowel or an /h/ and is not pronounced before words beginning with other consonants; see the English alternation between *a* and *an* as indefinite article.

Table 3. Gender marking in determiner phrases in Brabant dialects

Gender also appears in pronominal anaphora, though the patterns differ from determiners, a topic to which we now turn.

2.3. ANAPHOR. In both languages, pronominal anaphors require agreement with noun gender. This is largely still the prescribed standard for German (Duden 2016: §1588ff.), though even Duden concedes that "natural gender" can appear in certain circumstances, e.g., with *jemand* 'somebody' and *niemand* 'nobody', giving patterns like *jemand, die* 'somebody who.F'. At the same time, colloquial and dialect usage varies considerably. In what is often called "semantic gender agreement", we find pronouns that differ from the class of a given noun, so that *das Mädchen* 'the girl.N' is used with a feminine personal or relative pronoun, *sie* or *die,* or a neuter one, *es* or *das.* Beyond biology, there are other tendencies to use neuter for especially non-individuated referents. Audring (2009: 193) gives examples like the following ("constructed" but confirmed by her and other native speakers):

(1) Semantic agreement in German

Kartoffelsuppe?	Ja	**das**	esse	ich	gern.
potato.soup(F)	yes	**DEM.N**	eat	I	with.pleasure

'Potato soup? Yes, I like to eat that.'

We would historically or prescriptively expect an accusative *die* (DEM.F) rather than *das* (DEM.N) here.

Kraaikamp (2016) provides experimental evidence for such patterns in both German and Dutch, though with some differences between the two. This is in some sense a compromise of the agreement system. That is, baseline L1 speakers are changing, at least with regard to grammatical gender, slowly, but in directions akin to what Polinsky sees as heritage speakers' main difficulty with agreement, noted at the outset of this paper.

2.4. ADJECTIVAL AGREEMENT. Agreement within a noun phrase varies in Germanic, including with inflection directly on adjectives. In German, these patterns are complex, but in Dutch, they are far more restricted and lopsided in favor of declined rather than undeclined adjectives, as can be seen in Table 2 above. In fact, the only environment where noun class is differentiated via prenominal adjective agreement (declension) in standard Dutch is in singular indefinite contexts. In this context, adjectives between an indefinite article and a neuter-gender noun are undeclined. In all other cases, such as between an indefinite article and a common-gender noun, between a definite article and either a common-gender or a neuter-gender noun, or any context before a plural, adjectives are declined. We only cover these briefly, though they warrant further investigation.

These are then the major parameters of gender or noun class in West Germanic we draw on in the rest of this chapter.

3. German case study. In this section, we briefly summarize some relevant data from German across the three settings in question. This then sets up a more extensive parallel discussion of Dutch, which presents new data from a heritage setting.

3.1 HOMELAND GERMAN. We have already noted patterns of long-term change in assignment in European German and these continue along with some regional variation, such as standard *der Bach* 'the.M creek' vs. *die Bach* 'the.F creek' in some central varieties. The competition among competing factors – phonological shape, derivational morphology, and lexical semantics, mentioned in section 2.2 – have led researchers to look for insights into the structure of the mental lexicon, e.g., Salmons (1993) for German and Conzett (2006) more broadly. In other words, gender assignment can provide insight into how the lexicon is organized, like how competition between associations based on sound shape and word meaning plays out. Bybee (1988) argues that the mental lexicon is organized around a set of principles, including lexical semantics (so that we can retrieve words related to one another in meaning) and phonological shape (so that we can make rhymes and use alliteration, etc.). Salmons (1993) correlates these principles directly with German gender assignment patterns. We see similar patterns historically, as well. While early Germanic was organized around morphological classes that in part correspond to particular genders, Zubin & Köpcke (1984) show that semantic considerations have come steadily to the fore in modern gender assignment. Compounds take the gender of their head, normally the last element. Zubin & Köpcke demonstrate that compounds ending in (masculine) *Mut* 'courage' have over time shifted to feminine if they have a semantic characteristic they call "introspection" but remain masculine with "extroversion", so that *Hochmut* 'arrogance' is still masculine, but *Demut* 'humility', *Armut* 'poverty', and others have become feminine.

3.2. MULTIETHNOLECTAL GERMAN. Relatively little seems to have been written thus far about gender in multiethnolectal German, often called *Kiezdeutsch*, with the first element meaning 'neighborhood, district', sometimes translated into English as 'German from the hood'. Changes in noun class appear to be found in a relatively limited domain. Wiese (2012) remains a landmark work on the subject, and she only notes unexpected gender patterns in passing, as a parallel to what is found in other multiethnolectal languages in Europe (122). For instance, Wiese (2012: 59–60) gives examples where some forms are not marked in a standard-like way, e.g., *mein Schwester* 'my sister', where the standard *meine Schwester* shows feminine agreement on the pronoun. This is in fact a variable phenomenon in many kinds of German generally and something one can hear colloquially, especially in the many varieties that apocopate final schwas.

Auer & Siegel (2021: 16) observe that "An independent grammatical innovation indirectly affects gender agreement by eliminating some of its contexts", namely by using bare nouns where Standard German would require a determiner. Two of their examples are given in (2):

(2) Stuttgart Multiethnolect German bare nouns (Auer & Siegel 2021: 16)

a. ich hab Geldbeutel hier
I have.1SG.PRS purse here
'I have (my/the) purse here' (ER, BC_JA_08, 345)
Standard German: mein-en/den(M.ACC) Geldbeutel

b. der is Hauptschule am Nachholen
he is 'Hauptschule' PROG repeat
'he is about to repeat (the) Hauptschule' (BU, N_JH_05, 879)
Standard German: die(F.ACC) Hauptschule

Wiese (2012: 53, elsewhere) gives numerous examples of the same phenomenon, including *wir gehen Görlitzer Park* for standard *wir gehen in **den** Görlitzer Park.*

Auer and Siegel argue that such changes reflect the broader fact "that determiners are a vulnerable domain of German grammar", as their original function of marking definiteness has been largely taken over by pragmatic and other factors. This would suggest that such constructions might be found in homeland varieties. Indeed, Auer and Siegel found indications of similar incipient developments in a control group investigated for their study, namely speakers without migration background.

A further change in German gender (and case) marking comes from the adjective endings. In the homeland setting, there remains much ongoing variation and change after a long process of attempted standardization (see Salmons 2018: 266–267 for references). The standard reference work, *Duden Die Grammatik*, gives extensive treatment to "uncertainties in the choice of the inflected forms" ("Unsicherheiten der der Wahl der Flexionsformen", §492), with a later section of over 12 pages detailing variation (2016: §1525ff.). Part of the complexity here is that adjectives inflect differently when they are preceded by a definite article, so that we have *da**s** arme Kind* 'the.N poor.ADJ child', *ein arme**s** Kind* 'a.N poor.ADJ.N child', etc. That is, the inflection signaling neuter is sometimes on a determiner and sometimes on the adjective. For German multiethnolects, Auer & Siegel (2021: 25–26) find that:

> The only possible innovation in the German multiethnolect affecting gender that we found was the simplification of the inflection of prenominal adjectives in noun phrases without determiners; the traditional German system is being replaced by the generalized suffix *-e* marking attribution only.

They reasonably label this a "phenomenon that weakens the position of gender" (2021: 2), but conclude that the overall system is still largely intact here.

3.3. DIASPORIC GERMAN. As already noted, German in diaspora often shows reduction of case systems (e.g., Bousquette 2020). Still, some varieties have maintained basically complete sets of inherited nominal morphology, even where the relevant homeland varieties had forms more complex than the standard language possesses. Nützel (2009) shows this for an East Franconian dialect in Indiana that maintained gender-inflected forms of the numeral 'two' for generations.

A theme through much of the vast literature on diasporic and heritage varieties of German reports great basic stability in the noun class system, including the retention of regionally distinct patterns. Even after generations in diaspora, these varieties retain three genders. Individual nouns

may change class or differ from the standard language, though even that often has roots in dialectal differences imported with European varieties at the time of immigration. A long tradition of work (see Aron 1930 for an early example) treats loanword gender and while some work once proposed clear changes there, like a supposed tendency to assign loans to the feminine class, newer work has shown that not to be the case, at least for Pennsylvania Dutch, now a distinct language (Page 2011). For native vocabulary, Boas (2009: 236) concludes that "except for a few isolated cases, gender assignment has virtually remained unchanged in Texas German". For comparison to Wisconsin varieties, the second author surveyed a set of Seifert recordings (see Bousquette 2020) and found only a few deviations from expected patterns, e.g., a masculine determiner with *Warze* 'wart', which is typically feminine. Widely used and established loanwords typically have stable genders, such as *die Car*, for automobile.

That said, we find the same lack of determiners in American German varieties that Auer & Siegel found in multiethnolectal German as the examples below from Salmons (1994, noting similar data from another source on Texas German) illustrate. The second author of the present chapter has observed these same kinds of patterns in German spoken in Wisconsin and elsewhere.

(3) Texas German bare nouns (Salmons 1994: 66)
ich muß nach Badezimmer 'I've gotta go to [the] bathroom'
auf Blatz 'on [the] farm'
nach Rever 'down to [the] river'
Wenn man mit Mannskerl sprecht 'if you're talking to [a] man …'

Finally, for the diaspora, there has been little systematic work on adjective inflection – where case and gender are encoded in intertwined ways in American German. For adjectival case endings, Boas finds "a significant increase in variability and a substantial decrease in systematic case marking" (2009: 211), which fits with impressions from various other heritage varieties of German.

In summary, across homeland, multiethnolectal, and diasporic varieties, the core three-class system appears to remain intact over even long periods of time and under intense contact and advancing language shift, even as morphological case marking has often retreated. Assignment of gender to loanwords shows some variation but looks clearly rule-governed to the extent that we can tell. The absence of determiners in multiethnolectal and heritage varieties is striking but a minor piece of the puzzle, though it probably does point to an important broader context. Aside from the standard language in writing, adjective inflection is so variable historically and today that its apparent increase in variability beyond the homeland seems both expected and without great consequence for the noun class system itself. German, broadly understood, then does not look like North Germanic languages or English with regard to gender.

4. Dutch case study. Let us now consider parallel data from Dutch, again organized around homeland, multiethnolectal and diasporic varieties.

4.1. HOMELAND DUTCH. Homeland Dutch has been subject to reduction historically from the three-way gender system of Proto-Germanic to the two-way system found in the standard language and many dialects of Dutch in the present day. However, a three-way contrast is maintained in the pronominal system, and, as Audring (2006) points out, this poses a problem for agreement. If nouns are only classified on the basis of two genders but pronouns on the basis of three, how is this mismatch resolved in usage? Audring gives examples of apparent mismatch

between an antecedent noun's gender and the following anaphoric pronoun where a common gendered noun can be referred to with either a masculine, feminine or neuter pronoun (4), along with similar examples for a neuter noun.

(4) Homeland Dutch (Audring 2006: 88)

a. common > masculine
De *hun/hen*-**discussie** laat ik voor wat **hij** is.
The.C *them*-**discussion.C** leave I for what **3SG.SBJ.M** is.
'The *them*-**discussion** I leave for what **it (lit.: he)** is.' (*Metro*, July 30, 2004, Brieven)

b. common > feminine
dan kan je **moeder** d'r ook naartoe als **ze** dat wil.
then can your **mother.C** there also there if **3SG.SBJ.F** that wants
'Then your **mother** can also go there if **she** wants to.'

c. common > neuter
Ik draag geen **merkkleding**, tenzij **het** erg goedkoop is.
I wear no **brand.name.clothes.C** unless **3SG.SBJ.N** very cheap is
'I don't wear **brand-name clothes**, unless **it** is really cheap.'
(university periodical Ad Valvas 17, January 20, 2005: 12)

This leads to the conclusion that agreement is not grammatical or syntactic but rather semantic. One case that Audring (2006) makes for this is that animacy appears to play a role as all common gender nouns and many neuter nouns take a pronoun that matches the biological gender of their (animate) referent, as in (5), and see also Kraaikamp (2016).

(5) Homeland Dutch (Audring 2006: 92)

a. neuter > feminine
m'n **nicht-je** woont nu in Hilversum samen met **'r** vriend
my **niece-DIM.N** lives now in Hilversum together with **3SG.OBJ.F** friend
'My **niece** lives in Hilversum now, together with **her** friend.'

b. neuter > masculine
't is jouw **broer-tje** –
it is your **brother-DIM.N** –
[…] Vroeger kon ik veel beter met **hem** opschieten.
[…] earlier could I much better with **3SG.OBJ.M** get.along
'It's your **brother** – In the past I got along with **him** much better.'

Additionally, Audring's (2006) study of spoken Dutch corpus data strengthens claims made previously by other scholars that pronoun selection for *inanimate* nouns is also semantically conditioned. She finds that a masculine pronoun can be used for both common and neuter nouns if it refers to a countable item (6), while a neuter pronoun can be used to refer to either a common or neuter noun if it references something uncountable or a substance or material (7). She notes that exceptions to this pattern are very rare and found the same patterns to be true for grammatical "mismatches" between nouns and their following demonstratives or relative pronouns.

(6) Homeland Dutch (Audring 2006: 95)

a. neuter > masculine

Moet	je	nog	wat	informatie	over	dat	**boek**	hebben?
must	you	still	what	information	about	that	**book.N**	have
Dan	moet	'k	**'m**	ook	nog	niet	gaan	inleveren.
then	must	I	**3SG.OBJ.M**	also	still	not	go	turn.in

'Do you need some information about that **book**? Then I shouldn't return **it (lit.: him)** yet.'

b. neuter > masculine

't	**apparaat**	zelf	**dat**	kan	gaan	smeulen	–
the.N	**machine.N**	self	**that.N**	can	go	smolder	–
Dat	kan	niet	als	**ie**	af	staat.	
That	can	not	if	**3SG.SBJ.M**	off	stands	

'The **machine** itself can start smoldering – that can't happen when **it (lit.: he)** is off.'

(7) Homeland Dutch (Audring 2006: 95)

a. common > neuter

Ik	vind	**puree**	van	echte	aardappelen	altijd	lekkerder
I	find	**purée.C**	from	real	potatoes	always	tastier
want		**het**	is	wat	steviger.		
because		**3SG.SUBJ.N**	is	what	firmer.		

'I always prefer **purée** made of real potatoes, because **it** is more firm.'

b. common > neuter

't	zit	toch	ook	bij	**olijfolie**	wel	een	beetje	in	hoe
it	sits	still	also	by	**olive.oil.C**	well	a	little	in	how
't		geconserveerd			wordt.					
3SG.SBJ.N		preserved			was					

'Even with **olive oil**, it matters how **it** is preserved.'

Consequently, pronoun selection in Homeland Dutch appears to be semantic rather than grammatical, with speakers making use of the properties of animacy and countability to select a pronoun to match its antecedent. Animate nouns receive a pronoun that matches the biological gender of its referent rather than the grammatical gender, and for inanimate nouns a masculine pronoun is used if its referent is countable and a neuter pronoun if its referent is uncountable.

4.2. MULTIETHNOLECTAL DUTCH. Hinskens et al. (2020) provide an examination of gender in multiethnolectal Dutch. They examine the interactional speech of adolescent and young adult Dutch speakers of Turkish, Moroccan and nonimmigrant backgrounds from two cities with varying dialectal contact. Their goal was primarily to better understand the origins of ethnolectal features. However, their work also provides us with a prime example of how multiethnolectal speakers of Dutch realize gender and what language-internal and -external factors play a role in its realization.

They find remarkable stability in determiner and adjective inflection before common nouns, where nearly 100% of tokens from each speaker background group is realized with inflection expected from the standard system. This is not the case for neuter nouns, however. About a quarter of the forms used by speakers in standardly neuter contexts were realized with common-gender forms. This varied by speaker background with speakers of a Turkish or Moroccan background producing significantly fewer forms expected from the standard in neuter contexts than speakers

from a nonimmigrant background. They also found that older speakers (18-20 year old group) produced more standard neuter forms than the younger speakers (10-12 year old group), which they relate to an acquisition effect.

Conversely, the authors did not find the factors of diminutive status of the referent nor its animacy to significantly improve their model. That is to say that whether a noun is morphologically a diminutive or semantically animate did not seem to significantly correlate with whether these speakers produced a neuter form in a neuter context or not. This is surprising given that the Dutch diminutive suffix is one of only a small set of endings on a noun itself that can indicate what its underlying grammatical gender is, in this case neuter. It would be expected for speakers to be able to reliably use this cue in selecting a neuter form. However, because this variable was not selected as significant, it would appear that speakers do not reliably produce neuter forms for diminutive nouns. An example of this mismatch adapted from their paper is given in (8).

(8) Multiethnolectal Dutch (Hinskens et al. 2020: 90)
die boek-je 'this.C boek-DIM.N'

Furthermore, that animacy was not a significant main effect is also surprising given its role in pronoun selection for Modern Standard Dutch, outlined above. It could be expected that there would be a negative correlation between animate referents and multiethnolect speakers using a neuter form given that in Modern Standard Dutch speakers select pronouns that match the biological (masculine or feminine) and not grammatical gender of an animate antecedent. The lack of a significant correlation with animacy could be due to the focus of their multiethnolect study on examining determiners and not pronouns of various types. It seems that for this group of speakers, animacy has not progressed beyond pronouns as a factor in conditioning determiner selection.

Hinskens et al. (2020) also examined adnominal/attributive adjectives, as these display a gender distinction in indefinite contexts. They found a general overuse of the schwa suffix, a form associated with common gender and plurals. For adjectives, they also found the speakers with Moroccan and Turkish backgrounds and younger speakers (10–12-year-olds) to use the most nonstandard forms. This again suggests an effect of both a second (heritage) language and reduced input or interference, as well as acquisition as older speakers more accurately produced forms expected in the standard language. Additionally, they found animacy to significantly affect adnominal usage for neuter nouns. They posit that this could be due to (re)semanticization, as Audring (2006) suggests, as they find relatively frequent examples of grammatically neuter animate nouns being preceded by adnominals with a schwa suffix or a common gender determiner.

4.3. DIASPORIC (HERITAGE) DUTCH. While not a study focused on gender specifically, Smits (1996) does examine adjective declension (agreement) at two time periods in heritage Dutch in Iowa. Adjective declension is related to gender in Dutch, as adjectives in determiner phrases with an indefinite article and neuter singular noun receive a different suffix (unmarked or null suffix, -∅) than adjectives in all other cases (schwa suffix -*e*), including all contexts with a definite determiner (see also Table 2 above). Smits compares adjective declension by Dutch heritage speakers recorded in 1966 to heritage speakers recorded in 1989 and finds that in 1966 adjective declension was largely in line with Standard Dutch, indicating a complete acquisition of the Standard Dutch gender system. However, she notes that adjective declension for singular common-gender (*de*) nouns and plural nouns was preserved better than that of singular neuter-gender (*het*) nouns in either definite or indefinite contexts (96% preserved vs. 79.3% (def) and 85.8% (indef), respectively). The most common "deviation" from Standard Dutch she points out is adjectives in

singular neuter (*het*) noun DPs being undeclined in both definite (deviation from standard) and indefinite (non-deviation from standard) contexts. This occurred in 12 out of 46 cases (20.7%) of singular neuter nouns in the data. The second most common deviation was adjectives in singular indefinite neuter (*het*) noun DPs being declined (i.e., speakers did not distinguish this context and therefore adjectives in all contexts were declined). Smits states that this deviation is "probably related to the loss of gender distinctions" (1996: 118).

While adjective declension and by proxy gender was largely preserved in the 1966 data, by 1989 that was no longer the case. Smits details that in 1989 most speakers no longer made a gender distinction and specifically used *de* in place of *het*. Most speakers also preferred declined adjectives, which aligns well with a common-gender only system. Smits notes that only one consultant had largely preserved a gender distinction, though this is likely due to them being a second generation speaker (though not the only one in the data but where third and fourth generation speakers were also present) and also having the earliest birth year of the speakers examined.

The new data on Dutch presented here examines 12 speakers of heritage (diasporic) Dutch living in the Fox River Valley of Wisconsin (Table 4). These speakers were recorded in 2018 and include speakers of three different generations, where generation was classified based on generation since immigration (i.e., which of the speaker's family members immigrated: themself, parent, grandparent, etc.). The first generation is composed of speakers who immigrated from the Netherlands to the United States themselves as adults (after age 10) and have lived in the United States ever since. In this dataset, these speakers immigrated after World War II. The second generation is composed of speakers who had immigrant, Dutch-speaking parents and were either born in the United States or immigrated with their parents as children (before age 10). The second generation speakers here are children of immigrants that came to the US after World War II and several are the actual children of a first generation speaker in the dataset. The final generation examined here is the fourth generation which is composed of speakers whose great-grandparents or an even earlier generation immigrated to the United States as adults.

Speaker	Birth Year	Gender	Generation	Age at Recording	Age at Immigration	Length of Residence
11	1935	F	1st	83	25	58
17	1938	F	1st	80	24	56
19	1940	M	1st	78	15	63
1	1963	F	2nd	55	5	50
10	1965	M	2nd	53	–	–
12	1966	F	2nd	52	–	–
13	1961	F	2nd	57	–	–
14	1962	F	2nd	56	–	–
30	1949	F	2nd	69	2	67
3	1933	F	4th	85	–	–
4	1931	F	4th	86	–	–
9	1931	F	4th	86	–	–

Table 4. Dutch heritage speaker metadata

The fourth generation speakers in this dataset are not the great-grandchildren of the first generation speakers here, but rather descendants of immigrants that arrived to the US in the mid-1800s.

They therefore have similar birth years as the first-generation speakers. The first-generation speakers received most of their schooling in Dutch in the Netherlands, while the second- and fourth-generation speakers received little or no schooling in Dutch. This dataset does not include third-generation speakers whose grandparents would have been the ones to immigrate. This gap is due to two different reasons. First, the parents of the fourth-generation speakers were no longer alive at the time of recording. Second, the second generation has not passed the Dutch language on to their children beyond a passive level and being able to say a few phrases or sing a few songs. The children of second-generation speakers, consequently, did not complete the Dutch-language task described below and are not included in this dataset. In data taken from speakers' narrative picture tasks of the book *Frog, where are you?* by Mercer Mayer (2003), certain deviations from Standard Dutch are seen (Table 5). The first concerns usage of the neuter definite article *het*. Only 4 out of the 12 speakers use *het* at all. These speakers are three first-generation speakers and one second-generation speaker, who is the oldest daughter of one of the first-generation *het* users. In total, only 20 of the 494 tokens of definite articles were realized with *het* (~4%). Consequently, it appears that for these speakers and this community that *de* is the default.

Speaker	Generation	*het* Use	Prenominal Adjectives
11	1st	Yes	–
17	1st	Yes	Undeclined
19	1st	Yes	Declined
1	2nd	No	Undeclined
10	2nd	No	Declined
12	2nd	No	Declined
13	2nd	Yes	Undeclined
14	2nd	No	Variable
30	2nd	No	Undeclined
3	4th	No	Undeclined
4	4th	No	–
9	4th	No	Declined

Table 5. Use of the neuter determiner het and declension of adjectives by speaker

However, it is important to note that for the speakers who still use *het* that they always use it before a noun that is neuter and singular. That is to say that they use it in the context expected from Standard Dutch. They do not use *het* in unexpected cases such as before a common gender or plural noun. Examples of *het* tokens can be seen in (9). Consequently, these speakers do seem to have acquired (for the one second-generation speaker) and at least somewhat maintained a gender distinction.

(9) a. het hert 'the.N deer.N' (11: 1st)
b. het einde 'the.N end.N' (13: 2nd (US-born))
c. het hond-je 'the.N dog-DIM.N' (17: 1st)
d. het water 'the.N water.N' (19: 1st)

Nonetheless, the *de* default present in the rest of the speakers is quite pervasive. *De* is used even before diminutives, which are neuter in all Dutch dialects (MAND 2005, and see above), where theoretically the diminutive suffix can clue the speaker into what gender the noun is. Six out of twelve speakers used *de* before a singular definite diminutive (which in Standard Dutch and

many dialects would be preceded by *het* or *'t*). This includes both first- and second-generation speakers. Examples can be found in (10). In total, 30 out of 36 singular definite diminutives were preceded by *de* (~83%).

(10)	a.	de manne-ke	'the.C man-DIM.N'	(11: 1st)
	b.	de konijn-tje	'the.C rabbit-DIM.N'	(11: 1st)
	c.	de staat-je	'the.C estate-DIM.N'	(13: 2nd (US-born))
	d.	de hond-je	'the.C dog-DIM.N'	(13: 2nd (US-born), 17: 1st, 1: 2nd (NL-born))
	e.	de klein-ø kind-je	'the.C little-N kid-DIM.N'	(14: 2nd (US-born))
	f.	de kikker-tje	'the.C frog-DIM.N'	(30: 2nd (NL-born))

Although there are not many tokens with adjectives (n=43), some interesting trends are present in the data. There are many cases where the adjective is declined as expected based on Standard Dutch (e.g., (11)). These account for 21 out of 32 adjectives (65.6%) and were produced by eight different speakers. The total adjective count excludes cases where the expected declension was unable to be determined, e.g., where the adjective or noun was an English borrowing or an adjective was used before a neuter noun with no article (n=11).

(11)	a.	de klein-**e** jong	'the.C small-C boy.N'	(9: 4th)
	b.	ee(n) klein-**ø** manne-ke	'a small-N man-DIM.N'	(17: 1st)

There were 11 cases (35.4%) produced by six different speakers where the adjective was not declined as expected based on Standard Dutch (e.g., (12)).

(12)	a.	de mooi-**ø** weer	'the.C beautiful-N weather.N'	(1: 2nd (NL-born))
	b.	de ander-**ø** schoen	'the.C other-N shoe.C'	(3: 4th)

The mismatches of the expected declension from Standard Dutch notably do not always go in the same direction. While Smits (1996) found either always undeclined adjectives before neuter nouns (indefinite and definite) for some speakers in 1966 or always declined adjectives before all nouns for some speakers in 1966 and most speakers in 1989, here, instead, some speakers demonstrate a preference for leaving their adjectives undeclined in all instances, not just before neuter nouns (13), and some speakers demonstrate the opposite preference (i.e., they decline all their adjectives (14)).

(13)	a.	ee(n) klein-**ø** kus-je	'a small-N kiss-DIM.N'	(1: 2nd (NL-born)
	b.	de klein-**ø** ding	'the.C small-N thing.N'	(3: 4th)
	c.	de klein-**ø** jongen	'the.C small-N boy.C'	(30: 2nd (NL-born))
(14)	a.	ee(n) klein-**e** jong	'a small-C boy.N'	(4: 4th)
	b.	de klein-**e** mens	'the.C small-C human.C'	(10: 2nd (US-born))
	c.	hel-**e** familie	'whole-C family.C'	(12: 2nd (US-born))
	d.	zijn klein-**e** spulle-tje-s	'his small-C thing-DIM-PL'	(19: 1st)
	e.	een platt-**e** boom	'a flat-C tree.C'	(9: 4th)

The split between the two preferences was fairly equal with 15 tokens and five speakers using undeclined adjectives and 22 tokens and five speakers using declined adjectives. There was only one speaker, a second-generation speaker born in the US (speaker 14), who used both declined and undeclined adjectives including for the same lexeme (15). Of note is that this second-generation speaker is *not* the one that demonstrates any use of the neuter determiner *het*.

(15) a. de klein-**e** jongen ‘the.C small-C boy.C’
de klein-ø jongen ‘the.C small-N boy.C’
b. de klein-ø kind-je ‘the.C small-N kid-DIM.N’
de klein-ø kind ‘the.C small-N kid.N’
de klein-ø kind-je-s ‘the.C small-C kid-DIM-PL’

Thus, it seems rather than maintaining distinct adjective endings determined by gender and definiteness, these speakers employ only one set of adjectives that they use in all contexts. However, it should be noted that some speakers produced very few or no prenominal adjectives in the dataset. Therefore, it would be beneficial in future work to explore this further, including how much variability exists.

Further, for the few English borrowings that are used with adjectives in this dataset both declined and undeclined adjectives are seen (16).

(16) a. de ander-**e** side ‘the.C other-C side’ (10: 2nd (US-born))
b. rod-**e** boots ‘red-C boots’ (9: 4th)
c. een ander-**ø** liepefrog ‘an other-N leapfrog’ (13: 2nd (US-born))

Lastly, immigrant ancestors of several speakers and several speakers in this dataset themselves immigrated from a region of the Netherlands where a three-way distinction in gender was/is still present (see Table 3 above). While this dataset was not designed to assess whether any of the speakers acquired or use a three-way gender distinction, a couple tokens of (historically) masculine nouns were preceded by the masculine definite article *den,* rather than the common-gender and/or feminine definite article *de*, as in (17) below.

(17) de-n avond‘the-M evening.M’ (3: 4th)

However, a more targeted and nuanced approach is necessary to understand whether speakers in this community consistently employ a distinction between masculine and feminine and should be the topic of future research.

A few takeaways are possible from this data. First is that most speakers display no gender distinction. Most speakers do not use *het* at all even with supposedly transparently neuter diminutives. This lack of *het* and invariable use of *de* matches well with what Smits (1996) found for Iowa Dutch in 1989. Additionally, adjective declension no longer appears to be morphologically conditioned either by gender or definiteness. Instead, excepting one speaker, speakers have only one set of adjectives that they produce regardless of context. This contrasts with Smits’s (1996) findings for Iowa Dutch in 1989 where she found most speakers to produce only declined adjectives. The split for Wisconsin Dutch is pretty even between speakers who produced only declined adjectives and speakers who produced only undeclined adjectives. Additionally, we can see Polinsky’s statement, that the language of first-generation immigrants may differ from the language of homeland speakers, also at work here. While all first-generation speakers use the neuter article *het*, they do not use it as consistently as homeland speakers, particularly when it comes to diminutives. Further, none of the first-generation speakers show differential adjective declension, although this should be examined with a larger dataset. Consequently, first-generation speakers having (largely) left the homeland speech community seem to have progressed differently and beyond that of the homeland.

4.4. SUMMARY OF DUTCH VARIETIES. Consequently, the three varieties of Dutch examined here tell a story about the progression of grammatical gender change in general (Homeland) as well as

in situations of language contact (Multiethnolect and Diaspora/Heritage). Homeland Dutch historically experienced reduction from a three-way distinction to two-way distinction noun class system. A three-way distinction is maintained in the pronoun system, but Audring (2006) found that this is no longer syntactically determined (by the gender of the antecedent), but rather semantically conditioned. This conditioning does not trend toward collapse of the gender system (use of one gender's forms over the other; a default gender), but rather a use of common-gender forms in certain semantic contexts and neuter-gender forms in other semantic contexts.

Multiethnolectal Dutch, on the other hand, takes these changes a step further. These speakers do show a preference for using common-gender morphology over neuter-gender morphology. Speakers consistently used common-gender morphology when referring to common gender referents but did not consistently use neuter-gender morphology for neuter-gender referents. Here a common-gender default is starting to gain ground with approximately a quarter of neuter-gender contexts receiving common-gender determiners. The gender of the determiner used was also not significantly modulated by the diminutive status of the referent. This marks a further break from the standard language and homeland speakers described above. A diminutive ending for these speakers does not appear to be a transparent cue to gender and which matching form to use. Additionally, animacy of the referent was not a significant factor in determiner selection, though it was a factor in adnominal selection. This could indicate that the semantic conditioning found in homeland speakers for pronouns also applies to adjectives for multiethnolectal speakers, though it has not yet progressed (significantly) to determiners.

Lastly, the diaspora/heritage speakers show change to the gender system that is the most advanced, the farthest from early Germanic. Early varieties of Heritage Dutch largely maintained the two-way gender distinction found in Standard Dutch, although even in 1966 this was creeping towards a common-gender default with less of a correlation to Homeland Dutch for neuter-gender nouns. This trend has progressed nearly to its endpoint with Iowa speakers in 1989 and Wisconsin speakers in 2018 displaying almost no *het* (neuter-gender determiner) usage, except for a few speakers. Adjective declension is also no longer based on the underlying gender of the noun it modifies, but rather each speaker has one adjective form (declined or undeclined) that they use. Furthermore, diminutive status is not associated with neuter-gender morphology of either the determiner or adjective.

In short, the Dutch varieties show reduction parallel to one another, forming almost a continuum of change. At one end is the Homeland variety, which shows restructuring of pronouns from syntactically determined to semantically determined. At the other end is Diaspora Dutch, where forms are no longer determined but only one form (common-gender for determiners and either declined or undeclined for adjectives) is used, and in the middle is Multiethnolectal Dutch. This shows commonalities with both of the other two varieties. It shows reduction in the direction of a common-gender default like Diaspora Dutch, but a maintenance of a distinction and some semantic conditioning like the Homeland variety. Consequently, change is not just a result of language contact or reduced input but a part of language use, and this study shows how important insights can be gained by comparing different situations of the same language.

5. Conclusion. Building on Polinsky's observations about the vulnerability of gender agreement in heritage languages and on previous work pointing to its reduction and loss in some North Germanic varieties, we have compared varieties of two West Germanic sisters, in traditional homeland varieties, multiethnolects and in diaspora. Across the board, we find clear but limited change in homeland varieties vs. more change in the other two settings.

Let us return to our questions posed at the outset:

- How variable and vulnerable is gender within these West Germanic languages?

Both languages in various settings show some susceptibility to change, as Polinsky and many other scholars predict, but German retains the fundamental noun class system remarkably well, especially when compared to case marking, while the Dutch distinction appears far more prone to reduction and loss. Both languages of course started from the same historical three-way system, but Dutch had already moved farther from that historically and appears to be continuing on that path in the present day.

- How do changes in gender in diaspora and multiethnolectal varieties compare with homeland or baseline varieties?

In each language, the changes are broadly similar across any and all of these settings.

Dutch and German have taken and are taking very different directions of change, but those directions are closely parallel for each of the three types of varieties for each language: German has retained, to a striking extent, three genders, though quite possibly with changes to the gender assignment strategies and clear changes to marking in multiethnolect and diasporic varieties. The occasional absence of determiners and great variability in adjective inflection are labile, but the core system is intact.

Wiese (2012) stresses throughout her book that multiethnolectal German, *Kiezdeutsch*, is just another German dialect, calling it "typisch deutsch" (typically German) and putting "ein neuer Dialekt" (a new dialect) into her subtitle. The same holds just as well for diasporic varieties and the range of Dutch varieties reviewed here. The relative stability of German gender and relative instability of Dutch gender both run largely parallel between multiethnolect and diasporic heritage varieties.

The dynamics of ongoing development in each language are catalyzed by contact settings. In part it's the old story of contact facilitating change. It would be easy to assume that this is due to the heterogeneity of input to learners in such settings. What is less commonly noted is that the directions of such change often continue trends that were already present in the homeland varieties.

Polinsky (2018) concludes her book with an overview of modularity in heritage language. She argues that heritage speakers provide support for modularity in part because they pattern in some ways like L1 acquirers (for much morphology), in other ways like L2 learners (in the lexicon), in yet others like "baseline" speakers (phonology) and, yes, sometimes in unique ways, "due to their remarkable ability to innovate" (Polinsky 2018: 350). Still, she argues, "their new structures obey the established constraints of natural language design and the changes are logical" (2018: 350). Noun class in West Germanic provides a striking example of this kind of constrained and focused pattern of change within an area broadly susceptible to reduction and loss. A comparative look at two sister languages in very different settings points to an underlying logic in change.

The larger question we end on is why we find these consistent differences between maintenance of the noun-class system in German varieties of all sorts and its reduction and loss in Dutch varieties. The long arc of Germanic linguistic history is overwhelmingly one of gradual, steady and systematic reduction of nominal morphology from a rich Proto-Germanic system of case and gender built around a complex noun class system. English represents something near the end of the cline, without grammatical gender and virtually no remaining case marking.

German and Dutch occupy ground between these extremes. German retains robust gender and much of the case system. Dutch, already reduced to a two-way distinction with less explicit morphological marking, is moving toward an English-like system, especially in diasporic and multiethnolectal contexts. As noted earlier, Dutch and German start at different points on the historical trajectory of Germanic – German much closer to early Germanic patterns and Dutch much closer to a system like English, without grammatical gender. Dutch, like some North Germanic varieties, may just be far enough along that grammatical gender has become "fragile" so that it is now "on its way to disappearance" (Polinsky 2018: 206).

Still, as Bousquette & Putnam (2020) argue, even moribund heritage languages retain rich structural complexity, contrary to some earlier views. We find that here too, and the changes we see are constrained and systematic.

References

Aron, Albert W. 1930. The gender of English loan-words in colloquial American German. *Language* 6. 11–28. https://doi.org/10.2307/521982.

Audring, Jenny. 2006. Pronominal gender in spoken Dutch. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 18(2). 85–116. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542706000043.

Audring, Jenny. 2009. *Reinventing pronoun gender*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam dissertation.

Audring, Jenny. 2023. Gender systems in Germanic. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.953.

Auer, Peter & Vanessa Siegel. 2021. Grammatical gender in the German multiethnolect. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 33(1). 5–29. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542720000082.

Belk, Zoë, Lily Kahn & Kriszta Eszter Szendrői. 2020. Complete loss of case and gender within two generations: Evidence from Stamford Hill Hasidic Yiddish. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 23. 271–326. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10828-020-09119-9.

Belk, Zoë, Lily Kahn & Kriszta Eszter Szendrői. 2022. Absence of morphological case and gender marking in Contemporary Hasidic Yiddish worldwide. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 34(2). 139–185. https://doi.org/10.1017/S147054272100012X.

Boas, Hans C. 2009. *The life and death of Texas German*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press for the American Dialect Society.

Bousquette, Joshua. 2020. From bidialectal to bilingual: Evidence for multistage language shift in the 1946–49 Wisconsin German recordings of Lester W.J. "Smoky" Seifert. *American Speech* 95(4). 485–523. https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-8620496.

Bousquette, Joshua & Michael T. Putnam. 2020. Redefining language death: Evidence from moribund grammars. *Language Learning* 70(S1). 185–228. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12362.

Bybee Joan L. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Conzett, Philipp. 2006. Gender assignment and the structure of the lexicon. *Language Typology and Universals* 59(3). 223–240. https://doi.org/10.1524/stuf.2006.59.3.223.

Corbett, Greville G. 2013. Number of genders. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.) *WALS Online.* http://wals.info/chapter/30.

Curzan, Anne. 2003. *Gender shifts in the history of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486913.

Duden. 2016. *Die Grammatik* (9th edn.). Berlin: Dudenverlag.
Fulk, Robert D. 2018. *A comparative grammar of the early Germanic languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://benjamins.com/catalog/sigl.3.
Haugen, Einar. 1953. *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Hinskens, Frans, Roeland van Hout, Pieter Muysken & Ariën van Wijngaarden. 2021. Variation and change in grammatical gender marking: The case of Dutch ethnolects. *Linguistics* 59(1). 75–100. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2020-0265.
Kapović, Mate. 2017. Proto-Indo-European morphology. In Mate Kapović (ed.), *The Indo-European languages* (2nd edn.), 61–110. London: Routledge.
Kraaikamp, Margot. 2016. Semantic gender agreement: Dutch and German compared. *Linguistics in Amsterdam* 9(1). 1–29.
Kürschner, Sebastian. 2020. Grammatical gender in modern Germanic languages. In B. Richard Page & Michael T. Putnam (eds.), *Cambridge handbook of Germanic linguistics,* 259–281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108378291.013.
Lohndal, Terje & Marit Westergaard. 2016. Grammatical gender in American Norwegian heritage language: Stability or attrition? *Frontiers in Psychology* 7. 344. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00344.
MAND. 2005. *Morfologische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
Mayer, Mercer. 2003. *Frog, where are you?* (illustrated edn.). New York: Dial Books.
Nützel, Daniel. 2009. *The East Franconian dialect of Haysville, Indiana: A study in language death / Die ostfränkische Mundart von Haysville, Indiana: Eine Untersuchung mit ausgewählten morphologischen und syntaktischen Phänomenen*. Regensburg: Regensburger Dialektforum.
Page, B. Richard. 2011. Gender assignment of English loanwords in Pennsylvania German: Is there a feminine tendency? In Michael T. Putnam (ed.), *Studies on German-language islands*, 151–162. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.123.07pag.
Polinsky, Maria. 2018. *Heritage languages and their speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781107252349.
Riksem, Brita Ramsevik. 2017. Language mixing and diachronic change: American Norwegian noun phrases then and now. *Languages* 2(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/languages2020003.
Salmons, Joseph. 1992. The evolution of gender assignment rules from Old High German to New High German. In Rosina Lippi-Green (ed.), *Recent developments in Germanic linguistics*, 81–95. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Salmons, Joe. 1993. The structure of the lexicon: Evidence from German gender assignment rules. *Studies in Language* 17. 411–435. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.17.2.06sal.
Salmons, Joseph. 1994. Naturalness and morphological change in Texas German. In Nina Berend & Klaus J. Mattheier (eds.), *Deutsche Sprachinselforschung: Eine Gedenkschrift für Hugo Jedig,* 59–72. Bern: Peter Lang.
Salmons, Joseph. 2018. *A history of German: What the past reveals about today's language* (2nd edn.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Salmons, Joseph C. & Felecia A. Lucht. 2006. Standard German in Texas. In Linda Thornburg & Janet Fuller (eds.), *Studies in contact linguistics: Essays in honor of Glenn G. Gilbert*, 165–186. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Smits, Caroline. 1996. *Disintegration of inflection: The case of Iowa Dutch.* Amsterdam: Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.
Wiese, Heike. 2012. *Kiezdeutsch: Ein neuer Dialekt entsteht*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
Wyngaerd, Emma Vanden. 2014. The adjective in Dutch-French code switching. Leiden: Master's Thesis, Universiteit Leiden.
Zubin, David & Klaus-Michael Köpcke. 1984. Affect classification in the German gender system. *Lingua* 63. 41–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(84)90031-7.