

<https://www.doi.org/10.31918/twejer.1922.13>

e-ISSN (2617-0752)

p-ISSN (2617-0744)



A Critical analysis of Space in language variation and change: some examples of English and Kurdish languages

Salah Jameel Jabrael
Soran University-Faculty of Arts
salah.jabrael@soran.edu.iq

Sameerah Saleh Ahmed
Soran University-Faculty of Arts
sameerah.ahmed@soran.edu.iq

Abstract

This study will investigate the concept of space as a significant topic in dialectology, language and change, its three main categories which together construct spatiality: Euclidian space , Social Space and Perceived space. Furthermore, it will highlight the key types of methodologies employed by the early and contemporary dialectologists, Variationists and ethnographers who made a great contribution to the space, taking advantage of descriptive qualitative approach.

This paper, also, aims at discussing some drawbacks in the interpretation of the space among sociolinguists and presenting some solutions for the issue. For example, labov, for his early study in New York City, took a restricted area, whereas other dialectologists have taken into consideration expanded areas of dialectology, language and Change.

Likewise, it will shed light on some examples of space in both English and Kurdish languages. Finally, some key factors which can play key roles in the construction of space will be elucidated.

Key Words: Euclidian space, Social Space, Perceived space, spatiality, Approaches of Space, factors of Space construction

A Critical analysis of Space in language variation and change: some examples of English and Kurdish languages

Introduction

Dialectology as an essential branch of sociolinguistics is associated with studying regional dialect levelling in terms of grammatical, vocabulary and phonological domains. However, on the first hand , dialectology may include geographical diffusion by which characteristics of language can diffuse from a densely inhabited and cost-effectively and culturally overriding centre (Trudgill 1982b: 52-57; Britain 2002 cited in Kerswill 2003: 1). There may exist a close relationship between neighbouring areas where locate in adjacent regions. Also the accents and dialects of such bordering areas may be very similar to one another in terms of pronunciation, lexical and grammar. However, it is not always the case, because it is likely that residents of some areas are eager to create an independent identity for themselves. As Kerswill (2003: 13) states that the speakers of Middlesbrough are progressively employing more characteristics of Tyneside, a central area of Geordie especially the glottal underpinning of intervocalic /p/. Accordingly, despite being as a dominated accent in Newcastle, young people from Middlesbrough are agreeing to employ th-fronting as a reaction to image – awareness. This seems to be an overt feature of accent change between these two areas which may have given rise to separating Middlesbrough from Newcastle's accent, Geordie. As a result, on one hand, such accentual examples show the phonological variations of two geographical locations in the United Kingdom (UK) in which they vary in term of pronunciation and can be studied within the concept of Variationist sociolinguistics.

On the other hand, Variationist sociolinguistics is concerned with dissimilarities and structures within a language instead of taking into consideration linguistics in general, seeking to examine and mark the procedures of the divergences that are present in a specific language more willingly than overlook it. Examiners in this arena study how the variation is correlated to societal construction and issues such as age, class, gender, geography, race, belief, or other social groups at the official and indigenous levels. (Abrams 2018,p 13).

In this sense, it is of great significant how these dialectologists investigate space for the purpose of understanding the changeability in language. In this sense, both English and Kurdish examples have been presented regarding the space. As Britain (2010: 87) claims that it is imperative to prevent treating space as "homogenized, historically, socioeconomically and institutionally blind blank canvas"; therefore, this study will examine to reply aforementioned areas of Britain problem via comparing the viewpoints of first and modern dialectologists regarding space and elucidate some causes which contribute to the space including migration, retirement, age and others.

Literature Review

Over the past decades early dialectologists seemed to have been unable to carry out flawless research for demonstrating, for example a whole geographical area within a space so as to their studies regarding the space can exhibit better awareness as regards dialects. For example, for a founder of sociolinguistic dialectologist like William Labov it appears certain characteristics including gender, class and ethnicity to be of great attention. For the purpose of indicating social stratification, he conducted a research on the speaking of members of staff in three sections stocks in Manhattan,

New York City in 1966. For phonological variations of phoneme /r/ pronounced by the members of the three sections stores, they were requested to sound the noun phrase of ('fourth floor') which included the preferred accent feature in the members' speaking. The result revealed that the members having higher socioeconomic condition managed to sound /r/ phoneme more repeatedly than the employees having lower socioeconomic condition. This seems to be a drawback in the Labov's study in which he only focused on one part of New York City i.e. he might have ignored certain other features of space like the concept of spatiality in his analysis on New York City.

In addition, in contrast to other contemporary dialectologists he had debated his study in a *restricted approach*. In this respect, it is reasonable that this variety of study seems to have some shortcomings; this is possible owing to the fact that his study on the subject of New York City included a restricted field of analysis. As Auer and Schmit (2010: 143) claimed that Space was carefully controlled out where in spatial variances were not experimental. Such a drawback in the methodology in initial dialectologies used by one of the first dialectologists such as Labov and others is probable to be a noticeable suggestion signifying a poor and to some degree an unaware investigation regarding space in a constrained method.

Conversely, in his study in 1974 as to the city of Norwich, in contrast to Labov's investigation on New York City, Trudgill had expanded the space of his study in which he was able to take a number of randomly examples. In other words, in contrast to Labov and other early dialectologists, *Trudgill's investigation concentrated on five different places in the city of Norwich*. Consequently, this study is possibly better than Labov's analysis on New York City, since he not only had taken into account more

locations than Labov but also the scope of his research appears to be more spacious. Furthermore, *Trudgill's highest priority was given to spatiality*. As a result, it is of great interest to identify spatiality to display to what degree initial and modern dialectologists have been taking advantage of spatiality in recognizing the space sphere, which is why it is vital to consider spatiality to perceive the significance of the space.

Lameli, Kehrein and Rabanu(2010 : 70) argue that based upon of the notion of spatiality "Space is more than just a physical distance –and spatial becoming- space is a process not a fixed canvas on which social processes are enacted " . Space is possibly bordered by the communication of authority of human being; consequently, human power can be organised and constrained by the physical space which splits communicators and cultures from each other in society, especially when they interact and create link in society. Therefore, human social life can be governed and dominated by space. Likewise, it seems that the concepts of spatiality by Trudgill are expected to be of great importance in searching the space. This is likely due to the fact that spatiality has a power which to some extent might result in certain additional prevalent and broad findings. In this regard, despite the fact that Trudgill has carried out several research, his investigation regarding Norwich City in 1974 seemed to have made a great contribution to the spatiality. As a result, by making use of the Spatiality in his study, Trudgill investigation has likely been causing numerous and extensive effects compared to Labov's study on New York City or even in opposition to his earlier research regarding language variation and change. It is claimed that the study has played a key role of demonstrating the accents of geographical variances in five sections of countryside and metropolitan zones of Norwich City. This could be because of the fact that in such geographical regions diverse accents and

phonological discourses of variant people of the city were confirmed by Trudgill. Nevertheless, this investigation could be critiqued and might not be considered as a foundation for a study in space in which the space awareness might be a critical factor of sociolinguistic research. , it could be emerged as a significant characteristic in sociolinguistic analyses.

Additionally, it is vital to avoid considering space as an empty image institutionally, since over few decades ago early dialectologists and variationists maintained that space is a vacant canvas. They believed that various actions may occur within a physical distance. In this regard, because of understanding of the significance of space and its impact on social daily life of members of society, dialectologists and variationists were able to use space to evaluate language variation and change. It is generally claimed that the accountability of space is especially vivid in leading and directing the life of members of society in particular in terms of societal circumstance and structure. This is likely due to the fact that Social strategy of space basically plays a key role in supporting or hindering the everyday activities of human being. As Lameli, Kehrein and Rabunus (2010: 71) stressed the significance of space and its dominance over the life of human being; for instance for obtaining a bottle of juice for breakfast human environment is controlled by space aspect. It is space which separates the life of human in rural areas from urban areas. The life in city is more convenient than in countryside area, this is because of better availability of transportation means. Since a resident of a rural area may require driving a car or ride a bus to the neighboring superstore or shop. However for an inhabitant in a city everything might be accessible, not very far from his /her accommodation.

Furthermore, it is clear that investigating space completely overlooked by initial linguists. Such a negative point likely inspires

modern dialectologists and variationists to highly evaluate the field of language variation and change and proposes different techniques for enlightening it. For example, Trudgill, Chambers, and Schilling-Estes (2002: 618) have claimed that space basically includes three sorts which together build spatiality. In this regard, spatiality is of great importance. The first type of space is called Euclidian space; such a kind of space is related to the human, physical and in a social situation divided space of the sciences of mathematics and physics.

The second type of space is well-known as social space encompassing a space formed and dominated by social groups and members of the public who are in communication with each other. The third variety is called perceived space referring to how the members of community entirely observe its serious and non-urgent sites. In this kind of space the main priority is given to the level of comprehension and perspectives of members of society and the construction of daily actions and practices of human being. In this regard, occasionally the degree of contact among societies is limited. This constraint in communication with external world may result in people having less shared events with isolated ones (Trudgill, Chambers, and Schilling-Estes, 2002). One of these reasons is probably the topic of retirement from occupation. Perhaps, the superannuated people do not have sufficient knowledge regarding different changes and variations happening in language, since they are likely to be isolated from members of society, therefore, their contacts with their old networks and colleagues might be disturbed (Smith, 2008). As a result, their shared spatiality could be restricted with external realm. In contrast, working or young individuals who have better opportunities to contact with their co-workers and associates or with other members of society could be informed of latest changes

and variation in language (Qualls, 1998). Thus, for them language training could be a regular routine.

Additionally, studying spatiality seemed to have been a principal point for modern dialectologists in comprehending the space. Thus, identifying the connection between space and dialect is probably relied on recognizing the physical region in which such dialects can be used. For example, Preston (1999 a: xxxiv) in his research took advantage of a new methodology called hand-drawn map task; in so doing, he managed to evaluate stoolpigeon's feedbacks as regards verbal communication changes in the USA. Such a method is vital for modern dialectologists in choosing the geographical boundaries of regional dialects. It seems that the central emphasis of this technique is placed on the mental dialects of map of informants. As (Coupland and Jaworski, 2009) claim that this method does not only authorize informants to select the geographical zones of indigenous dialects, but also present names to these areas. On the basis of this technique Montgomery (2010: 588) managed to establish his new method, Free-choice task listening task. Such a new-fangled methodology is diverse from Preston. Consequently, by employing this method, informants can listen to a typical voice and requested to set, for instance, a cross on a blank map which matches with the origin of the model. Afterward, listeners were asked to indicate each cross with the linked letter to each model. Still in the second stage of this method to some extent, the mingled maps can be used from the first stage. After that participants are required to rate per intuitive region on the merged maps. Furthermore this stage contains an individual responses test in which informants were demanded to specify the percentage of each voice model such as recording of various participants who read identical passage not different from previous levels. A component of personal responses task may require participants to place all voice models on a different vacant map as

well. However, it is argued that selecting the geographical areas by drawing via hand is a shortcoming, because nowadays computers very easily and professionally perform such process without making mistakes. This situation was vivid in Montgomery survey.

One of the most important factors which may result in lingusitical homogenisation in a particular space is likely isolated communities. As Schilling-Estes (2002 : 64) argued that due to lingusitical homogenisation , inhabitants of those communities have little chances to communicate with outside world ; therefore , they can not take advantage of the latest variations occurring in language. In addition, the linguistic variations can be diminished when such communities start to liberate themselves from isolation and struggle to strengthen their social ties with outside.

In this regard it is of great interest to refer to the role of dialects convergence and divergence .As Auer et al. (2005: 1-2) discussed the convergence and divergence in language as the escalation and reduction in resemblance between dialects; however, in a large amount of research of dialect convergence or divergence, the main emphasis is placed on the procedures of linguistic variation and alteration. It is obvious that this situation might have been applied to Kurdish dialects in Turkey. Over the past many decades ,due to Turkish governments' restrictions on Kurdish language as a whole and its dialects such as Kurmanci , Zazaki , Gorani and so forth , Kurdish native speakers in Turkey have been isolated from their official Kurdish language phonologically and linguistically. In this sense, Zazaki speakers in cities such as Ankara , Istanbul can not pronounce [w] sound instead they read it [v] exactly similar to Turkish language ; for instance , they pronounce Nawroz , Kurdish new year , as Navroz. In addition , they mostly , mispronounce [o:] vowel , instead they pronounce it [u :] , for instance , in Kurdish word bo [bo:] , means why , they

say [bu:]. This is likely because they have been assimilated in Turkish language, whereas Kurdish Kurmanci speakers in cities of Diyarbakir, Wan in northern Turkey very easily pronounce such sounds. Another reason for this is that the Kurmanci dialect speakers have close social and economical relationships with Kurds in Iraq. Likewise, the convergence and divergence of those people have the same story.

There are four main Kurdish dialects: Northern Kurdish, Central Kurdish, Southern Kurdish and Goran (Khorshid 1983). In this sense, Northern Kurdish contains Kurmanci subdialect which can be spoken in Kurdish areas in Turkey such as Diyarbakir, Mardin, Wan (Van) and so forth. Also, Badini is a subdialect of Northern Kurdish dialect (Unger 2014). Such a subdialect is spoken in Duhok province, Mergasour district in Erbil province, some areas in Mosul province like Shingal. The researcher as an observer lived in Iranian Western Azerbaijan province, well-known as Wurme in Kurdish and observed that Kurmanci is spoken in some other areas in Iranian Western Azerbaijan province such as Wurme city, Mako, Salmas, Khoy towns and so on. Additionally, it can be spoken in some Kurdish areas in Syria including Qamishli, Hasaka, Kobani, Afrin and so forth.

The second main Kurdish dialect is Central Kurdish which is well-known among people as Sorani Dialect. Such a regional dialect is spoken largely in the North-Eastern part of Iraq and Western part of Iran (Hassanpour (1992: 386). It is spoken in Slaimani province, apart from Mergasour district; it is spoken in all areas of Erbil Province, Kirkuk and Halabja provinces in Kurdistan Region of Iraq and some other areas in Iraq such as Basra and Jasan in Diyala province. It can also be spoken in several Kurdish cities in Iran such as Mahabad, Bokoan, Piranshahr, Shardsht, Shno (Ushnawiye), Naqade, Takab, Jwanro, Rawansar, Salasi

Babajani and so forth (Hassanpour 1992). In this respect, it has appeared as an official language for Kurdistan Regional Government, parliament and other foundations (Hassanpour 1992).

Another main dialect of Kurdish language is Southern Kurdish such as Kalhori spoken in Iranian province of Ilam. According to (Karimipour, A., Ghaderi, et.al 2017), Kalhori subdialect, is associated with Southern Kurdish dialects spoken in the present region of Ilam (Karimipour, A., Ghaderi, et.al 2017). In this respect, Luri is a regional dialect within Southern Kurdish. There is a perception which argues that a mixture nature of Lak establishes a provisional link between some Kurdish subdialects and Luri ones (Asatrian 2009: 12, Shabsavari 2010). Additionally, Yusefvand (2008) claims that the Laks are regarded as a West Iranian national group linguistically narrowly related to the Lurs (Lors) and the Kurds. Likewise, Anonby (2003), stated that the largest focuses of Lurs can be found in the provinces of Luristān, Khuzestān, Chahārmahāl va Bakhtiāri and Boyerahmad – Kohgiluyeh in Iran. Additionally, this ethnic group typically live in the areas of Luristan, Kermanshah, Ilam, and Hamadan in Iran, they live in as Kirkuk and Khanaqin in Iraq as well.

The fourth main variety of Kurdish dialect is called Goran Dialect. It is argued that among the most difficult problems in Kurdish dialectology research is likely to be Gurani (Gorani). This is due to the fact that Gorani is a result of a mass immigration of the Kurds from the Caucasus and northern Iran to the central Zagros range and a succeeding assimilation of indigenous collections (Chaman, Amiri 2018). This dialect covers Original Goran, Hawramani, Bajalani and Zazai. In other words, it comprises some parts of eastern Kermanshah province and Hawraman Takht (Flat Hawraman). In Iraqi Kurdistan it contains Bajalani Shabak, in the Mosul Plain. Moreover, it embraces some

accents such as Origin Goran – covering Karand , Kohzaran in Kermanshah province , Hawrami – covering Lihon Hawraman in Iraqi Kurdistan , Hawaraman mountainous areas , Paweh , Palingan and Nawsood in Iran ; Another accent of Goran dialect is Bajalani covering Shabak community, north – east of Mosul, within the Mosul Plain. They fundamentally live in areas such Bashiq, Tilkef, and Qaraqosh in Iraqi Kurdistan.

Likewise, the old Dersim province, appears to be a shift point within the region governed by the Turks and Turkish language and the region is dominated by the Kurds and "Kurdish languages" (Arslan 2018). Similarly, the speakers of Zazai (Zazaki) accent as a branch of Goran dialect speak in some areas in Turkish Kurdish areas such as Dersim, Arzinjan, Mush, Bingul, Siwas and some other areas in Amed (Diyarbakir) as well. The religious minority of Alewi (Alevi) speaks Zazaki in those zones.

In this sense, Sorani , Bahadini ,Gorani and Kurmanci in each parts of Iran , Iraq , Syria and Turkey are spoken linguistically , lexically and phonologically differently from one another. According to the wave theory, linguistic changes spread like waves from a center of origin to its neighbors. This indicates that shared linguistic traits are a result of contact (Murawaki, 2015). This theory can be applied to each of aforementioned main Kurdish dialects. In another words, many Kurds in Iran, Iraq , Syria ,and Turkey use Farsi – Persian , Arabic , Arabic and Turkish respectively. For instance, the majority of Kurdish people in Iran use some identical lexemes such as nardban , a ladder , sandali , a chair , dastshoyi , a water closed , adab u rusoom , custom. Each of these words can be used Persian as well. Howere, many Kurdish speakers in Kurdistan Region of Iraq use qadirme , korsi and morafiq (awdest) for the three aforementioned words which originally can be found in Arabic as well. Likewise , a great

number of Northern Kurdish speakers use some Turkish vocabulary , for example araba for a car ,kapı for a door , yasak for ban , elektrik or ceyran for electricity. These are some few examples and need further research to be conducted in this area. However, Kurdish speakers living in Iran , Iraq , Turkey and elsewhere use some common words and expressions alike , pencere for window , kaxez for paper , mirov for human , jin for woman , hat for came , cho for went and many other identical examples.

As a result, these lexical variations in different Kurdish dialects indicate Kurdish linguistic convergence and divergence; however, when Kurdish native speakers from various geographical areas where Kurds live come together they still accommodate one another so that they can understand each other; despite the fact that Kurdish dialects from those areas are linguistically divergence, their communication can keep going successfully with understating.

Of particular interest in closeness of people for having a common ways of communication is dialect continuum. As In his primary investigation into a dialect continuum state, Trudgill (1974:15) perceives the Norfolk and Suffolk dialects that "...linguistic characteristics of [the] dialects change gradually from place to place. There is no clear linguistic break between [them]. It's also not clear where people 'choose' to place dividing lines. If a division is made at a territorial boundary then we accept state /political decisions, the division is political (Herson Finn. 1996).

As a result, convergence and divergence in dialect continuum can be seen in different rural and urban areas of Kurdistan Region depending on the extent of the closeness and remoteness of the people. For example , the accent of people from Balaki , including Majidawa , Balakyan ,Bapeshtayan , Gird Khiwat , and other linked

villages of Ballakyan is very identical to Dolmaryan areas of Mazne , Sardaw , Laylook and other rural the areas within Mergasor district ; therefore , the concept of dialect continuum plays a key role in the identical pronunciation and using the common expressions and words in such districts in Soran town lined to Erbil province.

This is likely to be because of the closeness of the people who communicate with one another closely, the people have the same lexicons, pronunciation and grammar; whereas, their accents are different from Rwandz , Choman areas; however , both are located in Erbil city. As a result, this convergence and divergence in dialect continuum can be seen in every geographical position in different parts of Kurdistan in Iraq, Turkey, Iran and Syria.

Another factor which may lead to variation of language and dialect in a specific region is likely the phenomenon of migration. Significant movements of residents across national borders for intention of long-lasting life have hastened in the contemporary period, as one of the unavoidable results of mobility (Chambers cited in Trudgill 2003).

Such a factor also can create homogenisation in language homogenisation. This might be due to the fact that the migrant groups can bring their foreign languages to new geographical territories. This phenomenon may separate early dialectologists' researchers from modern ones. This might be in view of the fact that early dialectologists had less considered the issue of migration in their research, whereas modern dialectologists have provided especially significant insights into this issue.

In this sense, the processes of pidginization and creolization in language change and variations are of particular interest. Abrahams (2005, p.139) stated that a pidgin language is required for out-

group communication, whereas creolized forms of narratives, songs, or displays are predominantly in-group defensive maneuvers. Likewise, there are some English pidgins still employed nowadays.

Similarly, Day (1972) argued that a pidgin is typically categorized by its simple or reduced morphological and syntactic constructions. Thus, they can be characterized by an absence of any complex grammatical morphology and a somewhat limited vocabulary. Also, morphologically, inflectional bound morphemes such as -s (plural) and -'s (possessive) on nouns in Standard English are uncommon in pidgins, however, structures like *tu buk* ("two books") and *di gyal place* ("the girl's place") are common.

Likewise, functional morphemes often take the place of inflectional morphemes found in the source language. For example, instead of changing the form of *you* to *your*, as in the English phrase *your book*, English-based pidgins use a form like *bilong*, and change the word order to produce phrases like */buk bilong yu/* means *book belongs to you*.

Similarly, Le Page, (1974), regarding pidgin and creolization has the below statements :

In the case of pidgins and contact vernaculars one finds, and must expect to find, a wide variety of results emerging from what appears to be linguistically 'the same' situation. This is apparent today in our survey in British Honduras; it must have been true on the West Coast of Africa or on the plantations in the 17th - 18th centuries. In the creolization phase, the amount of variation in the behavior of individuals was very quickly reduced by 'focusing' through daily interaction within small isolated communities, so that social norms emerged.

In this sense, when a pidgin develops beyond its role as a trade or contact language and becomes the first language of a social community, it is described as a creole. Tok Pisin is now a creole. Although still locally referred to as "Pidgin," the language spoken by a large number of people in Hawai'i is also a creole, technically known as Hawai'i Creole English (Day, 1972). Also, a French creole is spoken by the majority of the population in Haiti and English creoles are used in Jamaica and Sierra Leone.

Holm (1988-1989:6) claimed that the linguist's description of a creole language is associated with a whole speech community, frequently one whose descendants were moved geographically so as to their relations with their original language and sociocultural identity were moderately broken.

Le Page, (1974) Further exemplified the concept of creole as below:

The forms /brok/, /lef/, /los/ taking from Jamaican Creole may derive from the adoption of broken, left, lost as stative predicates distinct from the normal verb-cas as iWiniss happened also with one (/gaan/), and the use of their Creole reflexes as, apparently, action-verbs as a back-formation from this stative use under the influence of the grammatical thinking of the model language. Thinking this way, then: /hit brok; == It broke, it is broken. The English words broke, broken derive from a verb break. Jamaican verbs use the Creole reflex of the English verb invariably for both present and past. Therefore, /brok/ is the Creole reflex of English break.

Le Page, (1974), regarding creoles claims that:

In West Indian creoles rising final intonation is commonly used for both statements and questions, but is much more

pronounced in the latter case and is then frequently carried by a tag equivalent roughly to isn't it? or no? or nicht wahr? or n'est-ce pas? etc. In Jamaican Creole this tag commonly takes the form of /no! Or /na/.

Day (1972) further claimed that where education and greater social prestige are associated with a “higher” variety (e.g. British English in Jamaica), a number of speakers will tend to use fewer creole forms and structures. This process is known as decreolization. In this sense, the language of the Negro slaves in America is labeled as “being decreolized” (Day 1972: 5). Correspondingly, decreolization leads at one extreme to a variety that is closer to the external standard model and leaves, at the other extreme, a basic variety with more local creole features. Between these two extremes may be a variety of somewhat different varieties, some with many and some with less creole structures. This sort of varieties, developing after (= “post”) the creole has come into existence, is called the post-creole Continuum. Also, decreolization is a slow development, happening over a period of time. With the passage of time, the creole will come to look like the standard language more and more (Day 1972 : 6).

Consequently, in Jamaica, one speaker may say a fi mi buk dat, using the basic creole variety, another may put it as iz mi buk, employing a variety with fewer creole features, and yet another may choose it's my book, using a variety with only some pronunciation features of the creole, or a “creole accent.” It is also very common for speakers to be able to use a range of varieties in different situations.

Likewise, DeCamp (1971:351) recommends that for decreolization to happen, two conditions are required to be met. Firstly, the standard language, the prestigious language of the

speech community should be one of the paternal or giver languages of the creole. Secondly, the social factors which at one time prohibited creole speakers from progressing in the community is essential to be loosened enough in order to permit the creole speakers chance to enhance or improve themselves in the social order. Such a chance for social mobility gives the creole speakers motivation for changing their speech toward the standard language. When this occurs, it is clear that a condition could advance in which the dissimilarity between the creole and the standard language is not as easy as it was before decreolization. There are no longer two separate systems, but many varieties in-between the two extremes. Reinecke and Tokimasa (1934) claimed that this was the situation in Hawaii in the early 1930's and called it a dialect continuum. Reinecke, writing in 1934, describes this language mastery continuum (1969:21-22):

There is indeed a continuum of mastery. At one end of the scale is the uneducated laborer who, in atrociously mispronounced and extremely simplified English, can barely make known his elementary wants; at the other end is the exceptional immigrant, or more likely the son or grandson of an immigrant, who expresses himself in fluent, idiomatic, and adequate English but who retains a scarcely perceptible smack of the "foreign accent" and idioms peculiar to this language group.

Additionally, this issue has played an essential role in language change and variation in particular when there is a great interest in understanding the importance of spatiality and features of a city such as London. According to Pred (1985: 361) spatiality recognition is significant, because spatiality is constantly 'in a state of becoming – it is an ongoing and evolving process'. In this respect, apprehending the linguistic development and variation of any location over few many years ago is basically dependant on the

spatiality and characteristics of the place itself in which spoken language is employed. For instance, due to influx of many migrants such as Bangladeshi, Jews and many others to London over two centuries ago, some alterations have occurred nowadays in dialect of the city; for instance, Cockney is basically dealing with inner London "East End"(Pantagraph 1991). This dialect is spoken in the district of London and initially developed from the working-class diversity of London. The Cockney heartland was roughly a square mile between the Thames and the Barbican, bounded on the west by the Law Courts and on the east by the Tower of London. (Pantagraph 1991, p.B3). Here are some examples of phonological variations of cockney with their phonemic transcriptions and meanings:

1. Giz a butcher's at than then will you? It can be transcribed as //gɪz ə 'bʊtʃəz ə? ðæ? ðen wil jə/. It means 'Let me have a look at that then, will you?'. Also, the verb phrase of /gɪz/ here means give me. Similarly, the use of us for we is common in several varieties of non-standard English in Britain.

2. Get out of it! /ge? ɑ:ʔ əv ɪ?/. Of particular interest here is the use of three examples of glottal stop /ʔ/ in one sentence.

3. He ain't got the bottle to do it, has he? /i ʌɪn gɒ? ðə 'bɒ?əl tə du: ɪ?/æz i/

He doesn't have the courage to do it, does he?

The form ain't is common in non-standard British and American English. It can mean has not or is not. Notice the glottal stop between vowels in bottle and h-dropping in has he.

Another significant argument regarding life paths is the extension and perseverance of borders from generations of speakers, while the actual factor of these boundaries has long vanished. This phenomenon can apparently be witnessed and its results are practiced in the Fenland instance. In the past this zone was poorly negotiable and hospitable, this results in creation of a frontier between both East Anglia and East Midlands, and the south and north of England. The main reason for border was physical; this was due to the fact that the Fens contained unfriendly marshlands. In this sense, Physical restrictions on mobilization in the region inspired its inhabitants to direct towards locations where are close and available for work, amusement and provided facilities. Such a perception about area and annexation emerges from necessity for safety. Such a sense is obtained via typical and regularly visited spaces. Chambers, Trudgill and Schillings-Estes (2004) argue that community safety can be endangered as soon as mingled routines and social networks are split and interrupted by immigration, employment indentation, suburbanization and colonization. In addition, he states that routines are spontaneously and immediately rooted in the individuals' mind which is well-known as "Ontological security". This occurs as strangers arrive this routine comes under attack and the major incomers pursue continuation of their practices and satisfy their wishes for security which ultimately results in dialect contact.

It is obvious that stereotype is likely to be a common feature of many researchers. Thus, although Labov has conducted many studies in sociolinguistics, his ideas can not be one hundred percent correct. It is worth mentioning that Labov (1972) in his study on island of Martha's Vineyard , Massachusetts , conducted a direct observation of a sound change of the first elements of the diphthongs /ay/ and /aw/ amongst some major ethnic minorities of the island such as Portuguese , Indians and New England residents.

Meanwhile, his approach is mainly concentrated on claims made by speaker in sound shifting. This can not be true, because speakers themselves may lie and not tell the truth. For that reason, it is generally argued that most of the variationists, researchers can be to some extent favoritism in conveying their information when they conduct their investigations on a particular community. In addition, it is highly likely that even some members of community itself to be bias, since they may not represent the whole members of the society when those members are informants in research. In this regard, in the case of Labov, it is likely such a case to be true. Since, it is claimed that although he discussed a wide range of topics including a historical background regarding the island and its major inhabitants, diphthong shifting of /aw / , /ay/ and so forth. These can be positive points in a way. On the other hand, it seems that, he has been a generalist, taking into consideration much information in this research instead of being more specific in his ideas. Also, his study is a combination of both quantitative and qualitative example in which the quantitative is dominated the qualitative one, because general information is presented in more descriptive way. Furthermore, it seems to be so bias and stereotypical in his perspectives. This is due to the fact that he constructed his ideas in a way as if he was member of Martha's Vineyard society. In other words, his individual stereotypical and personal ideas might not reflect the exact circumstances of residents and their language variation.

Methodology and data analysis

The main methodology used in this study is qualitative, taking advantages of the ideas from various dialectologists, variationists and ethnographers regarding the concept of space. Likewise, for comprehending the notion of the space, it is vital to take advantage of certain various perspectives of the first and modern

dialectologists, variationists and ethnographers. In this respect, several differences and resemblances exist in their perceptions, approaches and methods with regard to the concept of space in the field of language variation and change. It is broadly claimed that early dialectologists simply concentrated on a number of specific and limited fields in their investigations regarding the space rather than considering thorough and wide-ranging studies in the field of the space. In this respect, various methodologies and techniques have been used to explain the concept of Space. Such methodologies contain 1.Restricted Approach by Labov in 1966 in which he indicated a restricted area of study in New York City.2.Trudgil's investigation focused on five various locations in the city of Norwich in 1974; Trudgill's main emphasis was placed on spatiality. 3.Hand-drawn map task by Preston in which Preston (1999 a: xxxiv) in his study employed a new approach called hand-drawn map task thereby he could assess informant's feedbacks regarding spoken language differences in the USA. This technique is of great interest for contemporary dialectologists in selecting the geographical borders of regional dialects as well.4.A Free-choice listening task: In such a technique Montgomery (2010) ,used informants who could listen to a voice model and required to place, for instance, a cross on an empty map which corresponds to the origin of the model. Subsequently, Listeners were requested to marker each cross with the related letter to every model.

Conclusions and results

It is of great importance for researcher to avoid treating space as homogenized, historically, socioeconomically and institutionally blind blank canvas. This is likely due to the fact that there have existed different approaches regarding the space by early and dialectologists, variationists and ethnographers. In the past, early scholars regard space as an empty canvas; their scopes of

perception as regards the space were restricted. However, nowadays owing to latest development in technology, transportation system and globalization, studying space has been facilitated by contemporary scholars. Consequently, it seems that this significant area of investigation into the space, namely spatiality probably had been a little attention by early dialectologists such as Labov over the past decades. Because, as earlier mentioned, Labov in his study in New York City in 1974 purely rested upon one side of the city. This can be considered as a drawback in his investigation. One solution for this problem could be taking advantage of many areas in his study rather than one place. Additionally, in his investigation into Martha's Vineyard in 1972 regarding vowel shifting in particular of [ay] and [aw], he constructed his study on the basis of claims made by participants. Likewise, his study involves greatly the quantitative approach. Such a research may pave the way for more bias by the researcher. Stereotype is likely to be a common feature of all variationists, ethnographers and dialectologists in particular those whose researches are quantitative. Likewise, the space not only has impact on variation and change phonologically, but also morphologically and syntactically as well. As, Day (1972) stated that a pidgin is not anyone's first native language and has no history of native speakers. As a result , the syntax of pidgins can be fairly dissimilar to the languages from which terms were borrowed and improved, as can be seen in this example from an earlier stage of Tok Pisin : Baimbai hed bilongyu i-arrait gain : ‘by and by head belong you he alright again ‘ which means “Your head will soon get well again”. Here, apart from syntactical variations, some phonological variations can be witnessed. As a result, the phrase, by and by due to assimilation and elision processes have been changed to /Baimbai/ in which the process before assimilation was / baiand bai/ , but after assimilation two changes happened. Firstly, / d/ phoneme due to elision process was deleted, secondly, / n/

phoneme because of assimilation process changed to /m/ phoneme ; this is because the adjacent sound affect one another and can be altered for the facility of better saying the words. Syntactically, Jamaican verbs employ the Creole reflex of the English verb invariably for both present and past. Consequently, /brok/ is considered a Creole reflex of English break. Likewise , syntactically , for instance in place of altering the form of you to your, as in the English phrase your book, English-based pidgins use a form like bilong, and modify the word order to make up phrases such as /buk bilong yu/ means book belongs to you. Also , morphologically , inflectional morphs such as -s (plural) and -'s (possessive) on nouns in Standard English are uncommon in pidgins, however ,structures like tu buk (“two books”) and di gyal place (“the girl’s place”) are common. Such a form as a pidgin can be used in Jamaican English. Likewise, Kurdish language with its main dialects can be used differently in terms of convergence and divergence; for example, phonologically Zazaki as a branch of Guran dialect use /v/ instead of / w/ , for instance , they pronounce , the Kurdish word Newroz as Nevroz. Correspondingly , Very often Northern Kurdish speakers pronounce / o:/ sound as / u:/ , for example , they utter the Kurdish word bo [bo:] , means why as [bu:]. Also, lexically, they are different as well. For instance , Kurdish people in Iran call ladder , narban , a Persian word , whereas , in Soran dialect it is called qaderma , whereas in Badini , a subdialect of Northern Kurdish it is well-known as Sirda, Also ,Badini call market , Sik which is a loan translation of Suq in Arabic. Likewise , syntactical structure of sentence of Kurdish main dialect is almost all SOV (Subject + Object + verb) , Cho mal (Kurdish Northern Dialect) means : He/She went home. However, they are various lexically, for instance, Ruyshte mallewe (Central Kurdish: Sorani) means he went home. Also, they vary grammatically. For instance, the English sentence, *The gardener watered his/her garden* can be used differently in Central Kurdish

as *Bakhawaneke bakhchey awda* , and in Northern Kurdish it is employed as *Baghavani baghcha avda*. As a result, it is strongly recommended that studying space should be conducted with further investigation in language variation and change; in particular a small number of examples of Kurdish language have been given. Furthermore, in some situations, Northern and Central Kurdish are morphologically different in particular when the plural noun is used in isolation, the Kurdish Northern dialect can be used as a singular noun , whereas Central Kurdish as plural , for instance , boys is *kur* in Northern , but it is *kurrekan* or *kurrekan* , a plural noun in Central Kurdish.

References:

- Abrams, K.D. (2018), Writing with a Dialect: Adolescents' Written African American English and Teachers' Perceptions, The University of Wisconsin - Madison.
- Abrahams, R.D. (2005). Everyday Life, a Poetics of Vernacular Practices. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Available at <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1860777696/C11342FDC7374DC6PQ/1?accountid=13631> (Accessed 20 April , 2019)
- Anonby, E.J. (2003), "Update on Luri: How many languages?", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 171-197. Available at <https://search.proquest.com/docview/218964914/4C641645CC4B90PQ/1?accountid=13631> (accessed 10 April 2019)

- Arslan, Z. (2018) ‘A discussion on perceptions and reflections on Zazaki and Zaza identity.,
- Border Crossing: Transnational Working Papers, 8(1), pp. 267–296. Available at: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=131193575&site=ehost-live> (Accessed: 1 March 2019).
- Asatrian, G. S. (2009), “Prolegomena to the Study of the Kurds”, Iran and the Caucasus, vol.
- 13.1: 1-59.
- Auer, P., Hinskens, F. & K Erswill, P. 2005, *Dialect change: convergence and divergence in European languages*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Auer, Peter and Schmidt, Jürgen E. (eds.) (2010). *Language and space: theories and methods: an international handbook of linguistic variation*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter and Co.
- Britain, D. (2002). *Space and spatial diffusion*. In Jack Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.) *The Handbook of Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell. 603-637
- Britain, David and Cheshire, Jenny (eds.)(2003).*dialect levelling and geographical diffusion in British English*. Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Britain, David and Cheshire, Jenny(2003).Social Dialectology.In J. K. Chambers (ed.) *Sociolinguistics of immigration*. Amsterdam, Benjamins. 93-113
- Britain, David, (2007).*Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Britain, David (2010). Conceptualizations of geographic space in linguistics. In: Lameli, Alfred, Kehrein, Roland and Rabanus, Stefan, (eds.) ***Language and space : an international handbook of linguistic variation. Language mapping***. Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 69-97.

- Chaman A., B. and Amiri, C. (2018) 'Gurani: practical language or Kurdish literary idiom?', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 45(4), pp. 627-643. doi: 10.1080/13530194.2018.1430536.
- Chambers, J.K, Trudgill, Peter and Schilling-Estes, Natalie (eds.) (2004). *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Day, R.R. (1972), *Patterns Of Variation In Copula And Tense In The Hawaiian Post-creole Continuum*, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Available
- <https://search.proquest.com/docview/302622363/17D461E50F904524PQ/1?accountid=13631>
- (Accessed 25 April, 2019)
- DeCanip, D. (1971) ,Toward a generative analysis of a post-creole speech continuum. In Hymes, 1971, 3^9-370.Available <https://search.proquest.com/docview/302622363/17D461E50F904524PQ/1?accountid=13631> (Accessed 25 April, 2019)
- From To Mesopotamia and Kurdistan in Disguise With Historical Notices of Kurdish Tribes and the Chaldeans of Kurdistan, (2008), *The International Journal of Kurdish Studies*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 59-76.Available <https://search.proquest.com/docview/216680400/4D97BFE4B0B74D6BPQ/1?accountid=13631> (Accessed 21 April ,2019)
- Hassanpour, A.H. (1992).*Nationalism and Language in Kurdistan, 1918-1985*. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press.

- Herson Finn, V.S. (1996), *What is "NAS"? Toward a theory of ethnolect in the South Slavic dialect continuum*, The Ohio State University.
- Holm, John. 1988-89. *Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge Language Surveys. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kerswill, P. (2003) *Dialect levelling and geographical diffusion in British English*. In: Britain, D. and Cheshire, J. (eds.) *Social dialectology: in honour of Peter Trudgill*. IMPACT: Studies in Language and Society (16). Benjamins, Amsterdam, 223-243.
- Labov, William (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics
- Lameil, Alfred, kerein, Roland and Rabanus, Stefen(eds.)(2010). *Language and space: an international handbook of linguistic variation*. Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton and Co.
- Llamas, C. 2001. "The sociolinguistic profiling of (r) in Middlesbrough English." In H. Van de Velde and R. van Hout (eds.). 'r-atics: Sociolinguistic, Phonetic, and Phonological Characteristics of /r/, 123-139. Etudes & Travaux. Institut des Langues Vivantes et de Phonétique, Université Libre de Bruxelles.
- Karimipour, A., Ghaderi, S. and Alinezhad, B. (2017), "On the lexical stress patterns of Ilami Kurdish", *Acta Scientiarum. Language and Culture*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 191-201.
- Khorshid, F. (1983). *Kurdish Language and the Geographical Distribution of its dialects*, trans. By Kadhim Sa'adedin. Baghdad: Ishbeelia Press.

- Le Page, R.B. (1974), Processes of Pidginization and Creolization. Available at: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/64042640/E2DC240209B4656PQ/13?accountid=13631> (Accessed 22 April, 2019)
- Montgomery, Chris (2010). Sprachraum and its perception. In: Lameli, Alfred, Kehrein, Roland and Rabanus, Stefan, (eds.) ***Language and space : an international handbook of linguistic variation. Language mapping.*** Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 586-606.
- Murawaki, Y. (2015), "Spatial Structure of Evolutionary Models of Dialects in Contact", *Plos One*, vol. 10, no. 7. Available at: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1700107646/943F28C73BA0431APQ/5?accountid=13631> Accessed: 20 April 2019)
- Preston, Dennis Richard (ed.) (1999). **Handbook of perceptual dialectology: Dialect recognition.** vol. 1, Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- Qualls, C.D. (1998), *Figurative language comprehension in younger and older African-Americans*, The University of Memphis. Available at: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/304483129/9BDD7E25B0CC4915PQ/20?accountid=13631> (Accessed: 26 April, 2019)
- Reinecke, J E. , A. Tokimasa. (1934) , The English dialect of Hawaii* American Speech 9.48-58, 122-131 .Available at <https://search.proquest.com/docview/302622363/17D461E50F904524PQ/1?accountid=13631> (accessed 26 April , 2019)
- Schilling-Estes, N. (2002). "On the nature of isolated and post-isolated dialects: Innovation, variation and differentiation", *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 64-85.

- Shahsavari, F. (2010) 'Lakī and Kurdish', Iran & The Caucasus, 14(1), pp. 79–82. doi: 10.1163/157338410X12743419189423.
- "Sound of the Cockney Fading Away: FINAL Edition." Pantagraph, Jun 16 1991, p.B3. Available <https://search.proquest.com/docview/251897186/6A1C4F37680C49F0PQ/11?accountid=13631> (Accessed 25 April 2019)
- Smith, F.L.M. (2008), *Life after work: Identity, communication, and retirement*, University of Missouri - Columbia. Available at: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/905178701/299EA82B2F1A449CPQ/12?accountid=13631> (Accessed: 28 April 2019)
- Torgersen, E. & Kerswill, P. (2004), "*Internal and external motivation in phonetic change: Dialect levelling outcomes for an English vowel shift*", *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 23-53.
- Trudgill, P. (1974). *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P. & Hannah, J. 1982. *International English: a guide to varieties of standard English*. Edward Arnold.
- Unger, C. (2014) 'Badini Kurdish modal particles dê and da: procedural semantics and language variation', *Kurdish Studies*, 2(2), pp. 177–200. Available at: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=103430089&site=ehost-live> (Accessed 20 March , 2019).
- Yusefvand, R 2008, 'Some Laki Demons', Iran & The Caucasus, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 275–279, Available at: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=36562923&site=ehost-live>. (Accessed 18 March , 2019).

پوختە:

ئەم توپۇزىنەۋەيە لىكۆلئىنەۋە دەكات لە چەمكى بۆشايى زمانەۋانى ۋەكو بابەتلىكى گرنگ لە نىۋ زانستى شىۋەزارناسى ، زمان و گۆرپانكارى زمان ،بە ھەر سى چەشنە سەرەكەيەكەي كە پىكەۋە جىگەگرتنى زمان پىكدىنن كە برىتن لە بۆشايى ئوقلىدوسى ، بۆشايى كۆمەلايەتى و بۆشايى بەرجەستە.ھەرۋەھا رووناكى دەخاتە سەر جۆرە سەرەكەيەكانى رېبازە لىكۆلئىنەۋەكانى بەكارھاتوو لەلايەن شىۋەزارناسان ، زانايانى نىشانەكانى نەتەۋە ، زمانەۋانانى شارەزا لە گۆرپانكارى زمان كە رۆللىكى بەرچاويان لەم بابەتەدا گىراۋە.توپۇزەران سوود لە رېبازى لىكۆلئىنەۋەي جۆرى ۋەسفى بۆ شروڤەي داتاكانيان ۋەرگرتوو.

ھاۋكات ، توپۇزىنەۋەكە مەرامىيەتى باس لە كۆمەللىك كەموكۆرى لە رافەکردنى بابەتى بۆشايى زمانەۋانى بكات كە لە نىۋان شارەزايانى بواری زمانەۋانى كۆمەلئاسى بەدى دەكرىت و ھەندى چارەسەر بۆ ئەم پرسە دەخاتە رپو ، بۆ نموونە ، زانا لاۋۇف لە توپۇزىنەۋە سەرەتايەكەيدا كە سەبارەت بە شارى نيۇيۆركى ئەمەريكا ئەنجامى دابوو ، ناۋچەيەكى سنووردارى لە لىكۆلئىنەۋەكەيدا لە بواری شىۋەزارناسى بەكار ھىنا لەكاتىكدا شىۋەزارناسانى دىكە سووديان لە ناۋچەي فراۋانبيان ۋەرگرتوو لە بواریكانى شىۋەزارناسى ، زمان و گۆرپانى زمانەۋانىدا.

ھاۋكات ، توپۇزىنەۋەكە زياتر تىشك دەخاتە سەر كۆمەللىك نموونە لە ھەردوو زمانى ئىنگلىزى و كوردى لەم بواریدا.لەكۆتاييدا ، ھەندى ھۆكار كە رۆلئان لە دروستكردنى بۆشايى زمانەۋانى ھەيە دەخىنە رپو.

ملخص:

يتناول البحث مفهوم الفضاء كموضوع مهم في علم اللهجات واللغة والتغيير ، وعلى انواعها الرئيسية الثلاثة التي تبني معا مجتمعة المكانية: الفضاء الإقليمي ، والفضاء الاجتماعي والفضاء المدرك. علاوة على ذلك ، البحث سوف يسلط الضوء على الأنواع الرئيسية للطروق المستخدمة من قبل علماء اللهجات الأوائل والمعاصرين ، وأخصائيي الاختلافات والأثنوغرافيين- الخبراء الأجناس البشرية الذين ساهموا بشكل كبير في الفضاء ، مع الاستفادة من المنهج الوصفي النوعي .

يهدف البحث ايضا إلى مناقشة بعض العيوب في تفسير الفضاء بين علماء اللغة وتقديم بعض الحلول لهذه القضية. على سبيل المثال ، أخذ لابوف ، لدراسته المبكرة في مدينة نيويورك ، منطقة محدودة ، في حين أخذ علماء اللهجات الآخرون في الاعتبار مجالات موسعة من علم اللهجات واللغة والتغيير .

بالإضافة إلى ذلك، الدراسة ستلقي الضوء على بعض الأمثلة على الفضاء باللغتين الإنجليزية والكردية. أخيرًا ، سيقوم البحث بتوضيح بعض العوامل الرئيسية التي يمكن أن تلعب أدوارًا رئيسية في بناء الفضاء .