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Preface

There has long been a need for a book in English about the Dutch language that presents important, interesting information in a form accessible even to those who know no Dutch and have no immediate intention of learning it. The need for such a book became all the more obvious to me, when, once employed in a position that entailed the dissemination of Dutch language and culture in an Anglo-Saxon society, I was continually amazed by the ignorance that prevails with regard to the Dutch language, even among colleagues involved in the teaching of other European languages. How often does one hear that Dutch is a dialect of German, or that Flemish and Dutch are closely related (but presumably separate) languages? To my knowledge there has never been a book in English that sets out to clarify such matters and to present other relevant issues to the general and studying public.¹

Holland's contributions to European and world history, to art, to shipbuilding, hydraulic engineering, bulb growing and cheese manufacture for example, are all aspects of Dutch culture which have attracted the interest of other nations, and consequently there are numerous books in English and other languages on these subjects. But the language of the people that achieved so much in all those fields has been almost completely neglected by other nations, and to a degree even by the Dutch themselves who have long been admired for their polyglot talents but whose lack of interest in their own language seems never to have disturbed them. And so the task of writing a book about Dutch in a language other than Dutch has fallen to a foreigner, but it is one I'm only too keen to fulfill. I have had close contact with the Netherlands for over a decade now during which time I have come to cherish many aspects of Dutch culture, but none so much as the language. This book is the result of my twelve year old 'affair' with the Dutch language.

After English and German, Dutch is the most important Germanic language, spoken by some twenty million people in Holland and Belgium. Outside the Low Countries it is little known or studied, although many more universities in the world teach Dutch than is generally realised. I hope this book will go some way towards enthusing those readers who do not yet know any Dutch, into reaching for a grammar and delving further into the language.

There are numerous books in English on the development of French and German which are intensively used by the English-speaking student of those languages, so there must be room for at least one on Dutch. There is actually more available in English on Frisian than there is on Dutch, a fact which seems to have

¹. The one exception to this statement is a booklet which appeared while this book was being prepared: "Dutch – the language of twenty million Dutch and Flemish people", published by the Stichting Ons Erfdeel, Rekkem, Belgium, 1981.
been overlooked by Dutch scholars. I expect a common reaction among academics teaching Dutch to be that their students should be able to consult reputable Dutch works on the topic and thus have no need of a book such as this. Why then, I ask such critics, does this argument not apply to French and German in which the tertiary student has usually had a school background, unlike Dutch, which is nearly always commenced after leaving school?

The Dutch language sources which I have drawn on for my information are, generally speaking, now somewhat old, not written in a Dutch that is easy for foreigners to follow, and most go into far greater detail than is necessary for the undergraduate student. What is more, the subject matter of the various chapters of this book is only to be found in numerous Dutch books – no one Dutch language text covers everything I have here, which makes acquisition of all relevant texts expensive and difficult, or even impossible.

The originality of this book lies in the synthesis of the material. Most of it is available only in Dutch, which, quite apart from being inaccessible to the English speaker, is often unpalatable even to the Dutch speaker because the Dutch texts are so antiquated or erudite or usually both. This fact has no doubt been partially responsible for the waning in interest in historical grammar among students of Dutch in Holland and Belgium that has occurred over the last few years. Much of what I present here is extremely basic, but precisely because it is so basic, and yet has never been available in English, it is high time that it appears in a book such as this. The chapter on historical phonology is an example of a new approach to a well documented subject: whereas all previous Dutch works on the topic have presumed (formerly rightly, but increasingly wrongly) that the reader had a knowledge of Gothic and Common Germanic, and thus they worked forward from the oldest forms of sounds to what they are in Dutch today, I have reversed the process. Nowadays most people have not done any Gothic, not even students of Germanic languages – at least this is the case in the Anglo-Saxon world – and therefore it makes more sense to work back from the known, i.e. the sounds as they are today, to the unknown, i.e. the sounds as they were in Common Germanic times. And because people tend to think in terms of how sounds are written, rather than how they are pronounced, I have taken the graphemes as the starting point. Continual contrast with English and German also helps to illustrate what is being explained – after all ohne Vergleichung, kein Verständnis.

As many of these matters are normally only discussed in Dutch, I was often faced with the difficulty of how to render certain concepts in English. For example, the main dialects of Dutch are called in Dutch Hollands, Brabants, Vlaams etc. but how should one refer to them in English? Vlaams can clearly be translated by the word Flemish, but Hollands and Brabants? Some writers have called them Hollandic, Brabantic etc. I find this however rather forced, as indeed is also the word Netherlandic which does nevertheless seem to enjoy some support, chiefly in America. I have opted for leaving such Dutch words untranslated, as I have also done with the words plat, cultuurtaal, beschaafd and Randstad, for example. Thus such words appear in the text in italics, but they are defined in the glossary.

It is perhaps also necessary to defend my use of the word Holland, as used in the title for example, where it refers to what is otherwise known as the Netherlands. I maintain that whatever the feelings of the Dutch may be on the use of Holland and
Nederland in Dutch, the attitude of the English speaker is quite different. Anglo-Saxons think of the country primarily as Holland and to refer to it consistently as the Netherlands, as I would have done had this book been written in Dutch, sounds unnatural and even pedantic. If and when the term Holland is used in reference to the former county of Holland (i.e. the present-day provinces of North and South Holland), this is made clear in the text. Where the word Hollands has been left untranslated, it refers to the dialect of those provinces and is not used as a synonym of Nederland which is rendered by the word "Dutch".

There has always been an overwhelming emphasis in language departments at Anglo-Saxon universities on the literature of the languages concerned, which has not been the case to anything like the same extent in Holland and Belgium. Tertiary students enrol to do a foreign language and once they have progressed beyond the basics of the grammar, they find that the language is often subordinate to the literature. I make a plea with the appearance of this book for Dutch studies at English-speaking universities not to go or continue to go in the same direction as French, German and Italian studies; an interest in the language in its own right should be encouraged, with or without an accompanying study of the literature of the language in question. Often the study of language history is either brushed off as too difficult for undergraduates or, alternatively, it is pooh-poohed as being a waste of time – the latter reaction is always a sad reflection of the ignorance of the speaker, whereas the ‘difficulty’ of historical language study, particularly of historical phonology, will, it is hoped, be alleviated by the approach I have employed in this book.

The interest in the historical study of Dutch I hope to generate with this book will encourage some readers to want to read more. With this in mind, every chapter is accompanied by a bibliography of works (including a commentary on the relative worth, importance, difficulty etc. of the books) on that facet of Dutch studies dealt with in each chapter. This book can thus be regarded as the Anglo-Saxon student’s first introduction to the interesting world of the Dutch language and can be used as a stepping stone into the wealth of literature that exists in Dutch on the topic.

The structure of the book warrants a word of explanation at this point. Section 1, the present, is likely to be of use to people who, at least initially, have no need of section 2. It is intended primarily for those with no knowledge of the language who wish to know what the learning of Dutch entails and/or how it differs from, or is similar to, English and German. Section 2 part A, the external history of the language, should be of equal use to both those who do and those who don’t know any Dutch, whereas part B, the historical grammar, will probably only be fully appreciated by those with more advanced knowledge of the language. By incorporating section 1 and 2 in the same book. I am, it is true, trying to kill several birds with the one stone.

I should perhaps point out one apparent inconsistency in the structure of the book. Whereas the chapters on modern phonology and morphology have parallel chapters in the historical section, I have not included an historical counterpart to chapter 7, the chapter on word order. This is in part a reflection of the situation as it is in Holland and Belgium. There has simply been very little done on the historical syntax of Dutch, and what has been done, is so rudimentary and unsystematic as to be unsuitable for incorporation in a book such as this.
Originally I intended incorporating chapters on Frisian and Afrikaans, but on reflection I decided against this. Firstly, to have done so would have made the book rather long and secondly, although Frisian and even Afrikaans could be said to be part of the 'linguistic history of Holland and Belgium', I would not have wanted to imply that they are not separate languages. In addition, there is already a number of texts in English on Frisian, as previously mentioned, and although this is certainly not the case for Afrikaans, the subject really warrants greater treatment than an additional chapter in this book could have given it. This is not to say, however, that I have not referred regularly to Afrikaans where the situation there is able to shed light on the situation in the Netherlands.

Because of the rather large scope of this book and the diversity of people that it is intended for, I have attempted to make it complete in itself – thus the glossary which includes an explanation of many terms that may be known to the linguist, but will be new to many laymen. Similarly a knowledge of the history of the Low Countries is useful for a thorough understanding of some of the issues covered in this book but I have not presupposed an acquaintance with Dutch and Belgian history. Therefore, on occasions, there are quite extensive accounts of historical events that are integral to an understanding of the linguistic concepts being discussed. An example of this is the quite detailed chapter on events in Belgium, where, in order to understand the present, an account of past events is unavoidable; thus the occurrence of a basically historical chapter in section 1.

Of course I have had to be selective in deciding what to incorporate and what to exclude. Some people will undoubtedly disagree with aspects of the selection I have made. My criterion for inclusion of data in this work has been largely what I myself have found either interesting or important about the Dutch language over the years of my acquaintance with it. On occasions I even resort to personal impressions and opinions that may not be shared by others but which are based on my experience of Holland and Belgium as a native-speaker of English from the 'colonies'. For example, some of my comments on upper and lower class usage and attitudes to Belgium many a Dutch or Belgian academic may be unprepared to put in the same terms; but as an outsider looking in, I can, I feel, be permitted to convey the impressions I have received.
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## Abbreviations and Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>accusative (case)</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr.</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>masc.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>ME.</td>
<td>Middle English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative (case)</td>
<td>MNL.</td>
<td>Middle Dutch (lit. <em>Middelnederlands</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>NHG.</td>
<td>Modern German (lit. New High German)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>for example</td>
<td>NNL.</td>
<td>Modern Dutch (lit. <em>Nieuwnederlands</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>nominative (case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>OWLF.</td>
<td>Old West Low Franconian (i.e. Old Dutch prior to 1100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fris.</td>
<td>Frisian</td>
<td>p.</td>
<td>page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>part.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germ.</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>pej.</td>
<td>pejorative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>genitive (case)</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmc.</td>
<td>Germanic</td>
<td>pron.</td>
<td>pronounced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE.</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>that is</td>
<td>Wgmc.</td>
<td>West Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infl.</td>
<td>inflected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interr.</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{á, ô, ū etc.} = \text{original long vowel in Germanic} \]
\[ \text{ā, ō, ū etc.} = \text{long vowel of later origin (usually by lengthening in open syllable)} \]
\[ \text{â, ô, ū etc.} = \text{short vowel} \]
\[ > = \text{became, changed into} \]
\[ < = \text{is derived from} \]
\[ [ ] = \text{phonetic transcription (usual meaning)} \]
\[ * = \text{a reconstructed form (placed before a word)} \]
Section 1  The Present
Map 1: The Netherlands and Belgium showing provincial borders and main cities.
1 What is Dutch?

Dutch is the mother tongue of some 14 million people living in the Kingdom of the Netherlands (also known as Holland), of some 6 million so-called Flemings living in Belgium (the remaining 4 million Walloons speak French) and is also spoken by a chiefly rural population numbering about 150,000 in the north-west of France (French Flanders). In addition, it is the official language of the Republic of Surinam and of the Leeward group of islands of the Dutch Antilles (Curaçao, Aruba and Bonaire) – this is not to say that it is necessarily the mother tongue of these peoples, but it is spoken by most of the population (250,000 and 264,000 respectively). Although Indonesia has been independent since 1948, there are still many older people who were educated under the Dutch in the former Dutch East Indies and who still speak the language very well. After the war approximately 300,000 Indonesians chose to move to Holland where all assimilated, at least linguistically, very well. In the years prior to the granting of independence to Surinam (Dutch Guyana), many of the Creoles, Indians, Negroes, Javanese and Chinese chose to move to Holland (half of the population in fact) and these people have also been linguistically assimilated. Surinamers have, in effect, continued to arrive in Holland since their independence in November 1975. It should also not be forgotten that hundreds of thousands of people left the Netherlands, in the 1950's in particular, to settle in Canada, U.S.A., Australia, South Africa and New Zealand. Many of these have retained their mother tongue, although many have not preserved it as well as other similar migrant groups in the countries mentioned.

Afrikaans, which has gradually developed from the Dutch of the first settlers that arrived in South Africa in the seventeenth century, is spoken by about 5 million people as mother tongue (2½ million Whites and 2½ million Cape Coloureds) and is used by millions more of all races as a second or third language. It is reasonably easily understood by speakers of Dutch, particularly in its written form.

So what might at first glance appear to be one of Europe's minor languages is, in fact, spoken by a considerable number of people in the world as a whole. When looked at in an historical perspective there was of course a time when the Dutch sailed the high seas to every corner of the earth where their influence was felt and their language used. The few Dutch-speaking areas outside Europe mentioned above are the meagre remains of that period.

As this book is to deal with many different aspects of the concept Dutch, definition of a certain number of terms is imperative at this early stage. The terms I will attempt to define in the following paragraphs can be quite confusing, often having more than one meaning depending on context and the point of view of the user. They have also often led to misconceptions which are wide-spread both within Holland and abroad, not the least in English-speaking countries.
Dutch

It may have struck the reader as strange that the country should be known as Holland or the Netherlands and yet the people and their language are designated by the word ‘Dutch’. Those with a knowledge of German will immediately recognise the word as being cognate with *Deutsch* but probably still wonder how this semantic shift occurred. After all, in Dutch itself the word *Duits* (formerly spelt *Duitsch* – see p. 41) means German too.

It is worth spending a little time on the origin and connotations of these cognate words as it is both an interesting and an important issue in a book such as this. Etymologically these forms are all to be traced back to a Germanic word *Þeoda* (tribe, people) and the adjective pertaining to this word, *Þeodisk*. The word was first recorded in Latinised form in the second half of the eighth century i.e. in the Carolingian era and area and thus very close to, if not in the Netherlands. The word occurs in Old High German as *diutisk*. By this time many of the Germanic peoples that had moved southwards during the Great Migrations (see p. 85) were becoming romanised and the term *frankisk*, for instance, was already ambiguous. An unambiguous name to denote the Germanic speech of the area, as opposed to the Vulgar Latin Speech of Gaul as well as the Latin of the Church and the learned, was *theudisk* i.e. the language of the people. Subsequently it came to denote all the German peoples. Further cognate forms are Teutonic, often used as a synonym for Germanic, and the Italian word *tedesco* (German).

The Germanic peoples of both the Low Countries and Germany called themselves *Duits(ch)ers/Deutsche* and their language *Duits(ch)/Deutsch*, although from the seventeenth century on the designation *Nederduits* (Low German) was commonly used in Holland, as it was in the north of Germany where the concept it designated was in fact somewhat different. In Germany the term *Niederdeutsch* refers to all those German dialects, most of which are Saxon based, that did not take part in the Second German Sound Shift (see p. 123) and which do not form the basis of the standard written and spoken language known as *Hochdeutsch*.

According to the Oxford Dictionary entry under ‘Dutch’, Germany was known to its inhabitants from the 12th and 13th centuries as *Deutschland* and in the 15th and 16th centuries the word ‘Dutch’ in English meant German, including the Low German of the Netherlands. When the Netherlands became an independent state in the late 16th century and then emerged in the 17th century as a great seafaring nation, in which capacity there was much contact with England, the word underwent a narrowing of meaning in English and came to designate simply the (Low) Dutch of the Seven United Provinces, otherwise known in English as the Dutch Republic. In Holland the word retained its original ambiguous meaning until the late 19th century, although usually in the form *Nederduits*; it gradually ceded to the less ambiguous *Nederlands* in the early 20th century.

Dutch also knows an Ablaut variant of the word *Duits*, namely *Diets*. Seen

1. It is conventional in historical linguistics to place an asterisk beside reconstructed forms to indicate that they are only hypothetical. The symbol þ is a former rune which is used to designate voiceless th.
2. The word is still preserved in the names of two of the Dutch Reformed Churches in South Africa, *die Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk, die Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk.*
historically, the modern word *Duits* is derived from the Middle Dutch *duutsc*, the Hollands form of the word, whereas *dijtsc* was the Flemish form in the Middle Ages. What were thus originally merely regional variants of the same word are now separate words. *Dijts* is or has been used in some circles to designate Dutch, particularly the idea of the whole Dutch-speaking area e.g. *Dijtsgezind* (pro-Dijts). The term *Dijts* was commonly used by the NSB, the Dutch Nazi movement. An interesting remnant of its former wider use is the expression *iemand iets dijts maken*—to make something clear to someone (lit. to explain it in the vernacular).

**Nederlands**

The most common and only official designation for Dutch in the language itself is *Nederlands* (formerly *Nederlandisch*). As was mentioned above, this term fully replaced *Nederduits* as the most usual name from the beginning of the twentieth century although it was commonly used long before that time. Some early English books refer to Dutch as Low Dutch, a literal translation of *Nederduits*. Standard Dutch, which is discussed in more detail on p. 17, is called *Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands* (General Cultivated Dutch) and is often referred to by the abbreviation *ABN*. During the last few years there has been a concerted effort in Belgium to replace the word *Vlaams* (see below) in all official titles and correspondence by the word *Nederlands*, reinforcing the idea that there is in fact no distinction between *Nederlands* and *Vlaams*, e.g. the *Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Taal en Letterkunde* in Ghent had its name so changed in the said period. In speech the term still competes with *Vlaams* in Belgium and in the Netherlands it competes with the word *Hollands* (see below). In linguistic and other learned circles the terms *Noord-ens Zuidnederlands* are often used when it is necessary to make a distinction between the Dutch of Holland and that of Belgium. For instance, Van Dale's dictionary, the one most commonly consulted in both countries for the final word on language issues, designates peculiarly Belgian words and phrases as *Zuidnederlands*, this in keeping with the name *Zuidelijke Nederlanden*, which is often used in historical contexts. The term *Zuidnederlands* can however also refer to anything south of the rivers (see p. 13); of course usage in Belgium and in the provinces of Holland south of the rivers is also very often the same.

From time to time there have been attempts to introduce the word Netherlandic into English to render more adequately the feeling behind the Dutch word *Nederlands*. It was felt, and still is by some academics for example, that English people associate ‘Dutch’ only with Holland whereas the word *Nederlands*, as mentioned above, also designates the language of northern Belgium, commonly known as Flemish (see below). Particularly after the publication of C.B. van Haeringen's *Netherlandic Language Research* in 1954, the term enjoyed some currency in certain restricted circles. His aim was to indicate that when studying Dutch language and literature, one was dealing equally with both Holland and Belgium. Fortunately the word seems to have died a natural death and I would like to lay a final sod of earth on its grave in this work. I regard it as one of the tasks of a book such as this

3. Art historians refer to the Flemish and Dutch schools of painting combined as Netherlandish art. This limited use of such a word in such a limited circle seems to me to be legitimate.
to encourage the general use of the word ‘Dutch’ to indicate the language of both countries. This is in line with official Dutch and Belgian practice and is also in accordance with the desires of the Internationale Vereniging voor Neerlandistiek (International Association for Dutch Studies).

It should be added that in certain official titles in English the word ‘Netherlands’ can be used as an adjective e.g. Royal Netherlands Embassy. In Holland and Belgium it is usual to refer to the study of Dutch language and literature as neerlandistiek (formerly sometimes nederlandistiek) and one who has graduated in same is a neerlandicus (plural neerlandici; the feminine form neerlandica has on the whole ceded to the masculine these days). Neerlandicus competed for some time with neerlandist but now seems to have won the race. Lacking any suitable equivalent in English, those in the field usually employ the Dutch words when the need arises. After all, even Germanists can only call themselves such in initiated circles in English.

Hollands

It is common over a wide area of the Netherlands, especially in the provinces of North and South Holland and in Utrecht, to use the word Hollands as a synonym for Nederlands. The origin of this very common practice is the same as the English tradition of calling the Netherlands ‘Holland’ i.e. because of the economic might of these two coastal provinces (with which also Utrecht allied itself culturally and linguistically) the rest of the country was, and to a certain degree still is, overshadowed. In English there are no social overtones and in fact to refer consistently to the country as the Netherlands often sounds pedantic or like translated Dutch. Many people living outside the provinces mentioned object to the country being referred to as Holland and the language as Hollands and for this reason the word is never used in official contexts. In linguistic circles it refers to the dialect of North and South Holland (see p. 13).

Flemish

Flemish, the English translation of the Dutch word Vlaams, is a word that has often been used incorrectly in English and has thus been the cause of many misconceptions. If I begin with the various connotations of the word Vlaams, how these misconceptions arose in English will become self evident. Vlaams can have four meanings, depending on the context and who is using the word:

1. First and foremost it designates the Dutch dialects of the two Belgian provinces West and East Flanders, although dialectologists would see only Westvlaams as

4. It is interesting to note that in bilingual South Africa, where the words Dutch and Dutchman have long been derogatory terms used by the English to designate Cape Dutch/Afrikaans and Afrikaners, it is not uncommon to hear the words Nederlands or (Hoog)hollands being used in English to refer to Dutch. A Dutchman too is nearly always called a Hollander to avoid the above unfortunate connotation. Most university departments of Afrikaans are entitled Departement van Afrikaans en Nederlands because of the indivisability of the two in history.
pure Flemish and *Oostvlaams* as a mixture of Flemish and *Brabants* (see p. 17). The
dialect of the north-west of France, the area known as *Frans-Vlaanderen*, is also
called Flemish. This definition of the meaning of Flemish/*Vlaams* is one which
would be known only to scholars of Dutch on the whole.

2 In the everyday speech of Dutchmen *Vlaams* is Dutch as spoken in Belgium (see
p. 33).

3 In the speech of Belgians the word *Vlaams* designates Dutch as spoken by them,
regardless of which Dutch-speaking province they hail from.

4 Finally, there are many people who live under the misconception that Flemish is
a separate, if related language to Dutch. The idea is extremely wide-spread in
English-speaking countries and many a linguistic publication will classify Flemish
as a separate language in the family of Germanic tongues. Because of Belgium’s
separate history since the late sixteenth century, it is not surprising that this mis-
conception arose and became so wide-spread. I am sure that many a Frenchman
too does not realise that the *patois* of the hinterland of Dunkirk which he labels as
*flamand* is in fact but a dialect of the fully accepted ‘cultural language’ he calls *holl-
landais* or *néerlandais*.

The historical background of this problem will be looked at in greater detail later
in the book (see p. 20). Suffice it to say at this stage that there is no such thing as
written Flemish; it is but one of several Dutch dialects and exists only in speech – a
literate Fleming writes Dutch.
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1 South Hollands
2 Kennemerlands
3 Waterlands
4 Zaans
5 West Frisian – North Holland
6 Utrechts
7 Zeeuws
8 Westhoeks
9 West Flemish and Zeeuws Flemish
10 Dialect of the area between West and East Flemish
11 East Flemish
12 Dialect of the area between East Flemish and Brabants
13 South Gelders
14 North Brabant and North Limburgs
15 Brabants
16 Dialect of the area between Brabants and Limburgs
17 Limburgs
18 Veluws
19 Gelders-Overijsels
20 Twents (former county)
21 Twents
22 Stellingwerfs
23 South Drents
24 Central Drents
25 Kollumerlands
26 Gronings and North Drents
27 Frisian
28 Bildts, Town Frisian, Midlands, Amelands

N.B. Very generally speaking, the higher the number, the greater the distance from standard Dutch.
2 Dialects and Standard Dutch

The previous chapter, which attempted to define the various names by which the language is called in Dutch and English, already inevitably touched on dialectal issues. Dialectology is a field which has attracted much attention in Holland and Belgium since its foundation as a recognized scientific pursuit in the nineteenth century. Many volumes have been and still are being written on this inexhaustible aspect of the Dutch language. My aim here is a modest one. I intend simply to define what is generally regarded to be a dialect in the Netherlands and to comment on the relative importance and main features of the various dialects.

The Oxford Dictionary's definition of a dialect is a convenient starting point for discussion of this complicated aspect of Dutch studies: 'One of the subordinate forms or varieties of a language arising from local peculiarities of vocabulary, pronunciation and idiom. In relation to modern languages usually specifically a variety of speech differing from the standard or literary "language"... Also in a wider sense applied to a particular language in its relation to the family of languages to which it belongs.' Starting with the latter part of the definition this is what one means when one talks of Dutch being a 'Germanic dialect'. If one hears Dutch being referred to as a German dialect, either the speaker is using the word German as a synonym for Continental West Germanic, as is sometimes done, or he is mistaken - the relationship of Dutch to German is fraternal, not filial.

But now to return to the main part of the definition of a dialect. As the dictionary defines a dialect here in general terms, so this definition applies in specific terms quite neatly to the situation in Holland and Belgium too, with certain qualifications. Not every regional variant of Dutch is necessarily considered to be dialect - it usually depends on the degree to which the various aspects of the language mentioned in the above definition (i.e. vocabulary, pronunciation etc.) diverge from the standard.1 It is in fact impossible to draw definite lines between certain dialects and then in turn between certain dialects and the standard language. One is, in effect, faced with a continuum of local speech as one travels from region to region. One good example of this is the continuum that exists between Zeeland, Zeeuws-Flanders and West Flanders and yet one talks in dialect circles of Zeeuws and West Flemish as separate entities.2 For this reason Van den Toorn, in his

1 It is common in Dutch linguistic circles to replace the word dialect with streektaal - regional language. Any sociologically negative connotations of the word dialect are then avoided and the term can also have a broader application i.e. it can refer to standard Dutch which contains just a little local colour, or even Frisian, usually regarded as a separate language, can be referred to as a streektaal and thus one avoids the argument of whether Frisian is or isn't a dialect of Dutch.

2 The two most characteristic features of Zeeuws/West Flemish are the confusion of g and h and the lack of diphthongisation in words containing ij and ui e.g. ies and muus where the standard language says ijs (ice) and muis (mouse).
excellent little introduction to Dutch linguistics, maintains that it is safer to talk of
the dialect of Enschede, for instance, or the Drents of Ruinen i.e. of specific towns
or villages. By so doing one avoids creating the impression, which so many dialect
maps based on clusters of isoglosses give, that a certain unity and delimitation exist
which in reality are not present.

Dialects don’t observe provincial or even national borders. Leaving Frisian
aside because of its somewhat unique status as a separate written language, I shall
confine myself here to the Saxon and Franconian based dialects. Those dialects
spoken along the Dutch-German border are regarded as either Dutch or German
dialects according to which of those two languages the speakers of those dialects
regard as their standard written language or cultuurtaal. The farmers on either side
of the border in any given area speak virtually the same dialect in accordance with
tribal settlement in the Dark Ages (see p. 85), but when they go to read a book or
write a letter, the Dutch farmer will read and write standard Dutch, based on the
language of the west of Holland, whereas the German farmer will read and write
standard or so-called High German, based on the language of central Germany.
Were they to exchange books or letters, they could not understand the other’s
language and yet in practice they speak the same dialect.

If one accepts the demarcation of Dutch dialects along the eastern border based
on the above socio-political criterion, the dialects of Dutch can be broadly classi-
fied as follows:4

a. The Saxon based dialects of Groningen, Drenthe, Overijssel and part of Fries-
land and Gelderland. One talks of Gronings, Drents and Stellingwerfs (in Friesland)
but Overijssel and the Saxon-speaking areas of Gelderland are divided into smaller
units and here one talks, for example, of Sallands and Twents in Overijssel and
Achterhoeks and Veluws in Gelderland.

Broadly speaking the river IJssel is the traditional border between the Saxon-
speaking and the Franconian-speaking regions (see map 3), but the Veluwe, whose
dialect is Saxon, lies west of the IJssel and reaches almost to Amersfoort.

b. The sociologically and historically more important Franconian based dialects:
Hollands (with numerous sub-divisions such as Westfries, Amsterdams, Rotterdams
and even Utrechts), Zeeuws, Flemish, Brabants and Limburgs.

Demarcation of Dutch dialects in the south is not as difficult as in the east due to
the clearly defined language border with French that runs through Belgium (see
map 7). Generally speaking it is also impossible to draw lines between the (Zeeuws-
Flemish, Brabants and Limburgs dialects of the Netherlands and those of the same
name on the Belgian side of the border: the dialects are of course much older than
the separation of Holland and Belgium which occurred in the late sixteenth century
(see p. 24).

It would go beyond the scope of this book to start listing the characteristics of the
various dialects mentioned above. Anyone interested in detailed information on

3 Toorn, M.C. van den, Nederlandse Taalkunde. Spectrum, Utrecht 1973, p. 68.
4 For a very detailed definition of what constitutes a dialect of Dutch, see Goossens, J.
Inleiding tot de Nederlandse Dialectologie. Michiels, Tongeren 1972. pp. 11-30. A defini-
tive classification of Dutch dialects is impossible because of the difficulty in drawing lines
but J. Daan’s map (map 2) gives a reasonably clear picture of the main divisions.
Map 4: The Netherlands and Belgium showing significant rivers, swamps, polders and dykes.
the topic can consult the texts recommended in the bibliography at the end of this chapter. It is perhaps useful, however, to mention some of the striking regional differences which are known to, and easily recognised by all Dutchmen.

In the dialect of Groningen there is a certain Frisian substrate (see map 9 for the historical reasons) which is, for instance, reflected in the frequency of family names ending in -inga, -stra and -ma, endings that are otherwise regarded as typically Frisian. But Gronings and the other Saxon based dialects are most characterised by the fact that they consistently pronounce the final -en in the many words that have this ending in Dutch as a syllabic n (see p. 55); after bilabial consonants the n is even pronounced as a syllabic m e.g. loomp (<loopen), krabm (<krabben). It is usual in the Franconian based dialects to drop this final n in natural speech.

Hollands, the basis of the standard language (see p. 17), knows regional varieties but none of these diverges so much from the standard that it is no longer intelligible to speakers of ABN. Westfries, the rather confusing name given to the Hollands dialect spoken in the area north and east of Alkmaar which was formerly enclosed by the Westfriese omringdijk bears, like Gronings, signs of Frisian substrate (see map 9). Actually this is the case to a certain extent with all the Hollands dialects. Well-known characteristics of Hollands include:

1. devoicing of initial v and z – the former is now accepted in ABN but the latter is not (yet?). e.g. voeten (pron. foete), zeven (pron. seve).

2. a tendency to diphthongise long o and e as in brood (bread) and weten (to know) to [o.a] and [e.i] respectively.

3. in Noordhollands (Westfries) the fricative gutteral in the combination sch- is pronounced as a stop e.g. school > skool.

4. the ABN diminutive ending -(p/t)je becomes -ie e.g. huisje > huisie, boompje > boompie.

The dialect of the city of Utrecht, an area that has traditionally been closely identified with Holland, is particularly noted for its tendency to drop final r’s e.g. Utrecht > Utereck, gepest > geapos (posted).

Although Zeeuws shares certain important features with West Flemish, notably those mentioned in footnote 2 on page 9, it does not share other typically southern features and is not generally regarded as a southern dialect. The status of this dialect is similar to that of the province of Zeeland itself i.e. lying on the coast and having thus been closely involved with Holland in maritime ventures through the ages, Zeeland has always been regarded as part of the prosperous north, as has Utrecht. The social connotations of the Zeeuws dialect are thus different from those of the true southern dialects.

Daily one hears in Holland the expression ten zuiden van de grote rivieren (south of the great rivers); a synonym thereof is beneden de Moerdijk (under/south of the Moer Dyke), that being the dyke that traditionally ran westwards from the confluence of the Meuse and the Waal to Hollandsch Diep (see map 4). The river complex that runs east-west through the centre of the Netherlands consists, in

---

5. -inga (pron. inxa) is an old genitive plural e.g. Kruisinga, Huizinga; -stra, a contraction of sitter (inhabitant) e.g. Dijkstra, Heemstra, Steegstra formed from the nouns dik (dyke), heem (home) and steeg (lane); -ma, formed from a contraction of the genitive ending -a added to a dative plural place name ending -um e.g. Miedema, Abma.
Map 5: The High German Sound Shift in Limburg. Line 1 – the Uerdinger Line between ABN ik/oek/-lijk and High German ich/auch/-lich. Line 2 – the Panninger Line between ABN sl/sm/sn/sp/st/zw and High German schl/schm/schp/schtr/schw (NB: according to the rules of German orthography [sp] and [st] are written sp and st). Line 3 – The Benrather Line between ABN maken and High German machen. Adapted from A. Weijnen, Nederlandse Dialectkunde, Assen, 1966.
order from north to south, of the Lek (in fact the main bed of the Rhine under another name), the Waal (an arm of the Rhine that breaks away soon after the river crosses the border into Holland from Germany) and the Meuse, called the Maas in Dutch. The Meuse forms the border between Dutch and Belgian Limburg for quite a distance as it flows north from France, but it then turns west and runs parallel with the Rhine/Lek and the Waal to the important delta south of Rotterdam. These rivers have played a unique role in the history of Holland, often forming a last line of defence against attack from the south or, as in the winter of 1944, acting as a barrier to liberation by the Allies. The rivers form a rough border between the Catholic south and the Protestant north, although there are notable Catholic enclaves north of the rivers too. Geographical factors such as mountains, lakes and rivers commonly form barriers between individual languages or dialects of a particular language – the river complex of the Netherlands is a classic example of this phenomenon. What is commonly referred to as southern Dutch (Zuidnederland) in Holland includes Brabants and Limburgs. In a broader sense it also includes the Brabants and Limburgs of Belgium as well as Flemish; however, the average Dutchman, and even Belgians for that matter, refers to all the dialects on the Belgian side of the border collectively as Flemish.

Brabants is an historically important dialect which has contributed considerably to the vocabulary and pronunciation of the standard language (see p. 101). It is usually immediately evident from his pronunciation whether a speaker hails from Brabant or Limburg, even though his Dutch may be pure ABN otherwise. There is one sound in particular which betrays a southern origin, namely g (also ch). The Dutch refer to the southern g as a zachte gee (soft g i.e. more palatal) by which they mean that the sound resembles that in German ich and thus differs distinctly from the northern g which is considerably more gutteral than even the sound in German ach. The uvular pronunciation of r is traditionally somewhat more common in the south and the trill is often more exaggerated than north of the rivers (see p. 54). The Dutch even have a verb to describe the sound – they often say of a southerner hij brouwt zo verschrikkelijk (he trills his throaty r so much).

North of the rivers there is a tendency to devoice initial v and z; this is not the case in the south. Southerners always clearly distinguish between initial f and v on the one hand and s and z on the other.

Although the beschadfd southern speaker uses it less, southern dialects are also typified by a particular form of the diminutive which is so ubiquitous in Dutch. Rather than adding -(p/t)je to the noun, they use -(s)ke e.g. huiske, boomke, kapske. In addition, southerners often use gjij/ge instead of jij/je as the second person form of address (see p. 171).

Limburg is one of the few corners of Holland where true dialect is spoken even by the many town dwellers. There is even a great regional pride in the dialect. The

---

6 The Land van Maas en Waal, part of the province of Gelderland and the area where the city of Nijmegen is situated, belongs linguistically and sociologically to the south, unlike the rest of Gelderland.

7 In some southern dialects the original distinction between g and ch, now both pronounced unvoiced in ABN, is still preserved i.e. g is pronounced as a voiced and ch as an unvoiced fricative.
somewhat wider gap than usual between Limburgs and the standard is due largely to the fact that this dialect shares several features with High German (see map 5 and p. 123). One small corner of Limburg, notably the towns of Kerkrade and Vaals, even lies south of the Benrather Line (i.e. the maken/machen line) which is generally accepted in linguistic circles as the border between Low and High German. However, the Uerdinger Line (i.e. the ik/ich line) runs even further north and takes in nearly all of Limburg. Also the transition from High German [J] to Dutch [sX] occurs in Limburg, most of the province retaining the German sound (see map 5). The overall effect of these factors is that Limburgs sounds more like German. It is, in fact, a good example of a border dialect being considered a dialect of Dutch because its speakers, for socio-political reasons, recognise ABN as their cultuurtaal. Applying purely linguistic criteria, one could probably more correctly classify it as a dialect of German (see p. 93).

The everyday speech of the cities, particularly the Randstad, cannot be termed dialect. It is close to the standard in most respects, the cities always having acted as linguistic melting pots. In the Randstad it is more common to draw social distinctions and to call the language of the lower classes volkstaal. The degree to which one's speech can betray one's position in the social order is quite marked in Holland. What I have called volkstaal here is a classification commonly used by dialectologists to designate what the layman colloquially refers to as plat. The body that deals with dialect research in Holland is the P.J. Meertens Instituut voor Dialectologie, Volkskunde en Naamkunde, Keizersgracht 596-571 in Amsterdam. The Taalatlas van Noord- en Zuidnederland (i.e. for all of Holland and Belgium) is housed here. In Groningen there is also a separate body that deals with the Taalatlas van Oost-Nederland – the Nederlandsch Instituut, a department of the State University of Groningen. The main periodical for articles on dialectological problems is Taal en Tongval, a Belgian publication with regular contributions from Holland, which was founded in 1947.

The dialect situation in Belgium is much more complex than in Holland as most of the Dutch-speaking population learns a dialect at home before progressing to...
the standard which is also a concept not as easily defined as in Holland. Broadly speaking there are four main dialects in Belgium which correspond roughly to provincial divisions: West Flemish, East Flemish, Brabants and Limburgs. It is as difficult to draw lines between them individually as it is to draw lines between them collectively and the dialects spoken on the Dutch side of the border. They too form a continuum. The very real existence of true dialect speech throughout Flanders has been part cause of the considerable difficulties which Belgium has been confronted with since the early nineteenth century. But the situation in Belgium is so complex and so important that it warrants a separate chapter (see p. 20).

The future of dialect speech in both Holland and Belgium is difficult to speculate on. There is no doubt, particularly in Holland and to an ever increasing degree in Belgium, that communications, education and the modern media are contributing to a certain levelling-out in language and that more people are abandoning their dialect in favour of the standard, often because of social pressure. At the same time there has been an obvious increase in regional consciousness and regional pride in Europe during the last decade or so. This is all the more remarkable because of the simultaneous decrease in national awareness due to the Common Market and Nato. This curious phenomenon is being reflected in a renewed interest in regional speech as well as in other aspects of local culture. Articles in dialect in local newspapers are now common-place in many areas in Holland, for example.

The increased mobility of people, with more people than ever before shifting to live and work in areas other than those where they were born and bred, as well as the concept of commuting to work, are also having an effect on the spread of the standard language at the cost of the dialects. 13

Before looking in detail at what is understood to be standard Dutch, one is reminded that the dialects as described above are not deviations from the standard language, as is commonly believed by the layman, but that the standard is in fact the product of those dialectal variations.

Standard Dutch — *Algemeen Beschaafld Nederlands* (*ABN*)

The equivalent of so-called Oxford English or the King’s English in the Netherlands is *Algemeen Beschaafld Nederlands* (General Cultured Dutch), usually referred to by its initials *ABN* or, particularly in Belgium, simply *AN*. When talking of such a concept in either Dutch or English circles, one often feels compelled to add ‘so-called’ because in the case of both languages, it is difficult to define exactly what we mean, and yet in a general sense we all know what we mean. The term *ABN* is frequently used to designate this rather abstract concept; its use is often criticised but its critics offer no better substitute. In addition, Dutch and Belgian opinions of what is and isn’t *ABN* often differ. Nevertheless some sort of positive definition must be attempted. One can say that what the average speaker of Dutch in the Netherlands regards as *ABN* is the language of the provinces of North and South

13 A good example of this are the reclaimed areas of the IJsselmeer, the so-called IJsselmeer polders; although contiguous with the Saxon-speaking east of the country, they have been populated chiefly by Hollanders from the west (see map 2).
Holland with Utrecht – in other words the language of the Randstad. The exact reasons for why the speech of this area emerged as the basis of the standard are discussed in chapter 12. But although ABN originated in this area, this does not mean it is spoken by all who live in the region, nor that it is not used outside the said area. Equally one can speak Dutch with a clearly Brabant or Groningen accent, for example, without being accused of not speaking ABN. Quite obviously then, pronunciation in itself is not a determining factor although one could argue that it depends to what degree the accent is Brabant, Groningen, etc.\footnote{Dutch also knows a la-di-da pronunciation of ABN, but even this, as Jo Daan points out, is in fact the accent of a given area within the Randstad, namely The Hague – Leiden. (Daan, J., \textit{Van Randstad tot landrand}, Noordhollandse Uitgeversmij. A'dam 1969. p. 15.)}

A definition of ABN that was formerly commonly cited but which is clearly invalid for the reasons given above was: the best Dutch is that which does not betray in any way the region from which the speaker hails. Van den Toorn offers the following definition of ABN: ‘One can assert that an ABN speaker is one who generally accepts the vocabulary of a normal school dictionary as his own and one who actively uses it’.\footnote{Toorn, M.C. van den, \textit{op. cit.} p. 64, where he himself falls back on an earlier definition formulated by Kloke.} Van den Toorn offers this definition with certain reservations as nearly everyone does that attempts to define the concept. Koelmans says of ABN (in translation): ‘ABN may one day become an entity but certainly is not that at the moment. Actually it is an abstract which becomes evident if one attempts to formulate a conclusive definition’.\footnote{Koelmans, L., \textit{Inleiding tot de historische taalkunde van het Nederlands}. Bohn, Scheltema en Holkema Utrecht, 1979, p. 36.} Van Haeringen draws interesting comparisons and contrasts between the position of standard Dutch in Holland and that of standard English in England on the one hand, and that of High German in Germany on the other; he concludes, as the title of the book suggests, that the position of the standard is weaker than in England but stronger than in Germany.\footnote{Haeringen, C.B. van, \textit{Nederlands tussen Duits en Engels}. Servire, The Hague p. 11.}

But what is the position of the standard in Belgium? There is no doubt that there are distinct differences in pronunciation, vocabulary and even syntax between beschafte speakers in Holland and Belgium and yet one must concede that a Flemish professor or lawyer for example speaks ABN. A common name for their Dutch in linguistic circles is Algemeen Beschafte Zuidnederlands. Van Dale, the authoritative dictionary in Holland and Belgium, classifies words used by Belgians which they consider not to be dialect but AN, as Zuidnederlands. He passes no further judgement. The reaction of the average Dutchman to such zuidnederlandische is often one of disdain. The general adoption of a standard form of the language by all speakers of Flemish dialects is going on at present. Van Coetsem describes the language of beschafte Flemings as ‘oscillating between a sort of purified dialect and, in a few cases, a Dutch that is to all intents and purposes pure “northern” Dutch’.\footnote{Coetsem, F. van, \textit{De rijksgrens tussen Nederland en België als taalgrens in de Algemene Taal}, in Schippers, B.W., \textit{op. cit.} p. 103.}
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This very useful little book, written in simple Dutch, deals with many different aspects of linguistics in general terms, as well as with reference to Dutch; dialects and ABN are two such subjects dealt with. It contains good basic bibliographies with commentary.

A clear, total introduction to the topic with a good chapter on ABN and written in simple Dutch.

A reasonably technical, but good account of the topic.

(reprinted by Wolters Noordhoff, Groningen, 1977)
An excellent basic handbook on the principles of dialectology in general, as well as how they apply to Dutch in particular.

A simple book written for the layman.

This contains map 2 and elaborates further on that map as well as providing a small grammophone record.

The definitive work on Dutch dialects. Only for the specialist.
3 The linguistic situation in Belgium

- the origins of bilingualism in Belgium
- the Flemish Movement
- the situation today
- the differences between Noord- and Zuidnederlands

In the Kingdom of Belgium there is a friction between the two main language groups, the Flemish and the Walloons, which is scarcely to be matched anywhere else in Europe. As the Dutch language and the status of its speakers are at the heart of this controversy, the issue deserves treatment here. What follows is a matter about which emotions often run high.

It is impossible to understand the situation as it is in the 1980's without a knowledge of the history of which it is a direct product. Although there are several excellent books in English on Belgian history (see bibliography), and thus also on the linguistic situation that is Belgium, the emphasis here will be on those historical events which are of direct relevance to the position of Dutch in that country. The situation is a very complex but also a very important one; after all, one in every four native-speakers of Dutch in the world today is a Belgian, or, as they prefer to call themselves, a Fleming.

The various connotations of the word Vlaams (Flemish), and thus of the word Vlaming (Fleming), were explained on p. 6. The name of the French-speaking Walen (Walloons) is derived from that of a Celtic tribe, the Volcae, which inhabited various parts of Europe at the beginning of the Christian era. The Germanic peoples adopted the name Waals[ch] (German: Welsch < Wallisc) originally to designate Celts and later, after the romanisation of Gaul, as a name for the Romance peoples. In linguistic terms Waals was that which one could not understand i.e. French – compare German Kauderwelsch and Dutch koeterwaals i.e. Double Dutch, nonsense; also in German Rotwelsch is the word for the secret language of the underworld, usually called Bargoons in Dutch, which itself is possibly a corruption of Boergondisch (Burgundian) i.e. also French, the ununderstandable.

In Britain the newly arrived Anglo-Saxons also came into contact with a romanised Celtic people, as the Franks did in Gaul, whom they called the Welsh, there being a certain parallel at the time between Welsh and English on the one hand and Waals and Vlaams on the other. Various cognate forms of the word Walloon have thus been in circulation for centuries, but the name Wallonia, as a designation for southern, French-speaking Belgium, has only been current since the 1840's. In the word Belgium too lies the name of a Celtic tribe which the Romans found inhabiting the southern Netherlands i.e. the Belgae. The word had been used
during the humanist period for the whole of the Netherlands but was revived in 1830 when a name had to be found for the newly formed kingdom that was created out of the Dutch and French-speaking provinces of the southern Netherlands.

This is a convenient point to look at how the Netherlands (i.e. both north and south) originally emerged as a separate entity in feudal Europe and thus how French and Dutch speakers ended up within the borders of one country. For the origins of the language border see chapter nine. Not long after the death of Charlemagne, during whose reign (768-814) the finishing touches had been put on a united western Europe stretching from the north of Germany to Rome and the Pyrenees, a three-way split occurred in this empire. By the Treaty of Verdun in 843 the sons of Louis the Pious, son of Charlemagne, each took a share. Basically the three parts were France in the west under Charles the Bald, Germany in the east under Louis the German and the so-called middle kingdom under Lothar, a strip of territory starting in the Netherlands in the north and running south through Luxemburg, Alsace-Lorraine (Lorraine in Dutch and German is Lotharingen < Lothar) and Burgundy to northern Italy. In the tenth century this three-way division became a two-way one with Germany, then called the Holy Roman Empire, taking the Dutch and French-speaking Low Countries, and France taking the rest, including the county of Flanders which then stretched from the river Scheldt to Normandy (see map 6). The county of Flanders was predominantly Dutch-speaking and thus the national border between the kingdom of France and the southern Netherlands divided Dutch speakers, as it did French speakers. Flanders, however, remained economically and culturally part of the Netherlands, although the count of Flanders was a vassal of the king of France; all other nobles in the Netherlands owed allegiance to the Holy Roman Emperor. The relative isolation of the Netherlands from the maelstrom of feudal Europe in the post-Carolingian period led to the reinforcement of the idea in that region that they were a separate entity within a greater whole. Their proximity to the sea and their position at the mouth of the major waterways of Europe was a common denominator in their economic development which was, and still is, the source of their wealth.

The county of Flanders played a leading role in the economy and culture of the region at this time. The prosperity that resulted from the flourishing economy of mediaeval Flanders, based heavily on the cloth industry of Bruges and Ghent, meant that the beginnings of the Dutch written word were also here. This aspect is dealt with on p. 95. But Flanders, situated as it was on the language border and owing allegiance to the king of France, was also an area where Dutch and French met head-on and where the nobility and many of the up-and-coming middle class were undoubtedly bilingual. Here then were already the beginnings of a situation where, as a result of the later cultural and economic dominance of France and thus a belief that French was socially more acceptable and worthy of mimicry, many

1. It is indicative of the important role that French has played in the region, that Dutch-speaking towns such as Bruges, Louvain and Malines (Dutch: Brugge, Leuven and Mechelen) are known in English by their French equivalents where the French names are now regarded as English too; I have used them here but for lesser known places I have given preference to the Dutch name with the French equivalent in brackets.
Map 6: The Burgundian Netherlands (± 1500) showing language areas, the episcopal principality of Liège (a separate state till the 1790's) and the Rhine/Meuse/Scheldt delta as it was before reclamation was begun in earnest – compare maps 4 and 9.
Flemings would feel inclined to abandon Dutch in favour of French. Bruges reached the zenith of its economic development in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The first open revolt by Flemings against French rule occurred in 1302 at the Battle of the Golden Spurs (de Guldensporenslag) which is still regarded as a red-letter day in the history of the Flemish people.

In 1384 there was a union of Flanders, and by 1430 all the other Netherlands provinces, with Burgundy, whose prince was thus both a vassal of the French king and of the Holy Roman Emperor. The Burgundian period, which lasted till 1477, although economically and culturally speaking one of the greatest periods in Dutch-Belgian history, brought with it certain dangers for the future prosperity of the Dutch language in the south. The seat of the French-speaking Burgundian rulers in the Netherlands became Brussels and thus the court and the circles that surrounded it were French-speaking, but Brussels lay well within the Dutch-speaking part of the duchy of Brabant. The ramifications of this are still with us today and are the bane of Belgian political life, as we shall see later.

During the period in question the economic centre of the southern Netherlands, which was in fact the economic hub of the entire Netherlands at the time, shifted to Antwerp, particularly as Bruges’ access to the sea, the Zwin, had silted up. The important role that Antwerp plays in the cultural life of Flanders today is ultimately the result of this shift of economic activity from Flanders to Brabant; but, as we shall see, Antwerp’s fortunes were to oscillate greatly before it would become the cultural capital of Flanders it is today.

By inheritance, the Burgundian Netherlands passed to the House of Habsburg in 1477 and thus ultimately became part of the great European empire of Charles V. Although Charles was in fact born in Ghent and educated in Malines and was leader of the German-speaking Holy Roman Empire, this did little to dislodge the position of French in Brussels, the city in which he was both sworn in as Lord of the Netherlands and later abdicated. His court too was French-speaking, as were many royal courts at the time, and it is he who is reputed to have said ‘I speak Spanish to God, Italian to women, French to men and German to my horse’; the word German could at the time, and undoubtedly did in this case, refer equally to Dutch and German. Thus we see that in the region where Dutch and French confronted each other, the southern Netherlands, different social connotations began to be allotted to each very early in history.

In 1555 Charles V abdicated, dividing his possessions between his brother Ferdinand, who received the Holy Roman Empire, and his son, Philip II, who received Spain and the Netherlands. Charles regarded Spain as the real source of wealth in his empire because by this time Spain and Portugal were spearheading the discovery of the New World and bringing back fabulous riches from the Americas. The Netherlands were given to Philip as a useful military outpost against the Habsburgs’ arch-enemy, the king of France. They were also conveniently situated in case of war with England. In this way the Netherlands were separated in the east for ever from Germany and also clearly demarcated in the south by the border with

2. It should be noted that the important French-speaking episcopal principality of Liège remained as a separate independent entity within the southern Netherlands until 1794 when it was incorporated into the new state (see map 6).
France. However, the language border still ran through the middle of them and a situation which favoured French had already been set in motion.

In 1568, after a period of growing discontent among the Netherlanders against Spanish rule, the Eighty Years' War broke out. It would be this war which would cause a split in the Netherlands which would remain forever. The split was not, however, on the basis of language, but rather of geography. At this point the histories of Holland and Belgium part ways and the linguistic situations in both countries follow different paths too. After the break with the north, the place that Dutch had as *cultuurtaal* in Holland, was occupied by French in the south. The Dutch language in the south was left as a disunited array of dialects, with no one dialect managing to rise up over the others to form the basis of a standard language as happened in the north. Particularly in Brussels, French still stands above the dialect as the *cultuurtaal* for some Flemings. Supporters of Dutch language and culture can only lament that this break between north and south ever occurred, but the resulting separate developments are as interesting as they are complex, above all in the south. There are many good works in English on the Eighty Years' War, also known in English as the Dutch Revolt (see bibliography). Every student of Dutch should read at least one account of this all important split in the destinies and fortunes of the northern and southern Netherlands. More than anything else it is the reason for the many striking differences between Dutch-speaking Belgium and Holland today, not the least of which is the language. In fact, when George Bernard Shaw said 'England and America are two countries separated by the same language', he could just as easily have been talking of Holland and Belgium.

The Treaty of Münster (1648) concluded the Eighty Years' War and left an area corresponding approximately to present-day Belgium in Spanish hands, whence the name the Spanish Netherlands. The War of the Spanish Succession (1702-13) saw the territory pass to the Austrian Habsburgs and throughout the eighteenth century the southern Netherlands were consequently known as the Austrian Netherlands. The whole period saw further consolidation of French as the more socially acceptable tongue, as the language of the aristocracy and more and more also of the wealthy middle class who tried, as elsewhere in Europe, to mimic their betters. In fact a knowledge of French became a necessity as it was the official language. It must also be remembered that this was the zenith of the *ancien régime* in France and that all Europe was aping French manners and speech; even Holland was subjected to considerable French influence at the time, but the circumstances in the Austrian Netherlands made the country even more susceptible to the influence of its powerful southern neighbour.

The revolutionary period and subsequent Napoleonic occupation that brought an end to Austrian rule at the end of the eighteenth century, only did more to consolidate the position of French in the southern Netherlands. Holland did not escape the effects of the end of the *ancien régime* in France either, and even there discriminatory steps against the Dutch language were taken by the French occupiers. But legislation in favour of French and to the detriment of Dutch in government, the law and education for example, was simply more practical in the bilingual southern provinces than in monolingual Holland. One should not forget, however, that the lower classes, of which the majority were Flemings, were not bilingual. The fact that the lower classes were never in a position to abandon Dutch
for French was to be the ultimate salvation of the language in Belgium when more enlightened times dawned.

There is a certain poetic justice in the fact that the Congress of Vienna, which met in 1813 to sort out the borders of post-Napoleonic Europe, should decide to reunite the northern and southern Netherlands under a Dutch king, William I. The union was short-lived, however, but it was important for the future development of Dutch in Belgium after the two split again in 1831, because it awakened the flame of what is now called the Flemish Movement (de Vlaamse Beweging). William was an enlightened despot who believed that his new unitary state should have one overriding national language – Dutch. After all, 75% of the population of the Kingdom of the United Netherlands was Dutch-speaking. Immediately on assuming control of the south in 1814, William reversed all previous legislation favouring French. He then set about compiling his language decrees (de Taalbesluiten) which were announced in September 1819 but were not to be enforced until January 1823 – there simply were not enough Dutch-speaking bureaucrats and the like to make the transition immediate. Meanwhile French continued to enjoy a privileged position in administration, law and education, but at least the Frenchification of the Flemish provinces was brought to an abrupt halt. The decrees demanded that all official affairs in Flanders were to be conducted in Dutch and of course Dutch became the language of all national issues where the north was also involved. William also founded the State University of Ghent for the Flemish people, as well as a university in Liège for the Walloons. The introduction of Dutch language instruction in Ghent was slow, however, due to the position of firstly Latin and secondly French in the world of scholarly learning.

William’s taalpolitiek, coming as it did after a long period of heavy French domination, did not have any long lasting effect. On the foundation of the Kingdom of Belgium in 1831, the Dutch language there consisted chiefly of a conglomeration of local patois, with all affairs of substance once again being conducted in French. It should once again be stated, however, that if a Fleming wrote his native tongue, he wrote Dutch, as Flemish did not and does not exist as a written alternative to Dutch. The new constitution made no special commitment to French, but in effect it was the only language used in the government, law, army and higher education for the first forty years of the new nation.

To relate the fate of Dutch and the status of its speakers in Belgium after 1831, is to relate the story of nineteenth and twentieth century Belgian politics, and it is a story that as yet has no end. Much has been written on the topic, even in English, and interested readers are referred to the bibliography at the end of the chapter for further reading. Here we can but look briefly at the main events of the period which were of immediate importance to the position of the language in the new Belgian state.

The early leaders of the Flemish Movement, those that gave birth to the concept, were men of letters: Hendrik Conscience (1812-83) – his book, De Leeuw van

3. In 1788 J.B.C. Verloo, a politician, published an essay entitled Verhandeling op d'onnacht der moederlijke taal in de Nederlanden (Treatise on the neglect of the mother-tongue in the Netherlands). This was an appeal to his compatriots in the Austrian Netherlands to take note of the linguistic injustice and to rectify it. That such feelings could be interpreted as treason by the Austrian authorities is evidenced by the fact that the essay was written
*Vlaanderen* (The Lion of Flanders, 1838) reminded Flemings of their glorious victory against French domination in 1302 at the Battle of the Golden Spurs. Jan Frans Willems (1793-1846) was a philologist and ardent supporter of the equality of Dutch in Belgium; he was an advocate of the *Grootnederlandse Gedachte* (greater Netherlands idea) which favoured (also linguistic) unity with Holland. On the other hand, Guido Gezelle (1830-99), a poet-priest from Bruges was one of the earliest Flemish particularists who favoured following a separate line in linguistic issues from Holland.

Only later did the movement gradually become politically and socially oriented and it was not until World War I with the emergence of Frontism and Activism, that it assumed a more aggressive face. It is the present-day successor of that movement, the political party known as the *Volksunie*, which forced the government to introduce the language laws of 1962 (i.e. those that fixed the language border) and legislation dating from the late 1960’s to turn Belgium into a federal state.

The Flemings are and always have been in the majority, but the rapid industrialisation which Belgium underwent in the nineteenth century developed chiefly in Wallonia and Flanders declined. Flemings flocked south to work and were gallicised. Belgium was also quick to exploit the potential of the newest form of land transport, the railway, and soon an extensive railway system was taking Flemish commuters back and forth from the Dutch-speaking country-side to the French-speaking cities to work. In towns such as Brussels and Liège the Flemish worker was under great social pressure to conform linguistically. In the case of Brussels this is still a problem today, but in the nineteenth century the Fleming had no political power or social status behind him to resist. Nowadays, however, it is the industry of Flanders with its natural harbour in Antwerp that is developing at a faster rate than in Wallonia whose prosperity in the nineteenth century was based largely on the proximity of coal mines. Antwerp, in addition to regaining much of its former economic importance, especially since World War II, is at the same time also assuming more and more the role of cultural capital of Flanders, Brussels being unsuitable and unworthy. For too long the Flemings had been left without a clear cultural centre.

One of the problems the Flemish language cause had to face in the late nineteenth century was a division between the particularists, who favoured a separate written tradition from Holland based on Flemish usage, and the unitarians who had no objection to following protestant Holland in linguistic issues, and who saw all the more hope for their cause by so doing; after all, the Walloons had the backing of France. It is fortunate for a ‘small’ language like Dutch that the latter course of action won out in the end. Although there is still hesitation in the minds of some Flemings to be guided completely by northern usage, this trend is not to be reversed and it is remarkable how much standardisation, in favour of northern speech, has been achieved in the relatively short time that has elapsed. One can now say that the Flemings of Belgium truly do speak Dutch. This has recently been

anonymously and ostensibly published in Maastricht, outside the Austrian Netherlands, although in fact it was printed in Brussels. For this reason Verloooy is often regarded as the father of the Flemish Movement and the first true flamingant (Flemish chauvinist).
reflected in the abolition of the word *Vlaams* from all official titles e.g. *de Koninklijke Vlaamse Akademie voor Taal- en Letterkunde* in Ghent, an important cultural and literary body, is now called *de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie voor Taal- en Letterkunde* (changed in 1972); *het Ministerie van Vlaamse Cultuur* has also been renamed: *het Ministerie van Nederlandse Cultuur*.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, more and more concessions were made to Dutch in the civil service, the law courts and the schools. Not till 1878 did all administrative decrees and laws have to be published in both languages, however. But a true quality was to be long in coming and in some senses one can say that it has still not been completely achieved. During World War I, the injustices that still existed led to two movements which were to completely change the tone of the Flemish Movement – Frontism and Activism. Frontism is the name given to a mood of rebellion among Flemish troops fighting on the Front, who, while being commanded by French-speaking officers, were being asked to die for a country in which they were considered second-class citizens; the ‘law of equality’ of 1898 was not being enforced. Activism, on the other hand, was a movement which was supported by a considerable number of Flemings during World War I who saw the German occupation as an opportunity to further their own interests in achieving equality for themselves and their language. In 1916, for example, the State University of Ghent, which King William I had founded for the Flemings in 1816, was made Dutch-speaking by the Germans, only to revert to French after the war.\(^4\)

The ‘collaboration’ was to prove to be a temporary setback for the Flemish Movement after the war, but the true feelings of the Flemish people had been heard and there was now to be no turning back. In the period between the wars the *flaminganten* began to organise themselves politically and in time their ‘sins’ of the war years were forgotten. In 1930 the University of Ghent became Dutch-speaking and was to stay so. The language laws of 1932 also marked the beginning of an official policy of unilingualism whereby civil servants needed to be proficient in only one of the two national languages. This was thus the beginning of a ‘linguistic federalism’, a concept which now in the 1980’s is in the process of being applied to all aspects of Belgian society.

When Belgium fell to Nazi Germany in 1940, once again certain Flemish factions, now politically organised, fell in with the Germans. It is true that there were certain Fascist sympathies among some of them, but, as was the case in the First World War, it was more because there was still a gross inequality of opportunity for Flemings and thus collaboration was one means of rectifying this. The defeat of Germany in this war had a similar effect on the Flemish Movement as the same circumstances had had at the end of the other, although the socialist *flaminganten* had felt that the language issue should be shelved for the duration of the war. The movement took a decade to recover after the war. Its ideals were, however, kept alive by various small nationalist groups which began to reorganise themselves politically and finally amalgamated in 1954 to form the *Volksunie*, a party which was to become quite influential from the 1960’s on.

There were pressing social problems to be solved in the immediate post-war

\(^4\) In the 1960’s the *vervlaamsing (=vernederlandsing)* of the Catholic University of Louvain (*Leuven*), situated also well within the language border, would also become a burning issue.
period, such as reconstruction, the 'royal question', and the 'schools' struggle', plus the fact that the movement had to keep a low profile until its activities of the war years were forgotten. But in the 1960's the troubles started again. The increasing gallicisation of the capital, not helped by the adoption of Brussels as headquarters of Nato and the E.E.C., as well as the continuing lack of equality of Flemings and Walloons in business, the army and the diplomatic corps', were issues which still had to be solved. The 1960's also witnessed the economic revival of Flanders and subsequent decline of Wallonia, thus encouraging the Flemings all the more in their demands.

A cure for the evergrowing cancer known as Brussels (*de Brusselse agglomeratie*), situated as it was in the belly of Flanders, was to become the final and most difficult task the Flemish Movement had to deal with. Erecting a barrier against further expansion of Brussels, fixing the language border across the country and the subsequent creation of a truly federal state became the express aims of the Flemish Movement in the 60's, 70's and 80's.

Bilingualism in Belgium was to be understood as follows: the two national languages were to be equal but the jurisdiction of each would be limited to that part of the country where it is the mother-tongue of the majority, except for bilingual Brussels where either could be used. The language laws of 1962-3 fixed the border between Flanders and Wallonia but there were certain difficulties in so doing. For example, the area known as Komen-Moeskroen (Comines-Mouscron, population 75,000), which is predominantly French-speaking but not contiguous with a French-speaking province of Belgium (see map 7) was transferred for administrative purposes to Hainaut, although it is geographically part of West Flanders; the language rights of the Dutch-speaking minority in the area were to be preserved, however. In return for this obvious concession to the Walloons, the Voerstreek (Fourons, but also called Land van Overmaas, population 4,400), situated south of the Dutch Limburg border, was handed over to the Belgian province of Limburg; here Flemings are in the majority, although the region is not contiguous with a Dutch-speaking province but is geographically part of the province of Liège. As in the case of Komen-Moeskroen, the linguistic rights of the minority, in this case the Walloons, are preserved. There is, however, continual friction between the two factions due to the economic dependence of the Flemings in the area on the French cities to the south.

It should be pointed out that strictly speaking Belgium is a trilingual country with a sizeable German-speaking minority (60,000) concentrated along its eastern

5. The *koningskwestie* is the name given to the controversy which arose as a result of many people feeling that the king, Leopold III, had handed the country over to the Germans too easily and by residing in comfort in Germany for the duration of the war, he too was felt to have been guilty of collaboration. Conservative Catholic Flanders demanded the return of the king from Germany after the war, but progressive Wallonia opposed it. The Flemish vote outnumbered the Walloon vote and yet the king was forced to abdicate in 1952 in favour of his son, Baudouin (*Boudewijn*), the present king.

6. The *schoolstrijd* was the fight to retain government subsidies for Catholic schools, a Flemish cause, while at the same time building more non-religious state schools, a Walloon cause. A solution was found in 1958.

7. The Flemings were demanding only a 50/50 share of posts in the foreign service and of federal expenditure, which, considering the population splits 60/40 in their favour, seems a very reasonable demand.
Map 7: (a) The language border in the west as it is and is believed to have been in former times. Taken from the Winkler Prins Geschiedenis der Nederlanden, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1978 (volume 1, p. 81). (b) The language border and the various linguistic communities in the present-day Kingdom of Belgium. (c) The language border in the east featuring the Voerstreek (i.e. the area of the Fourons, a small river).
border in the so-called East Cantons. Belgium already possessed German-speaking territory prior to World War I but this increased in size after that war as a result of a decision of the Treaty of Versailles to reward Belgium and punish Germany. This so-called Eupen-Malmédy area belongs to French-speaking Liège, but the language rights of the German-speaking minority are guaranteed by the constitution. The whole north-eastern corner of Belgium is a region where in the course of time French has made considerable gains at the cost of Germanic speech, whether it be Dutch or German.

When the language border was fixed in 1962-3, the metropolitan area of Brussels was also restricted to 19 communes. In addition 6 peripheral communes (see map 8) got taalfaciliteiten for their French-speaking minority; this means, for example, that French-speaking children, although living in Vlaamstalig Brabant, as it is often called, can go to French language schools. This is not possible in the rest of Flanders, nor is the reverse the case in Wallonia. 80% of Brusselaars (Bruxellois) are French-speaking but many people commute from the towns and villages of Flanders to work there, switching to French on arrival in their work environment.

Thus the language laws of 1962 were the beginning of the political break-up of the unitary state of Belgium. This break-up was a direct result of the Flemish pressure of decades and federalism was and is seen as the only means of preserving any form of state at all. Central to the whole issue, although not the exclusive cause, had been the Dutch language in Belgium. Protests over the inequality of the two languages were numerous in the 1960's after the language border had been fixed. The seaside resorts along the Flemish coast were (and are) heavily Frenchified in the summer, due not only to Walloon holiday-makers but also due to many tourists from France. This coast was thus one of the scenes of protest against the dominance of French. At the same time there were also repeated demonstrations against the occasional use of French in some of the churches in the cities of Flanders. The conservative Catholic church had been one of the bastions of the French language in Flanders that had to be combatted from the beginning of the Flemish Movement.

The late 1960's witnessed the controversy about the Catholic University of Louvain (Leuven), the oldest university in the Low Countries dating from 1425. The language border, as it was drawn in 1962, passed 15 kilometres south of Louvain and yet the university, due to the Catholic church which manages it, had been allowed to continue instruction in French. The student discontent, which much of Western Europe witnessed at this time, found expression in Belgium among nationalist Flemings in the fight for the vervlaamsing (now vernerlaandsing) of Louvain university – Leuven Vlaams was the slogan of the day. Finally in 1969 the French-speaking faculties were removed to Wavre near Ottignies, south of the language border. Feelings ran very high at the time and the split led, for example, to such bizarre situations as the possessions of the historic university library being split down the middle on the basis of odd and even catalogue numbers.8

8. This ancient library had been world-famous until World War I when it was destroyed. During World War II many of its possessions were once again lost due to bombardment. This division of the library's holdings in the late 1960's was regarded by many as the third destruction of the university library.
The Belgian dilemma has thus been that it is an artificially created country, founded a mere 150 years ago but divided in two by a linguistic frontier which has existed for over 1000 years. Union of the Flemish and Walloon provinces with their northern and southern neighbours respectively was neither practical nor desirable, nor was independence from each other. Thus union was the only practical alternative but that brought inevitable problems with it, which, it is now felt, can only be solved if the country is organised along federal lines with recognition of three separate regions – Flanders, Wallonia and Brussels – and three languages: Dutch, French and German. In the 1980’s we are witnessing the application of this solution to the Belgian predicament, often labelled the communautaire probleem.

The problems of this three-way division of the federal state have caused every government since 1968 to fall, the main cause usually being Brussels and the complications its growth is causing. The Flemings, at the head of whose protest stands the Volksunie⁹, are trying to prevent so-called bilingual Brussels from assuming a status equal to that of Flanders or Wallonia, in which case they feel their equality would be lost – there would then be two French-speaking regions to one Dutch-speaking region, although population-wise the division is 3 to 2 in their favour. In addition the Brusselaars want complete language rights for all French-speakers living on the outskirts of Brussels. Since 1978 there has been an impasse between Flemings and Walloons on the status which Brussels is to have in the new federal state. Meanwhile the administrative and cultural autonomy of Flanders and Wallonia is being put into practice, but the Flemings are not prepared to let go of Brussels which stands well within their territory.

Map 8 shows that any further concessions to the Walloons in the south of Brussels could very soon led to the city joining up geographically with Wallonia. A good Dutch sounding place name like Waterloo, situated south of the language border twenty kilometres from the capital shows, for example, that Dutch has already lost ground to French in this area in the past.¹⁰

For the full implementation of a federal state, compromises will have to be found. It seems that Belgium will remain a united country but linguistic friction will probably also always be a fact of Belgian life. Although both Flemings and Walloons have always learnt the other’s language at school, in practice it was usually the case that the Fleming spoke better French than the Walloon spoke Dutch – the result of social and economic pressure – and thus the need and desire of the Walloon to learn Dutch properly was minimal. Nowadays, although it is compulsory to study both languages at school, it is very common for many young people to choose English as their second language instead of the language of their compatriots. In addition, English already enjoys a privileged position in Brussels as the main language of the Nato and E.E.C. This situation is thus leading very

---

9. It is interesting to note that the success of the stand which the Volksunie took on the issue of language caused the previously united national parties to split into Flemish and Walloon branches.

10. When the Flemings reformed the spelling of Dutch in 1946 (see p. 42), they also applied the new rules to place-names, unlike Holland where it remained optional. Thus Waterloo became Waterlo and Schaerbeek became Schaarbeek. But these areas had become French-speaking and the Walloons had nothing to gain by recognising a Dutch spelling reform; thus the Walloons retained the spelling Waterloo and Schaerbeek while the Flemings write these and other such names according to the new spelling.
Map 8: The growth of Brussels.
gradually to a situation where in the future Flemings and Walloons may well find it easier and preferable to converse with each other in English. But this remains speculation at this stage. There is a long way to go before such a solution becomes fact.

One final hurdle some Flemings have yet to overcome in their struggle for complete linguistic equality is a psychological one. Although numbers are on their side, and although legislation now protects monolingual Flemings inside Flanders, there is still a lingering feeling among many people that a knowledge of French is necessary for full social acceptance. And it is indeed a fact that a monolingual Fleming who is forced to seek work in his capital city would find life difficult.

In addition many Flemings (although an ever decreasing number) are still reared in a dialect environment and thoughout their schooling, and even their university education for example, they are continually unsure of the correctness and acceptability of their Dutch. This insecurity is not aided at all by the attitude of the Dutch to Belgian language usage. Although Flanders has now clearly opted to follow northern practice, and thus in time to break down the existing differences between north and south, the average Dutchman is not at all interested in the Fleming’s plight and regards him, his country and particularly his language as ‘quaint’, to put it mildly.

In the hope of uniting Flanders and Holland on at least a cultural level, and thus also on a linguistic one, the Nederlandse Taalunie was founded in September 1980; its objectives are the integration of Holland and the Dutch-speaking community in Belgium in the field of language and literature. In May 1981 the Vlaams Cultureel Centrum was also opened in Amsterdam for cultural exchange between the two countries.

Nowadays the relationship of the various forms of Flemish to Dutch does not really differ greatly from that of all other Dutch dialects to standard Dutch. The cultuurtaal of the majority of Flemings in the church, science, education, literature and journalism is Dutch, and whatever position French may have in Belgium today, it does not alter this relationship at all.

But what are some of the characteristics of Belgian Dutch, commonly called Flemish? In pronunciation it is particularly the soft g, the (often) bilabial w, the common dropping of h and the pure long vowels and diphthongs that typify it. Only a minority of people attempt to adopt a northern pronunciation but a certain regional colour in accent is no impediment to standardisation.

The enormous and inevitable influence of French is evidenced in several ways:
1 Gallicisms in the grammar e.g. telefoneren naar – téléfoner à (in N. Dutch simply telefoneren).
2 There are many French loanwords that are not used in the north, where words of French origin are also not uncommon e.g. contacteren (N. Dutch: contact opnemen met), de lavabo (N. Dutch: de wastafel – wash basin), de chauffage (N. Dutch: de verwarming – heating), konfijt (N. Dutch: jam, an English loanword).
3 There is often an avoidance of French loanwords which are commonly used in Holland e.g. stortbad – douche (shower), aanvaarden – accepteren (to accept), dagblad – krant (< courrant, newspaper).

Such purism is common to many languages that are in competition with others or where it is seen as integral to the preservation of separate identity e.g. Afrikaans, Hebrew, Icelandic.
4 French loanwords that are considered indispensable are dutchified to some extent e.g. statie < station, bureel < bureau, energie (with a Dutch, not a French g), okkazie < occasion.

The last example is an interesting illustration of the difference in orientation between Flanders and Holland. The source of most loanwords in Northern Dutch today is English, whereas in Belgium it is still either French or English which often reaches Flanders via French. The word occasion (a special offer in a shop) is a loanword of quite long standing. In Flanders they are only too aware that it is French and thus attempt to dutchify it. In Holland, however, they assume it is from English and thus write and pronounce it as an English word. So too the English loanwords flat and ram are pronounced with an [a] in Belgium, as in French, while in Holland they are pronounced with an [e], an attempt to pronounce them as in English (see p. 48). English words like service and plastic are also pronounced more or less as in English in Holland, with the stress on the first syllable, whereas in Belgium the stress is on the last syllable, as in French.

The Dutch of the administration, particularly in Brussels, is often a language of translation with all the mistakes that this implies. Because dialect speech is still so prevalent in Belgium, there is a tendency among Flemings to regard the written word as the prototype of the spoken word, with the result that Belgian Dutch can sound bookish and unnatural e.g. gehuwd for getrouwd (married), u zijt for u bent (you are), bekomen for krijgen (to get), zegde for zei (past tense of zeggen, to say).

Many Dutch words in everyday use in Belgium sound archaic to the Dutchman e.g. gans (heel-whole), gij(jij-you), gaarne(graag-gladly) (see p. 103). Many also sound humorous to the northerner because of the differences in meaning that often exist e.g. kuisen (B. to clean, H. to chaste), schoon (B. pretty, H. clean), tas (B. cup, H. bag), kleed (B. dress, H. rug), merkwaardig (B. remarkable, H. peculiar).

The Belgian, like the southern Dutchman, still knows three genders of the noun: the historical difference between masculine and feminine nouns, which died out in the north, was preserved in the south. This has implications for pronominal use e.g. de vloer > hij, de deur > zij, but in Holland both are referred to as hij (i.e. it). (See p. 61).

Belgian word order can also differ from the northern norm, particularly the order of verbs at the end of a clause e.g. Hij weet dat het nu moet gedaan worden (he knows that it must now be done), whereas in Holland the auxiliary verbs are preferably kept together: Hij weet dat het nu gedaan moet worden/moet worden gedaan. There is also, for example, an avoidance of tangconstructies (see p. 72) with separable verbs e.g. Ik heb het hem proberen duidelijk maken but in Holland: Ik heb het hem duidelijk proberen te maken/Ik heb het hem proberen duidelijk te maken (I tried to make it clear to him).

In conclusion it should be mentioned that whereas Holland's colonial past led to the plantation of the Dutch language in areas outside Europe, where it still exists today, Belgium's colonial activity, although of course not as long-lasting or as wide-spread as that of its northern neighbour, did nothing at all for the spread of Dutch language and culture. Belgium had control of the Congo, now Zaïre, from the 1880's to 1960. It is somehow indicative of the situation in Belgium itself during that period that although the vast majority of colonial administrators in the Congo were Flemings, there was no place for Dutch in that administration and consequently Zaïre belongs to francophone Africa.
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A very detailed work on word usage in Belgium, including many words and expressions that are commonly used in Holland south of the rivers.

DELEU, G. ed. and others *Encyclopedie van de Vlaamse beweging,* volumes 1 & 2.
Absolutely the definitive work on the Flemish Movement (ca. 3000 pages).
4 Spelling

Few European languages have such a logical, economic spelling system as Dutch. Even German, whose spelling is a godsend to the English-speaking student after his years of hassle with the spelling of his mother-tongue, has cause to envy Dutch spelling. The spelling of Dutch as we know it today has of course developed over a long period and controversy about certain aspects of it still has not ceased. Such issues will be dealt with later in this chapter.

The layman might feel inclined to say Dutch spelling is almost completely phonetic and to a great extent this comment is not far from the truth. However, if the linguist looks in detail at how the written symbols of the language relate to the spoken word, he soon discovers many non-phonetic spellings and recognises too that a fully phonetic spelling system is not necessarily a desirable thing. For example, Dutch has in common with German that final b and d are pronounced as p and t respectively i.e. they are devoiced in Auslaut: to write web and bed as wep and bet would not be desirable given that the plural of these words, both in writing and in speech, is webben and bedden. Here the eye, not the ear, seems to demand a consistency of spelling even though it is at odds with what is actually said.

A truly phonetic spelling system for any given language would be one that had a separate written symbol for every individual sound. In fact, what one loosely calls 'phonetic' spelling is correctly called 'phonemic' spelling i.e. one where each significant difference in pronunciation is reflected in the spelling, not simply every difference in sound. For example, the different pronunciation of the s in English ‘house’ and ‘houses’ is not a phonemic difference and thus a different spelling for the two separate sounds is not considered necessary. Similarly, phonetically speaking the k sound in ‘cat’ is different from the k sound in ‘kit’, as a result of the back and front vowels following the k in each word, but this difference is not significant to meaning; it is merely determined by the different phonological environment in the words concerned.

Yet another reason for avoiding a fully phonetic spelling is homonyms i.e. similar sounding words with different meanings e.g. calf (of the leg) – calf (young of a cow). For historical reasons (see p. 145-48) the Dutch can render the diphthong [ei] with two spellings, ei or ij. Retention of this distinction in spelling from a time in history when the two were pronounced differently, often helps the eye to distinguish homonyms e.g. wij (we) – wei (meadow), lijden (to suffer) – leiden (to lead). Similarly the sound [au] can be written two ways in Dutch for historical reasons i.e. au or ou. This distinction can also occasionally help distinguish homonyms e.g. gauw (soon) – gouv (province).

We have thus seen that etymology can often be the reason for various spellings of the same sound. Having looked at some of the complications of a phonetic spelling
and the reasons why even a phonemic spelling is not always possible or desirable, we shall now examine the basic rules of Dutch spelling and come to appreciate its economy and consistency.

The most striking feature of Dutch spelling is its economy of letters and nowhere is this better illustrated than in the way it reproduces the vowels of the language. It is immediately evident whether the vowels in any given word are long or short. Whether the long vowels are written double or not to indicate length depends on whether they stand in open or closed syllables (see glossary) e.g. *boom* (tree) – *bomen* (trees): in the singular the long vowel occurs in a closed syllable and thus the vowel is doubled, whereas in the plural it occurs in an open syllable and a second *o* would be a superfluous extra indication of length.

Equally the word could not be pronounced with a short *o* because a double *m* would then be used e.g. *bom* (bomb) – *bommen* (bombs). The same rule applies to *a, e* and *u* e.g. *paal* (pole) – *palen* (poles), *peer* (pear) – *peren* (pears), *muur* (wall) – *muren* (walls). Compare *kat* (cat) – *katten* (cats), *bed* (bed) – *bedden* (beds) and *bus* (bus) – *bussen* (buses). Only *i* employs a different system: short *i* is written as such e.g. *pit* (seed) – *pitten* (seeds), and long *i* is written *ie* e.g. *mier* (ant) – *mieren* (ants).

This alternation of double and single vowels and consonants to indicate long vowels, although illustrated above only by contrasting the singular and plural of nouns, is also found in verbs and adjectives. For example, infinitives all end in *-en* and can look as follows: *varen* (to go by ship), *leren* (to learn, teach), *kopen* (to buy) and *huren* (to hire). They are conjugated in the present tense as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ik leer} & \quad \text{wij leren} & \quad \text{ik koop} & \quad \text{wij kopen} \\
\text{jij leert} & \quad \text{jullie leren} & \quad \text{jij koopt} & \quad \text{jullie kopen} \\
\text{hij leert} & \quad \text{zij leren} & \quad \text{hij koopt} & \quad \text{zij kopen} & \text{etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

The same alternation of *a/aa, e/ee* etc. also occurs in adjectives when inflected e.g. *kaal* (bald) – *kale, geel* (yellow) – *gele* etc.

Double consonants always indicate that the preceding vowel is short e.g. *laf* (cowardly) – *laffe, spatten* (to splash) – *ik spat, potten* (pots) – *pot*. It is impossible to have a double consonant (i.e. the same consonant) at the end of a Dutch word. For example, the second and third persons of the verb in the present tense normally take a *-t* ending but a verb like *zitten* (to sit), whose stem already ends in *t*, forgoes the ending e.g. *ik zit, jij zit, hij zit*. A second *t* would be superfluous to indicate the correct pronunciation.

At this point we touch on a spelling problem which has tormented Dutch

1. Two notable exceptions to this otherwise hard and fast rule are *waarom* (why), a compound of two separate words, and *tweede* (second), where the dropping of an *e* could obscure its relationship to *twee* (two).

2. The diminutive forms of *café* and *auto* (car) are interesting examples of Dutch spelling: *cafeetje, autoetje* i.e. long vowels in closed syllables must be indicated by doubling. Also the plural of foreign words ending in *a, o* and *u* illustrates an interesting variant i.e. *firma's, auto's* and *paraphu's*, replacing *firmaas, *autoos* and *paraphius* where once again the doubling of the vowel in such obviously foreign words, although in accordance with the spelling rules of Dutch, would disturb the eye too much. The apostrophe thus literally stands in place of a letter which has dropped out.
school-children, and many adults as well, for a long time. Because final \(d\) is pronounced as \(t\), confusion often arises as to which letter is required. Nowhere is the problem greater, however, than in the spelling of verbs. Whereas zitten, as illustrated above, does not require a second \(t\) in the second and third persons singular, a verb such as verbranden (to burn, trans.) does require \(t\) because the sight of \(dt\) at the end of a word does not disturb the Dutch eye i.e. \(ik\) verbrand, \(jij\) verbrandt, \(wij\) verbrandt, \(wij\) verbranden. The \(dt\) cluster sounds, however, like a single \(t\). The issue is further complicated by the past participle i.e. verbrand (see p. 63). There are simple rules for knowing the correct spelling of \(t\), \(dt\) or \(d\) but nevertheless the Dutch make many mistakes in this regard. It is one of the few instances where the spelling is not phonemic but partially determined by grammar.

Another consistency between the spoken word and spelling is the way in which a final \(f\) or \(s\) following a long vowel or diphthong\(^3\) become \(v\) and \(z\) when an \(e\) follows in other forms of the word i.e. \(f\) and \(s\) are then voiced in intervocalic position and their voiced equivalent in the alphabet replaces them e.g. duif (dove) – duiven (doves), vies (dirty) – vieze (inflected form), ik reis (I travel) – wij reizen (we travel). As the examples illustrate, this spelling change also occurs, as do the \(a/a\) etc. changes, in nouns, adjectives and verbs and consequently pervades the whole of Dutch. In effect, as far as the \(f/v\) and \(s/z\) alternation is concerned, the Dutch are simply expressing in writing something which we also say in English but do not always attempt to reflect in the spelling: compare the pronunciation of ‘house’ and ‘houses’, ‘roof – rooves’.

The above summary of the logic behind the spelling of Dutch is similar to what one would find in any basic grammar of the language for foreigners. There are, however, several more peculiarities and even some inconsistencies which are usually left unexplained, but which are both interesting and important.

The \(ij\): this ligature, along with the double vowels, is the most distinctive feature of written Dutch and enables a novice to recognise a printed page immediately as being Dutch. Although the Dutch for historical reasons have two spellings for the diphthong \([ei]\), namely \(ei\) and \(ij\), the latter spelling, because of its origin in long \(i\) and also because of the way it is formed in handwriting\(^2\), has become totally confused with the letter \(y\) which to all intents and purposes hardly exists in Dutch except in very few foreign words e.g. baby, typisch (pron. \(i\)).

The new diphthong \(ij\) has been present in Dutch since the end of the Middle Ages, but the spelling \(ij\), to indicate the length of the original long \(i\) has been present since the Middle Dutch period i.e. 1100-1500 (see p. 93). In the course of time speakers of Dutch, or one should say writers of Dutch, have come to regard the ligature as

---

3. This spelling change is also often found after certain consonants e.g. wolf – wolven (wolf – wolves), vers – verzen (verse – verses), gans – ganzen (goose – geese) but kers – kersen (cherry – cherries) and mens – mensen (person – people).

4. This is called lange \([ei]\), a reference to the length of the \(j\) in writing, to distinguish it from \(ei\).

5. For the history of the \(ij\) spelling for the diphthong \([ei]\) see p. 40. The letter \(j\), which the Romans did not know, was originally a scribal variant of the letter \(i\) in much the same way as we used to have a long and a short \(s\) even in English e.g. bef and was. Thus the ligature \(ij\) goes back to a double \(i\), the tradition we still employ with \(a, e\) and \(u\) in Dutch today.
one letter, pronounced [ei]. This attitude is already evident in Middle Dutch manuscripts and the earliest printed texts (latter half of the fifteenth century) as is the habit of leaving the dots off, thus writing a y instead. Consequently, when saying the alphabet most Dutch people pronounce the letter y as [ei], although the letter y is strictly speaking called i grec or ypsilon. An important ramification of this alternative way of regarding the ligature ij (which by the way is a separate key on a Dutch typewriter and when used in a situation where capitalisation is necessary both the I and the J are capitalised or else a capital Y is used) is that library catalogues, encyclopaedias and telephone books arrange all words containing ij alphabetically under y6; this is not the case in Belgium, however. Such inconsistency can often be confusing, even to the Dutch. Whatever attempts have been made to insist that ij is not y, the practice continues and seems to be here to stay, even though dictionaries now all place ij under i.7 I recall having seen the French loan word bijouterie (jewellery counter) in various stores spelt byouterie and yet this is an instance where the pronunciation is definitely i + j i.e. [i.3]. For years there has been debate as to whether ij belongs under i, under y or should be regarded as a 27th letter, occurring even after z in the alphabet. Swedish and Spanish, to name but two notable examples, know similar problems with additional letters and have found various solutions to them.

Finally a word about several other minor peculiarities of Dutch spelling. There are two spellings for the guttural fricative [X], namely ch and g. The distinction in spelling is a remnant of a time when the latter was a voiced fricative, as is still the case in southern dialects, but in the north both are now pronounced as voiceless fricatives. The falling together of those two sounds is one of the factors which has given rise to the commonly heard comment ‘Dutch is such a gutteral language, isn’t it?’ (see chapter on pronunciation p. 5).

Dutch also knows the grave and acute accents in its spelling, and not only in French loan words. The acute accent in particular is often used to show emphasis, where an English text may underline or use bold type; it is also used to distinguish homonyms where confusion can arise e.g. een = a, één = one; voor = for, vôór = in front of/before.

Dutch makes extensive use of the diaeresis. The Dutch name, deelteken (lit. part sign, also called trema), explains its function. When two vowel signs representing two separate syllables may lead the reader to pronounce them as one sound (whether as a long vowel or a diphthong), the vowel of the second syllable bears a diaeresis to indicate this e.g. zoëven, financiën, tweeëntwintig. It is sometimes used on o’s as well, but will usually only be found on e’s.

Syllabification in Dutch also differs from English. Whereas English splits words according to the semantics of the component parts e.g. regist-er, Dutch splits entirely according to sound, e.g. har-ten (hearts), mees-ter (master), lo-pen (to walk). The rule is simply that the break-away syllable(s) must always begin with a consonant; where double consonants are concerned, one stays behind and the

6. Afrikaans knows only the y spelling and places it under ij in the alphabet.
7. Van Dale’s Dutch dictionary, generally accepted as the ‘Oxford’ of Holland, has a note at the point between the lemmas i-grec and ij to the effect that it is incorrect to regard ij as y in alphabetical lists.
other precedes the break-away syllable on the new line e.g. belet-ten (to prevent), kat-ten (cats).

Compound nouns are usually always written as one word. In certain specific instances hyphens may occasionally be used e.g. auto-ongeluk (to avoid a cumbersome double oo), West-Duitsland (a geographic name, although the corresponding adjective is written Westduits). There is, however, and I feel I should add unfortunately, an ever growing tendency to write compound nouns as separate words, even when medial sounds are used to complete the compound e.g. klanten service, bibliotheeks uren, stads vernieuwingsgebied. Whether this is simply due to carelessness, influence of English or a genuine belief that there is nothing wrong with such spellings, I have been unable to ascertain. The practice is not just limited to informal writings by simple individuals. The example bibliotheeks uren was taken from an official sign on the door of the university library in Utrecht. Whether compound nouns are written as one word, two words or hyphenated is indeed a problem for all in English; the Dutch had an ideal solution but seem to be heading into the same confusion we find ourselves in. The practice should not be copied.

The recent history of Dutch spelling

The Spelling De Vries en Te Winkel (1860-1934)

From the 1860's through to 1934, the official spelling system of Dutch which had received government backing, was that of Matthijs de Vries and Lammert Allard te Winkel. The former was a professor of Dutch in Groningen and later in Leiden while the latter was a teacher at a Leiden gymnasium. They were working on a definitive dictionary of Dutch for both the northern and southern Netherlands. Such a task was only feasible if there was agreement on spelling and thus in 1863 De Vries and Te Winkel produced Grondbeginselen der Nederlandsche spelling. Both men had a thorough knowledge of philology and thus although they did not break completely with the spelling traditions of their predecessors, they did apply certain historical principles which had hitherto often been ignored or not thoroughly understood. Some of these are still present in the spelling today.

It has already been mentioned that the diphthong [ei] can be spelt either ei or ij, depending on the origin of the word. This distinction was originally a recommendation of De Vries en Te Winkel. They argued that any word containing an [ei] that was derived from an original long i, should be written ij e.g. wijn < wijn, karwij from French carvi (a plant). The ei spelling, they maintained, should represent the [ei] diphthong in all words where the origin was either an original Germanic diphthong or of any origin other than long i e.g. bereid - compare Gothic raidjan, vallei from French vallée.

De Vries and Te Winkel were also guided by etymology when they laid down the rules for e/ee, o/oo and sch. Because in certain dialects, notably Rotterdams and Zeeuws, long e and o were and are pronounced differently according to whether they were derived from an original diphthong or were simply long vowels, this was reflected in the spelling. By comparing the following Dutch words with cognate forms in German, one can see what spelling was required: heeten, beenen, wezen versus heißen, Beine, Waisen but deken, gele, bede versus Decke, gelbe, Bitte;
droomen, boomen, koopen versus träumen, Bäume, kaufen but boter, zonen versus Butter, Söhne. Similarly, that ruischen was written sch and bruisen was written s (also Nederlandsch, mensch etc.) was also to be traced back to etymology; here again comparison with German clarifies the situation somewhat i.e. rauschen but brausen.

There were, however, many instances where the origin of words was not clear but the main objection was that the common man had no idea of etymology anyway. And as far as the e/ee and o/oo issue was concerned, it was based on a distinction in pronunciation that only a minority of speakers applied; in the ABN of most of the country the two sounds had fallen together long ago.

De Vries and Te Winkel were also guided by historical principles when they, like generations before them, insisted on case endings still being used with articles and adjectives; this was also an artificial distinction which had long since disappeared from the spoken language and which thus caused great difficulty e.g. Ik heb haren vader met zijn hond in het park gezien.

De Vries and Te Winkel also allotted a masculine or feminine gender to all common gender nouns, once again basing their rules on historical principles which the common man had no knowledge of or natural feeling for. With few exceptions (see p. 62) all common gender nouns had come to be regarded as masculine when they needed to be replaced by pronouns i.e. hij/hem were used in such cases, seldom zij/haar.  

It is obvious from the above summary of the basics of the De Vries and Te Winkel spelling that there must have been a great deal of opposition. Nevertheless it received government approval and managed to maintain its authoritative position for some seventy years. Opposition in the nineteenth century culminated in the foundation of the Vereniging tot vereenvoudiging van onze schrijftaal by R.A. Kollewijn in 1893. He cast aside most historical principles and based his spelling on general cultivated speech. This became known as the Spelling Kollewijn. Kollewijn had many followers but his spelling did not gain government approval.

Little official notice was taken of the newer simplified spelling until 1934, and even then only in Holland, not in Belgium. This was during the period of office of the minister of education H.P. Marchant. The so-called Spelling Marchant, which was adopted by royal decree in 1936, did not go quite as far as Kollewijn had recommended. The difficulties of e/ee, o/oo and s/sch were removed and case n’s were only to be written where they are heard in ABN i.e. in standard expressions such as op den duur, goedavond etc. There was, however, one annoying exception to this which was not abolished till 1947: articles and adjectives standing before words designating singular masculine beings or the names of animals which designate only the male of the species, still required an n in oblique cases e.g. bij den

8. Virtually all pre-war books are printed in the spelling of De Vries and Te Winkel but apart from looking somewhat antiquated, their spelling is no bar to understanding the text for a modern reader.

9. When Afrikaans replaced Dutch as one of the two official languages of South Africa in 1925, the simplified spelling of Kollewijn was adopted immediately; South Africa is still far ahead of the Netherlands in the degree to which its spelling is phonetic, particularly with regard to foreign words, a problem which still exists in Dutch.
man but op de stoel (formerly also op den stoel), van den aap (masculine) but van de muis (feminine).

This final remnant of the etymologically based spelling of De Vries and Te Winkel was eradicated in Holland by the so-called Spellingwet of 1947 and in Belgium by the Spellingbesluit of 1946. In 1947 a committee comprising both Belgians and Dutchmen was given the task of compiling an official spelling list which appeared in 1954 under the title Woordenlijst der Nederlandse Taal. Ever since that book has been the ‘Bible’ of Dutch spelling in Holland and Belgium; it is known colloquially as het Groene Boekje as all editions thereof since 1954 have appeared in the same green hardback cover. Although this is the spelling used by all government and educational establishments, it is not uncommon for older people educated prior to the war still to write in the spelling of De Vries and Te Winkel.

The voorkeurspelling versus the nieuwe spelling
The spelling which the Groene Boekje recommended did not adequately solve the problem of how to spell foreign loan words, known generally in Dutch as bastaardwoorden. Typical entries in the Woordenlijst for foreign words are:

konvokatie; zie convocatie.
convocatie; ook konvokatie.
tekst (but text is not given as a possibility)
textiel (but tekstiel is not given as a possibility)
However examen or eksamen are both permitted.

To leave the choice to the user was a mistake and the fact that the Woordenlijst was not prepared to give the seal of approval to one spelling or the other has been a continual source of confusion and inconsistency ever since. It was clear that the intention was for foreign words to be gradually dutchified, but the compilers were afraid to push people too quickly.

Eventually a Dutch-Belgian commission was appointed to look into the issue further and its suggestions were published in 1967: Rapport van de Nederlands-Belgische commissie van spelling van de bastaardwoorden. Its Eindvoorstellen (final suggestions) were published in 1969. These recommendations formed the basis of the so-called nieuwe spelling whereupon the spelling as it appears in the Woordenlijst, still the only spelling with government approval, became known as the voorkeurspelling (preferred spelling). To exemplify the sort of suggestions made in this report, let the following suffice:

a. intervocalic s should be written z e.g. prezident, filozofie
b. th should become t e.g. tee, bibliothek
c. total replacement of c by k e.g. aktueel, kollege or by s e.g. sent, sijfer, sukses (< succes)
The last recommendation was supported, for example, by the fact that foreign words no longer necessarily regarded as such were spelt like that e.g. sigaret, prinses, porselein.
d. oe should replace ou e.g. dooane, goeverneur but not in words such as douche and journalist where other foreign sounds that cannot be dutchified are still present.

10. This statement is not completely true because the ei/ij and au/ou distinctions which still exist and which also have certain opponents are also etymologically based.
The commission's report concludes by expressing the hope that a revised edition of the *Woordenlijst* will appear at some time in the future in which all its recommendations will be adopted. So far this has not happened.\(^{11}\) However, looking at spelling tendencies in the Netherlands today, there is a definite trend, whether sanctioned by government and educational bodies or not, towards many of the commission's suggestions.

The student of Dutch, whether native born or not, is well advised to follow the *Groene Boekje* to the letter until such time as it is revised and the many varying alternative spellings that one meets daily in Holland and Belgium are given official recognition. Many avant-garde publications, such as student newspapers, often use the *nieuwe spelling*, employing spellings such as *kado* (< *cadeau*), *logies* (< *logisch*) and sometimes go even further than the commission suggested e.g. *tejater* (< *theater*), *sosjeteit* (< *sociëteit*).

The ongoing controversy about the spelling of Dutch is not, however, restricted to the spelling of loan words. There are those, and the commission touched on this too, who also wish to introduce radical changes into the spelling of indigenous words e.g. abolition of the historical distinction between *au* and *ou* (*gauw* – soon, *gouw* – province) and *ei* and *ij* (*hei* – heath, *hij* – he), as well as writing the unstressed endings *-lijk* and *-rijk* as *-lik* and *-rik* (lelijk – ugly, belangrijk – important).\(^{12}\) There is also the perennial problem of final *d* and *dt* (particularly in verbal conjugations), both being pronounced *t* and thus a recommendation that they be written *t*. Official adoption of such radical changes would seem, however, to be even more remote than adoption of the Dutch-Belgian commission’s recommendations for the spelling of the *bastaardwoorden*.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**KEUKEN, G.J. van der De nieuwe spelling.**

Thieme, Zutphen.

A good brief account of the rules of Dutch spelling as decided in 1947.

**Woordenlijst van de Nederlandse Taal**


The official spelling list of the Dutch language (see p. 42). On page 42 updates of this list with regard to the spelling of foreign words are also mentioned.

---

11. Interesting examples of negative reactions to the commission’s recommendations can be found in L. Craeybeckx *Stuipmoord op de spelling* (1972), which, in addition to Craeybeckx’ own opinion, incorporates numerous letters from well-known academics and writers of the day.

12. It is interesting to note that in the more radical spelling of *Afrikaans* *au* and *ou* are both written as *ou*, *-lijk* and *-rijk* are also written with a simple *t*, but the *ei/ij* distinction has been preserved, the *ij* being written as *y*, however.
This leesplank (reading board), which was introduced into all schools in Holland in 1909, was only gradually phased out during the 1960's. The words that appear on it contain all the cardinal sounds of Dutch. It is known colloquially and affectionately as aap-noot-mies.

The distinction between ö (closed) in bok and ø (open) in hok is not made by all speakers of Dutch (see p. 48) (The words Mies, Wim, Jet, Teun and Gijs are proper nouns.)
5 The sounds of Dutch (phonology)

When beginning a new language one inevitably starts with pronunciation. In the case of Dutch, the beginner is immediately struck by how 'hard' it is to pronounce. In this section I shall attempt to look in some detail and in more specific terms at what constitutes the difficulty of Dutch pronunciation for English speakers. The average Dutchman is aware that foreigners find his language difficult to pronounce but he usually thinks no further than the pronunciation of g/ch, which even Germans pronounce too softly; a common shibboleth they often ask foreigners to repeat is the name Scheveningen, a town near The Hague. In my opinion, it is in fact more the vowels, in particular the diphthongs, which form the main barrier in attaining a good Dutch pronunciation.

The articulation basis of Dutch is considerably further back and lower\(^1\) in the mouth than in both English and German. Dutch vowels are, on the whole, not as palatal. The chapter on historical phonology looks in greater depth at the general absence of Umlaut of long vowels in Dutch; this lack of Umlaut, which is simply another name for the fronting of vowels, is a good example of the articulation basis of the language being considerably further back in the mouth than is the case in English and German. Both these languages have undergone extensive umlauting – compare kaas v. cheese/Käse (here English has even palatalised the initial consonant), groeten v. greetings/Grüße.

The Vowels

**Checked vowels:**

Checked vowels only occur in closed syllables and are thus always followed by a consonant e.g. *pan* (pan), *pet* (cap), *pit* (seed), *pot* (pot), *put* (well); *pannen* (pans), *petten* (caps) etc. Such double consonants (see Spelling, p. 37) only indicate a preceding short vowel and are not pronounced double.

The phonetic symbols used here do not all adequately reflect some of the subleties of these vowels. For instance, the *a* in Dutch *man* is obviously pronounced lower in the mouth than in English 'man', where the vowel is *[æ]*, but it is even somewhat lower than in German *Mann*. To the English ear it often tends to sound a little like *[ə]*.

The situation with *e* is rather complex for the English speaker because although

---

\(^1\) An example of this is the way English speakers often pronounce Dutch *ee* and *oo*, which often sound like Dutch *ie* and *oe* to Dutch ears i.e. higher vowels.
The vowels

Checked vowels\(^1\) (all short):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>graphemes</th>
<th>phonetic values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>[ʊ](^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>[e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>[ɔ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[ɑ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unchecked or free vowels\(^1\) and diphthongs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>graphemes</th>
<th>phonetic values(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ie</td>
<td>[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uu(^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe</td>
<td>[y]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short or long</td>
<td>[u]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei/ij</td>
<td>[eɪ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ui</td>
<td>[o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ou/au</td>
<td>[o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diphthongs</td>
<td>[ɔː]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee(^2)</td>
<td>[e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eu</td>
<td>[ø]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oo(^2)</td>
<td>[o]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long or half long</td>
<td>[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa(^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. In Dutch one talks of *gedekte* and *ongedekte* or *vrije klinkers*. The vowels *ie, uu* and *oe*, although now pronounced short except before *r*, are regarded historically as long vowels, as their spelling suggests. This has led to the common use of the term long and short instead of checked and unchecked.

2. These sounds are written with one letter in open syllables (see Spelling, p. 37).

3. Full length and half length are usually indicated as follows [iː] [i] etc.

4. See the explanation of this symbol on p. 48.

5. Some people would possibly give preference to the symbol [au] to represent this Dutch sound. I too have used it on p. 148.
The vowels (continued)

The three diphthongs on the opposite page are the short diphthongs of Dutch. In certain words, however, vowels combine to give the following additional long diphthongs, sometimes called double vowels:

\([a.i]\) e.g. haai (shark), haaien (sharks)
\([o.i]\) e.g. mooi (pretty), mooie (inflected)
\([u.i]\) e.g. boei (buoy), boeien (buoys)
\([i.u]\) e.g. nieuw (new), nieuwe (inflected) N.B. pron. [niuwe]
\([y.u]\) e.g. schuwe (shy), schuwe (inflected) N.B. pron. [sXywe]
\([e.u]\) e.g. leeuw (lion), leeuwen (lions) N.B. pron. [le.uwən]

In the first three examples the \(i > j\) when followed by \(\sigma\) and in the last three examples \(u > w\) in that position.

The colourless vowel \(\sigma\), called schwa, is common in Dutch in unstressed syllables and can be written as \(e\), \(i\) or \(i\), e.g. beloven (to promise), gelukkig (happy), lelijk (ugly). Schwa is also sometimes heard as a svarabhakti vowel after \(l\) or \(r\) plus a consonant particularly in plait speech e.g. melk (milk) – [mɛlɔk], film – [fɪləm].
[e] is used on page 46 as the phonetic transcription, in reality the Dutch sound is a little lower than English [e], i.e. it approximates [æ]. English, however, knows two separate phonemes: [e], written e, and [ae], written a e.g. ‘bed’ and ‘bad’. In Dutch these are perceived as allophones of the same phoneme, [ɛ]. This is best illustrated in the way the Dutch treat English loan words containing an a; for example the loan word tram⁴ is also pronounced in Dutch as [traːm] but is somewhat shorter than in English. But this is the normal pronunciation of e in Dutch and consequently some people now write he word as trem; such a spelling would be pronounced [trem] in English. In other words, Dutch e, like Dutch a, are pronounced lower in the mouth than the corresponding sounds in English (see footnote 1). This is the result of the difference in articulation basis between the two languages.

Depending on the phonetic environment, some speakers of Dutch distinguish between an open and a more closed pronunciation of o (i.e. hòk and bòk, see leesplank p. 44, but north of the rivers, at any rate, there is an ever growing tendency in favour of the more open vowel as the difference is not phonemic. Thus a falling together of once distinctly separate sounds has occurred among some speakers.³ This is fortunate for the English-speaking student of Dutch, particularly as the more open variant is closer to the short o in English.

[ʊ] is occasionally heard as a long vowel in certain foreign words e.g. logé (theatre box), roze (pink).

The pronunciation of the checked vowel ū usually causes foreigners some trouble at first. Even its phonetic transcription is not always the same; some academics use [y] or [ʌ]. I have opted for [ʊ] as this clearly shows it is a high rounded sound. It can be described as a rounded [ʊ] for it is pronounced very short.

Unchecked vowels

Unchecked vowels can occur in both closed and open syllables, unlike checked vowels e.g. closed syllables— dier (animal), wij laadden (we loaded), groot (big), wij vergrootten (we enlarged); open syllables— dieren (animals), wij laden (we load), wij vergroten (we enlarge), ik zie (I see), na (after).

The terms long and half long on the chart on p. 46 refer to the pronunciation of the sounds aa, ee, eu and oo before r (or in Auslaut) and other consonants respectively. They are not as long as the corresponding sounds in German where the spelling often uses an h to show length e.g. fahre (to travel), Sohn (son). The sound r, which has had a variety of effects on the phonology of Dutch (see p. 159) causes these vowels to be pronounced very long when it follows: e.g. schaar (scissors), beer (bear), deur (door), boor (drill) with [aː], [eː], [ʊ] and [oː]. Even the otherwise short unchecked vowels ie⁴, oe and uu are pronounced long before r e.g. Piet (Pete), boek (book), minuut (minute) with [i], [u] and [y] but mier (ant), boer (farmer), duur (expensive) with [iː], [uː] and [yː].

2. There are many loan words from English with this sound e.g. flat, jam, plannen (to plan) and a Dutch creation tanken (to fill up with petrol). Belgians pronounce these words as they are written i.e. as [a], because some, if not all, have reached them via the medium of French where they had already undergone assimilation. Sometimes this pronunciation is also heard in Holland but then it is usually simply a spelling pronunciation.

3. The historical distinction between the two is discussed on p. 136.

4. In some words of Greek origin, this sound is written as y e.g. typisch (typical), type.
The long vowel ee and the diphthong ei/ij cause different problems in different parts of the English speaking world. Once again the cause of the difficulty is that the difference between the two is phonemic in Dutch whereas English knows the two sounds simply as allophones of the one phoneme. An Englishman, for example, will have difficulty in separating kreeg (got) and krijg (get) and is likely to apply the pronunciation of the former to both; an Australian, on the other hand, will also tend to pronounce the two in the same way but will diphthongise both – compare the pronunciation of ‘today’ in British and Australian English. As the above minimal pair illustrates, it is imperative to keep the two sounds separate in Dutch.

There is, to make matters even more complex, a strong tendency in plat Hollands to diphthongise ee too much. Although speakers of ABN regard their ee as a pure (half) long vowel, phonetically speaking there is a certain diphthongisation present even in their pronunciation. It is this tendency which is taken further in plat Hollands e.g. ik weet (I know) > ik weeji. As the vowel then encroaches into the territory of the diphthong ei/ij, this latter sound then shifts somewhat in plat speech towards [ai] to avoid a falling together.5

The unchecked vowel oo is in a similar position to ee i.e. Dutch speakers generally regard it as a pure (half) long vowel but it is in fact somewhat diphthongised in ABN, a tendency which becomes stronger in plat speech.6 South of the rivers both ee and oo are pronounced considerably ‘purer’. But a tendency to diphthongise long vowels is nothing new to speakers of English. For further comment on the pronunciation of ee and oo see footnote one on page 45.

The sound represented in writing by eu – the spelling is French in origin. see p. 141 – resembles ee and oo in that if too is considered by ABN speakers to be a pure (half) long vowel that tends in reality to be diphthongised a little in the ABN of the west of Holland. It is more open than German ö (i.e. as in Vögel) in western ABN, but in the south and the east of the Netherlands it is pronounced purer and higher; it is thus closer to the corresponding sound in German.

Dutch uu is a difficult sound for English speakers but will not be difficult for those who have done French or German as it corresponds exactly in quality, if not always in quantity, to French u i.e. pur (pure) and för (for).

[u] is written as oe for historical reasons (see p. 140).

Diphthongs:

The two spellings of the diphthong [ei] are the result of two historically separate sounds having fallen together (see p. 145). This has led to homonyms e.g. leiden (to lead) – lijden (to suffer), hei (heath) – hij (he), zei (said) – zij (she). This is quite an open sound, although a too open pronunciation can sound somewhat plat (see ee above). English speakers tend to pronounce ei/ij as [ai], firstly because this exact sound does not exist in English but also because the Dutch words containing ij

5. Such shifts are common in language to avoid homonyms, which can lead to misunderstanding.
6. See p. 137 and p. 139 where the origin of these two sounds is discussed; both were in fact originally diphthongs. Afrikaans, which bears many plat Hollands traits in pronunciation, breaks ee and oo very strongly e.g. weet (know) – [ve.at], brood (bread) – [bro.at].
often have cognate forms in English (and German) with [ai] e.g. *mijn* – *mine/mein*, *ij* – *ice/Eis*.

The two spellings of the diphthong [au] are also the result of separate origins (see p. 148). In certain words, for etymological reasons, they can be followed by a w in spelling which does not affect pronunciation, however, e.g. ik hou (I hold) but *houwen* (to hew), *blauw* (blue). This sound is similar to the corresponding sound in English and does not normally present any difficulty to speakers of English.

The diphthong *ui* is one of the most difficult sounds in Dutch. It is often found in words whose cognate forms in English contain *ou*, e.g. *huis* – *house*, and thus the tendency for English speakers is to substitute *ou* for *ui*, but Dutch also knows a diphthong *ou*, as described above, so this must be avoided.

Vocalisation of *d*: it is a curious characteristic of Dutch that an intervocalic *d*, according to the vowel preceding it, can drop out and generate a semi-vowel in its stead. After long *a* in words such as *raden* (to guess) and *laden* (to load), the pronunciation [a.i] is commonly heard i.e. *raaie*, *laaie* (see long diphthongs on p. 47). It is particularly colloquial and is considered in some words as *plat*.

After *oe* in the word *goede* (inflected form of *goed*, good), one will nearly always hear *d* pronounced as the semi-vowel *j* i.e. *goeje* or *goeie*;7 to pronounce the *d* in this word sounds most unnatural.

This *i/j* quality of intervocalic *d* is also often heard, but never written, after long *e* e.g. *geleden* (ago) – *geleje*, *beneden* – (beneath) – *beneje*. When *d* follows *ei/ij* it is virtually always dropped except in careful, deliberate speech8 e.g. *rijden* (to ride) (drive), *sniijden* (to cut); *ik rij(d)*, *sniijd(d)* je.

After *ou*, *d* very commonly becomes the semi-vowel *w*. This phenomenon is not limited to any particular words, nor is it necessarily unnatural to pronounce *d* as *d* in such words e.g. *houwen* (to hold) > *houwe*.9

With the exception of *d* after long *a*, there is not generally speaking any particular social connotation associated with the vocalisation of *d*. It can be said, however, that the lower classes in the west of the country9 tend to apply it consistently, whereas the upper classes are not so consistent in their application.

See p. 155 for the vocalisation of *d* in words where the original form with *d* has become obsolete.

---

7. As a general rule it is advisable not to write these spellings although the words *goede* and *oude* are commonly spelt *goeie* and *ouwe*, but *houden*, for example, would never be written as *houwen*. However, *ik hou(d)*, like *ik rij*, is possible and usually is written without *d*.
8. Leiden, in the dialect of the area, is pronounced *Leie* by the lower classes but in addition the pronunciation *Leie/Leienaar* (inhabitant of Leiden) is regarded in certain upper class circles, notably the *studentenkorps* of Leiden University, as particularly posh. A similar sociological phenomenon is reflected in the lower classes pronouncing hypercorrect *d*'s e.g. *partijen* (parties) > *partijden*.
9. In those regions in the north and east of Holland where final -en is pronounced as a syllabic *n* (see p. 13), *d* is no longer intervocalic and is thus not vocalised.
The Consonants

- **b**: [b] but [p] in Auslaut.
- **c**: [s] or [k] – only in words of foreign origin.\(^{10}\)
- **d**: [d] but [t] in Auslaut.
- **f**: [f]
- **g**: [X] or [γ] – also rendered [g]
- **h**: [h]
- **j**: [j]
- **k**: [k]
- **l**: [l]
- **m**: [m]
- **n**: [n]
- **p**: [p]
- **q**: [k] only in words of foreign origin.
- **r**: [r] or [R]
- **s**: [s]
- **t**: [t]
- **v**: [b] or [f]
- **w**: [v] i.e. labiodental but bilabial after u and au/ou.
- **x**: [ks] only in words of foreign origin.
- **z**: [z]

The stops:

The voiceless stops p, t and k are not aspirated at all in Dutch and consequently p and t without aspiration often sound somewhat like b and d to the English speaker, who like the German, strongly aspirates these sounds. The corresponding voiced stops b and d – g is a fricative in Dutch\(^{11}\) – are also unaspirated; in fact the Dutchman often hears p and t when the English speaker attempts to pronounce Dutch b and d, which can lead to confusing homonyms e.g. pet (cap) and bed (bed). Aspiration is a prominent characteristic of an English or German accent in Dutch and is one of the most difficult to overcome.

B and d are devoiced at the end of a word, as in German. See p. 50 for the vocalisation of d in intervocalic positions.

The fricatives:

The fricatives g and ch are usually phonetically transcribed as [γ] and [X], i.e. as voiced and unvoiced respectively. However, nowadays in the north this represents

---

10. The fricative pronunciation is heard before e, i, ij and y e.g. cent, citroen (lemon), cijfer (number), cynisch (cynical).
11. The voiced stop [g] occurs only incidentally in Dutch where k is assimilated to a following voiced consonant (see p. 55).
more what was, than what is the case; they are now usually both voiceless, but this point will be discussed a little later. It is undoubtedly the common occurrence of [X] which leads the layman to label Dutch a ‘gutteral’ language.\textsuperscript{12} It is true that the way \textit{g/ch} are pronounced in the west of the country, they do nothing to enhance the sound of the language although there is perhaps nowadays a tendency afoot towards a somewhat softer pronunciation of [X], even in the \textit{Randstad}. But some people have a particularly hard pronunciation. When Holland, and particularly Amsterdam, had a larger Jewish community than it does now – the result of World War II – it was commonly claimed that the Jews of the \textit{Randstad} had an especially hard [X], as a result of the frequent occurrence of that pronunciation in both Yiddish and Hebrew.

The so-called soft \textit{g} (\textit{zachte gee}) of the south (see p. 15) is a more palatal sound, somewhat like the sound in German \textit{ich}, but is heard before and after vowels of all qualities. However, in areas where soft \textit{g} is used, it is also commonly voiced.

Dutch \textit{v} is pronounced somewhere between English \textit{v} and \textit{f} and is a sound that can cause the English speaker some difficulty. North of the rivers, however, initial \textit{v} has been largely devoiced and can be safely pronounced as an \textit{f}; certainly an \textit{f} pronunciation of Dutch \textit{v} in Anlaut is preferable to an English \textit{v}, a role filled by the letter \textit{w} in Dutch. Intervocally, in more deliberate speech and south of the rivers, \textit{v} is pronounced voiced.

Dutch \textit{z} is pronounced as in English. In the west of the country the local dialects have devoiced initial \textit{z} to \textit{s} and as the standard language is largely based on these dialects, initial \textit{z} is often somewhat devoiced by \textit{ABN} speakers of the \textit{Randstad}. Nevertheless this is a tendency which should be avoided as it is considered \textit{plat} if it is done too clearly and consistently.

It is useful to bring the following three fricative couplets together to compare what has happened or is happening to them in Dutch:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{voiced} & \text{unvoiced} \\
g & > & ch \\
v & > & f \\
z & > & s \\
\end{array}
\]

:\text{now usually devoiced in all positions in northern }ABN\text{ although a degree of voicing can still occur intervocally; it is considered regional to give }g\text{ a voiced pronunciation consistently.}

:\text{may be, and usually is devoiced in initial position north of the rivers, but not intervocally.}

:\text{cannot be devoiced anywhere in a word without being considered socially inferior. This does not include devoicing of }z\text{ under the influence of assimilation however (see p. 55).}

This is an interesting sociolinguistic facet of the development of the voiced fricatives in the \textit{ABN} of the \textit{Randstad}. But south of the rivers the distinction between voiced and unvoiced fricatives is still clearly made. For the foreign student of

\textsuperscript{12} In English circles one often hears the same of German but the gutterals are not as hard nor as frequent as in Dutch; after all, \textit{g} is a stop in German. In addition, German has several other very palatal sounds which Dutch does not.
Dutch, the above development can be seen as a simplification, particularly as Dutch g and v are sounds that English does not know.

Dutch f is pronounced as in English and often falls together with Dutch v in Anlaut. In Auslaut v is never written, always f e.g. leven (to live) – ik leef (I live). This latter rule also applies to z e.g. reizen (to travel) – ik reis (I travel). It is not the case for g, however, as both g and ch occur in Auslaut, although ch never occurs in Anlaut except in foreign words e.g. vragen (to ask) – ik vraag (I ask), lachen (to laugh) – ik lach (I laugh), chaos.

To summarise what has been said about consonants so far, the following may help:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voiceless:</th>
<th>stops</th>
<th>fricatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p t k</td>
<td>f s ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced:</td>
<td>b d</td>
<td>v z g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| voiced and voiceless: contrast do not contrast phonemically

Dutch s is similar to English s. The palatal sound [ʃ], which is so common in English and German, is not at all common in Dutch. English and German words that start with [ʃ] begin with [sX] in Dutch, and those that end in that sound in English and German, end in s in Dutch. One may be led initially to assume that Dutch does not know [ʃ] at all but it does occur by accident when nouns ending in s are diminutised e.g. huisje pron. [hœyʃə] but it never occurs in Anlaut or Auslaut in indigenous words. Consequently, when foreign words that contain [ʃ] are borrowed into Dutch, the sound is often shifted to [s], the closest voiceless fricative, to facilitate pronunciation e.g. Chinees (Chinese), douche (shower). In the French loan words sju (gravy, < jus), sjek (cheque) and sjaal (scarf, shawl), [ʃ] is usually said, as reflected in the spelling which resorts to s + j to approximate the sound.

A similar thing occurs with English loan words containing ch; in indigenous words this sound also occurs only ‘by accident’ in Dutch diminutives e.g. katje (kitten), where the pronunciation is, however, truly [tʃ] + [ʃ] and thus not identical to English [tʃ].

So sjek (< French cheque) contrasts with checken (< Eng. to check).

The voiced equivalent of English sh, [ʃ], occurs in French loan words e.g. garage [ˈɡarɑs]. In some words that have been assimilated, former French [ʃ] is now pronounced [X] e.g. intelligent.

The grapheme w in Anlaut represents the English v sound i.e. a labiodental

---

13. See footnote 11.

14. It is possible to find minimal pairs where f/v and s/z would seem to contrast phonemically, but in practice the two usually fall together in those areas where v and z in Anlaut are not voiced e.g. Finnen (Finns) – vinnen (fins), cent (cent) – zend (send).

15. The current spellings historisch (historical), logisch (logical) etc. and the former spellings Nederlandisch (Dutch), mensch (person) – now spelt Nederlands and mens – are remnants of an earlier period in Dutch when they were possibly pronounced [sX], as is still the case with schip (ship), school etc.; sch was dropped in spelling from the end of indigenous words after 1934.
sound. South of the rivers, and particularly in Belgium, w is commonly pronounced as a bilabial sound i.e. as English w. It also receives a bilabial pronunciation, even in the north, after u and ou e.g. ruwe (rough, inflected), brouwen (to brew), as well as in the combinations -auw, -eew, -ieuw and -ouw when followed by a vowel e.g. blauwe (blue), leeuwin (lioness), nieuwe (new), mouwen (sleeves).

The trills and laterals

Dutch r is very interesting, as indeed r is in many European languages. Historically too it has had various curious effects on its environment (see p. 159). There are two accepted pronunciations of r in Dutch, and as both are quite different from English r and as all r's must be heard in Dutch – even at the end of words, as in vader and moeder – this sound is one of the larger stumbling blocks on the road towards a good Dutch accent for English speakers.

The original Dutch r is [r] i.e. a slightly trilled dental sound.\(^{16}\) When the uvular or velar r, [R], spread all over Europe from France, particularly in the eighteenth century, it did not miss the Netherlands and Belgium. For a long time it was considered typical of upper class Haags and of Dutch as spoken south of the rivers. Even today r in the latter area is a particularly 'thoarly' sound – the Dutch call it brouwen i.e. to speak with a thoarly r. This uvular r has, however, been making ever increasing inroads into the north and is now more common there, particularly in the cities and among younger people, than the original dental r which Van Haeringen maintains is on the way to becoming a provincialism, as is already the case in Denmark and France.\(^{17}\)

It is paradoxical that uvular r, which originally started to replace dental r because it was considered socially more acceptable at a time when French manners, dress and speech swept across Europe, should now have become the norm and that dental r is now considered by many to be chic and 'more correct';\(^ {18} \) elocution and singing teachers, for example, recommend the dental sound as 'nicer' and 'clearer'.

Clarity of speech is in fact affected by the close phonetic relationship of the velar sounds [R] and [X]. In many mouths the two sounds have almost fallen together producing homonyms e.g. erwt (pea, where w is silent) and echt (real). In the combinations schr and gr only one continuous velar sound is often heard e.g. schrijven (to write), pron. [sRei\(\text{\textit{v}}\)\(\text{\textit{n}}\)] and grot (cave), pron. [\(\text{\textit{xa}}\)\(\text{\textit{t}}\)] or [\(\text{\textit{yat}}\)].

Historically l is also an interesting sound and it is dealt with in the chapter on historical phonology on p. 157. The phoneme [l] has two allophones in Dutch, a so-called thick l and a somewhat thinner variant: the former occurs in Auslaut and in Inlaut after back vowels e.g. wel (well) and vallen (to fall), whereas the latter is heard in Anlaut and after front vowels e.g. lopen (to walk) and vellen (to fall). To

16. An overtrilled dental r is often termed een Indische r because it is considered to be one of the prominent characteristics of Dutch as spoken in the East Indies.
18. Increase in the use of [R] and the somewhat softer g in the north are, however, phenomena which are too recent for sociological values to have been allotted to them.
the English and German ear, however, all Dutch /s/ sound particularly ‘thick’ and ‘dark’ and can be difficult to master.

See page 47 for comments on a svarabhakti vowel after /l/.

Some idiosyncrasies of Dutch pronunciation

1. It is normal practice in ABN to ‘drop one’s /n’s’. There is a large number of words – infinitives, plural nouns and strong past participles, for example – that end in -en but which leave the /n/ unpronounced in normal fluent speech.
2. The indefinite article een is always pronounced [an] but the numeral ‘one’ is pronounced [e:n].
3. The word het – neuter singular definite article and pronoun ‘it’ – is always pronounced [at] except in the most deliberate speech (see p. 163 for the historical reasons). It is also often written ‘t’.
4. The possessives mijn (my) and zijn (his, its), unless stressed, are pronounced [man] and [zan] and are sometimes written m’n and z’n.
5. Generally speaking, the articulation of Dutch is laxer – the Dutch say slapper – than that of German. This can apply to individual sounds, such as /l/ for example, but also to the overall sound of the language: syllables run over into each other and one word often flows on into the next much more than in German (see Assimilation below). For example: Dutch koeien (cows), pron. [ku:jən] and German Kühe, pron. [kyːə]; Dutch herinneren (to remind) pron. [herɪnərən] and German erinnern pron. [erɪnərn] where [ ’] stands for a glottal stop.

Assimilation

The student of French is always drilled in the application of liaison i.e. the gliding together of the sound at the end of one word with the first sound of the next. In Dutch there is a similar although somewhat different phenomenon which is best called simply assimilation. Assimilation can be either progressive or regressive i.e. a sound can affect either the one which follows it or the one which precedes it. It can occur both within a word and between words. It is the voiced and unvoiced stops and fricatives which are affected e.g. postzegel (postage stamp) > pos(t)segl (progressive assimilation), uitbreiden (to expand) > uïdbreiden (regressive assimilation); wat zit erin (what’s in it) wat sit erin (progressive assimilation), ik ben ziek > ig ben ziek (regressive assimilation).

It is curious that through assimilation of /k/ with a following voiced sound, a g sound (i.e. a stop, as in English) occurs which is a sound that Dutch does not otherwise know e.g. zakdoek (handkerchief) > zagdoek, vlak naast ons (right next to us) > vlag naast ons.

As mentioned previously, initial /z/ should not be devoiced in ABN, unlike /v/ where either voiced or voiceless variants are permissible, but in situations where /z/ is devoiced by assimilation with preceding voiceless consonants, it is permissible to do so.

Certain words also know a proleptic assimilation where the preceding devoicing
factor is no longer evident e.g. zestig (sixty) – pron. sextig, vijftig (fifty) – pron. fijftig, langzaam (slow) – pron. lanksaam < older lankzaam.

Stress

Being a Germanic language, Dutch usually stresses the first syllable of a word, except when that syllable is a recognised unstressed prefix such as be-, ge-, ont- etc.; this it has in common with all other Germanic languages e.g. listening, but beginning. Loan words often behave differently in this regard, but so they do in other Germanic languages too e.g. oppositie (opposition), failliet (bankrupt), pick-up (record-player). However, even in Dutch words the stress can vary in certain compounds and in this respect Dutch stands alone. Even German, where word formation is very similar to that of Dutch, does not let the accent shift from the first syllable when compounds are formed e.g. lopen/läufen (to run) but voorlópig/vórlräftig (temporary), hogeschóol/Höchschule (university), stadhúís/Ráthaus (town hall), burgeméester/Bürgermeister (mayor).

This shifting stress can be very confusing to the student of Dutch as hard and fast rules are difficult to formulate but there is a certain reasoning behind the phenomenon. As heavy stress on the first syllable of a word can lead to a reduction in the quality and quantity of the vowels in following syllables, it seems likely that certain (particularly adjectival) endings pulled the stress towards them to help preserve the full value of the vowels in all syllables e.g. misdádig (criminal, adj.) < misdaad (crime), onuittúttelijke (inexhaustible) < uitputten (to exhaust).

The stress is often placed on the final syllable of certain Dutch place names e.g. Amsterrdám, Edám, Maastrích (but Ütrecht), Bredá (but Góouda).
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19. Shifting stress is of course also very characteristic of English e.g. to proceed and proceeds, but such shifts are peculiar to the words of Norman or Latin origin.
LAGERWIJ, W. *Speak Dutch.*
Meulenhoff, Amsterdam, 1968.
Not quite as vibrant as *Levend Nederlands* but nevertheless still a good aid.

CONINCK, R.H.B. *Groot uitspraakwoordenboek van de Nederlandse taal.*
The only pronunciation dictionary currently available.

BLANCQUAERT, E. *Praktische uitspraakleer van de Nederlandse taal.*
A good detailed account of Dutch pronunciation intended for native-speakers. It deals at times with issues that are only relevant in Belgium. It is particularly good on Dutch stress patterns.
6 The grammar of Dutch (morphology)

Articles, gender and nouns

Dutch nouns are of one of two genders – common gender or neuter. Common gender incorporates what were formerly masculine and feminine nouns, a distinction which is now only sometimes made in pronominal substitution (see p. 61).

The definite article is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Plural (both genders)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The</td>
<td>de</td>
<td>het</td>
<td>de</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with so many other European languages, gender generally has to be learnt parrot fashion with every new noun; there are few water-tight rules for determining gender. Exceptions to this are certain nominal endings which always indicate one or other gender e.g. the diminutive ending -je is neuter and the abstract endings -heid (Eng. -hood, -ness) and -ing, for example, are always common gender. Compound nouns, as in German, always take the gender of the last element e.g. de stad (town) + het huis (house) > het stadhuis (town hall).

The indefinite article, een (pron. 'n), is the same for both genders but the demonstratives require separate forms for either gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
<th>Plural (both genders)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That, those:</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>dat</td>
<td>die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This, these:</td>
<td>deze</td>
<td>dit</td>
<td>deze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possession

Possession is usually expressed by means of the preposition van e.g. het huis van mijn vriend (my friend's house); the so-called Anglo-Saxon genitive with s is sometimes used in Dutch with normal nouns e.g. mijn vaders hoed (my father’s hat) but is frequently used with proper nouns e.g. Piets dochter (Piet’s daughter). In spoken Dutch a further variant is commonly heard where the unstressed form of the possessive is inserted between the possessor and the thing possessed e.g. mijn hond z’n poot (my dog’s leg, lit. my dog his leg), zijn moeder d’r tante (his mother’s aunt, lit. his mother her aunt).

Although the masculine and neuter genitive singular of the definite article, ’s (< des), is found only in standard expressions e.g. 's morgens (in the morning), the feminine genitive singular and the genitive plural, der, is still productive in written language e.g. de geheime der taal (the secrets of the language), de koningin der Nederlanden (the queen of the Netherlands).

1. Here taal is still felt to be a feminine noun (see p. 62).
Case
With the exception of the above and a host of standard expressions, case is no longer indicated, with the result that the situation is now very similar to English. Compare:

English: The woman gave the apple to the child.
Dutch: De vrouw gaf de appel aan het kind.
German: Die Frau gab dem Kind den Apfel.

Plural of nouns
Plural formation in Dutch, although not quite as easy as in English, is infinitely simpler than in German. Generally speaking, the former weak noun plural ending -en has taken over throughout in Dutch (see p. 166), in much the same way as the plural in -s has in English, but a considerable number of nouns with particular endings also take an -s in the plural in Dutch\(^2\), notably nouns ending in -el, -em, -en and -er e.g. tafels (tables), bezems (brooms), dekens (blankets), vaders (fathers). Diminutives, which end in -je, also take -s e.g. huisjes (houses).

Diminutives
Many languages know a diminutive ending e.g. German -chen or -lein, Italian -ino/-ina, but there is to my knowledge no language which uses its diminutive ending on nouns more than does Dutch. Although the function of a diminutive ending is basically to make small or endear, in Dutch it does this and much more – it is but one aspect of what the Dutch call gezelligheid. Someone with a knowledge of German may make light of the translation of gezelligheid by equating it with Gemütlichkeit; gezelligheid does cover the field of meaning of Gemütlichkeit plus much more. The Dutchman will be heard to use the word gezellig (cosy, chummy, pleasant) for many situations for which gemütlich is inappropriate.

The much more frequent use of the diminutive in Dutch is an example of this. The diminutive can also be used, and frequently is, to convey cynicism or humour; for example, someone who has bought a million dollar mansion can be said to have acquired een mooi huisje, for which ‘a nice little house’ is a poor translation. Similarly, a language one doesn’t understand can be called een raar taalje (a peculiar lingo). Wijf is a derogatory term for a woman, but the form wijfje refers to the female of any species of animal. And so the potential of the diminutive ending on nouns in Dutch goes on. It is, without doubt, a unique feature of the language.

Amazingly, however, the diminutive ending is not limited to nouns. Pronouns, numerals and even adverbs can take a diminutive ending to convey an extra air of gezelligheid e.g. onder-onsje (tête-à-tête); met z’n tweetjes (the two of us) – a more gezellig form of met z’n tweeeën, wacht eventjes (wait just a minute), zachtjes (quietly).

\(^2\) The frequency of -en and -s plurals in Dutch is in a sense the reverse of the situation in English where -en plurals are still found, but only rarely e.g. oxen, children, brethren. The -s plural is, however, much more common in Dutch than the -en plural is in English.
Adjectives

Adjectival inflection still exists in Dutch, as it does in German, but it has been greatly simplified in modern Dutch. The attributive adjective (i.e. before the noun) takes an -e ending in definite contexts before nouns of both genders, both singular and plural, and also before singular common gender nouns in indefinite contexts, but before singular neuter nouns in indefinite contexts it is left uninflected e.g. de/die/mijn grote auto (the/that/my large car), het/dit/zijn nieuwe huis (the/this/his new house); een/geen/iedere grote auto (a/no/every large car), een/geen/ieder nieuw huis (a/no/every new house).

The comparative and superlative of the adjective are formed by the addition of -er and -st, as in English. However, in English it is usual for adjectives of more than two syllables, and even some bisyllabic adjectives, to form their comparative and superlative periphrastically by using 'more' and 'most' in lieu of the endings -er and -st. Although Dutch meer and meest are occasionally used in a similar way in a few special cases, in general all Dutch adjectives, regardless of length, can take these endings e.g. klein – kleiner (small – smaller), interessant – interessanter (interesting – more interesting). There are also, as in English, a few adjectives with an irregular comparative and superlative form e.g. goed – better – best (good – better – best), kwaad – erger – ergst (bad, evil – worse – worst).

Adverbs

There is no formal difference in Dutch between the predicative adjective and the adverb; in other words there is no equivalent of the English -ly ending e.g. Haar stem is erg mooi (Her voice is very nice), Zij zingt erg mooi (She sings very nicely). The ending -lijk, etymologically related to -ly, is found on both adjectives and adverbs alike e.g. vrolijk (merry/merrily), mogelijk (possible/possibly).

Numerals

The cardinal numerals show certain similarities to German in that the ‘four-and-twenty’ system is applied from 21 on and the copula ‘and’ is usually omitted in numerals over 100: een (1), twee (2), drie (3), vier (4), vijf (5), zes (6), zeven (7), acht (8), negen (9), tien (10), elf (11), twaalf (12), dertien (13), veertien (14), vijftien (15) etc., twintig (20), eenentwintig (21), tweeëntwintig (22) etc., dertig (30), veertig (40), vijftig (50), zestig (60), zeventig (70), tachtig (80), negentig (90), honderd (100), honderd een (101), tweehonderd drieëenhalf (253), duizend (1000).

Een doubles up as both the indefinite article and the numeral, although there is a difference in pronunciation between the two (see p. 55); where ambiguity in writing can arise, the numeral is written één.

Drie/dertien/dertig show the same metathesis of r that is present in English, but lacking in German – compare drei/dreizehn/dreissig.

3. See p. 39 for an explanation of the diaeresis.
The change in spelling and pronunciation in *vier/veertien/veertig* and the enigmatic *t* of *tachtig* are explained on p. 170.

The ordinal numerals are as follows: *eerste* (1st), *tweede* (2nd), *derde* (3rd), *vierde* (4th), *vijfde* (5th), *zesde* (6th), *zevende* (7th), *achtste* (8th), *negende* (9th), *tiende* (10th), *elfde* (11th), *twaalfde* (12th), *dertiende* (13th), *veertiende* (14th), *twintigste* (20th), *eenentwintigste* (21st) etc.

**Pronouns**

**Personal pronouns:**

| subject: | ik | jij (je) | u | hij | zij (ze) | het |
| object: | mij (me) | jou (je) | u | hem | haar | het |
| possessive: | mijn | jouw (je) | uw | zijn | haar | zijn |

| subject: | wij (we) | jullie (je) | u | zij (ze) |
| object: | ons | jullie (je) | u | hen/hun (ze) |
| possessive: | ons/onzè | jullie (je) | uw | hun |

As in English, there is but one object form of the pronoun because the accusative and the dative have fallen together; only the third person plural still preserves a separate dative form, *hun* (see p. 172).

A unique feature of some of the personal pronouns of Dutch is the fact that several have unemphatic forms that are actually written i.e. the bracketed forms above. The alternation of stressed and unstressed forms of the pronoun is shared by English too (e.g. you – ya) but such forms are not written. Most of the other pronouns given above also know unemphatic forms in the spoken language e.g. *haar* (d’r), *het* (*t*), *hij* (*ie*).

*U* is used for polite address in both the singular and the plural, although it always takes a singular form of the verb i.e. either the second or third person ending which are the same for most verbs anyway.

See p. 68 for the pronominal use of *er*.

**Pronominal substitution**

Although the distinction between masculine and feminine nouns has become virtually extinct for non-animate things, it sometimes returns when such nouns are substituted by pronouns. The issue of pronominal substitution in Dutch is not easy for speakers of English. For example, although *de deur* (the door) is historically a feminine noun and *de vloer* (the floor) is a masculine noun, both are nowadays substituted by *hij* which then translates English ‘it’, as does *het*, of course, with reference to neuter nouns i.e. *Ik doe de deur dicht. Hij is dicht* (I shut the door. It is closed). Even a cow or a mother cat will usually be referred to as *hij*, although *zij* is
possible in such cases. However, certain abstract nouns which have recognisably (formerly) feminine endings can be, and usually are in elevated speech and writing, substituted by *zij* and the corresponding object and possessive form *haar* e.g. *regering* (government), *muziek* (music), *liefdadigheid* (charity) or even non-compound abstract nouns such as *wereld* (world) and *wet* (law).

**Possessive pronouns**
Possessive pronouns before the noun no longer inflect except for *ons*, which becomes *onze* before singular common gender nouns and plural nouns e.g. *onze vader* (our father), *onze kinderen* (our child). All independent possessives take an -e ending, however e.g. *Dat is zijn stoel maar dit is de mijne* (That is his chair, but this is mine).

**Relative pronouns**
The demonstrative pronouns *die/dat* also act as relative pronouns in Dutch in much the same way as 'that' can function in English e.g. *De man die hier woont, is mijn oom* (The man who lives here is my uncle). As for the demonstrative pronouns, *die* is used to refer back to singular common gender nouns and plural nouns of both genders, whereas *dat* is used after singular neuter antecedents e.g. *Het huis dat ik gekocht heb, was erg goedkoop* (The house that/which I bought, was very cheap).

When a relative pronoun which refers to a person is preceded by a preposition, *wie*, which is also the interrogative pronoun ‘who’, is used instead of *die* e.g. *De vrouw aan wie ik het geld gaf...* (The lady to whom I gave the money...). This construction is almost identical to English. When the antecedent is non-personal, however, *waar* + preposition is used e.g. *De tafel waarop de krant ligt, is erg hoog* (The table on which – lit. whereon – the newspaper is lying, is very high). But constructions of this sort are usually split in speech in the following way: *De tafel waar de krant op ligt, is erg hoog* (see p. 72) – compare: The table which the newspaper is lying on, is very high.

**Verbs**

With the exception of six monosyllabic verbs⁴, Dutch infinitives always end in -en. The infinitive can also be used as a neuter noun, as in German e.g. *het roken* (smoking), *het koken* (cooking) etc. Present participles are not as commonly used as in English; they are formed by adding either -d or -de to the infinitive e.g. *huilend* (crying), *al lezende* (while reading).

**Present tense**
With the usual exceptions of ‘to be’ and ‘to have’ there are no irregular verbs in the present tense in Dutch. A verb is conjugated in the present indicative as follows:

4. The six are: *doen* (to do), *gaan* (to go), *slaan* (to hit), *staan* (to stand), *zien* (to see), *zijn* (to be).
wonen (to live, dwell)

| Subject | Infinitive | Imperative | Possessive
|---------|------------|------------|----------
| ik      | wooneen    | wonen      |
| jij/u   | woont      | jullie wonen|
| hij, zij, het | woont | zij wonen |

When the second person singular (i.e. only jij, not u) inverts, the -t ending is dropped for phonetic reasons e.g. wooneen jij? (do you live?) Historically the second person plural took a -t ending but nowadays it is usual to use -en throughout the plural.

**Imperative**
The imperative is the same as the stem\(^5\) of the verb for all persons, singular or plural i.e. woone (live).

**Imperfect tense of weak verbs**
Consistent with all other Germanic languages, the imperfect of weak verbs is formed by the addition of a dental suffix i.e. either -de/-den or -te/-ten, depending on whether the stem of the verb to which the suffix is added, ends in a voiced or an unvoiced sound\(^6\) e.g. ik woonde/wij woonden (I lived/we lived) but ik stopte/wij stopten (I stopped/we stopped). Because of the tendency not to pronounce the final n in such words (see p. 55), in practice the singular and the plural fall together in speech.

**Past participle of weak verbs**
The past participle is formed, as in German, by the prefixing of ge- and the suffixing of -d or -t, according to the rule above, to the stem of the verb e.g. gewoond (lived), gestopt (stopped). In practice, however, both d and t in this position are pronounced as t.

**Imperfect tense and past participle of strong verbs**
Strong verbs, which are commonly called irregular verbs – but this is a term I prefer to avoid for reasons that will soon become clear – only emerge as different from weak verbs in the past tenses.\(^7\) As in all Germanic languages, they form their imperfect and past participle not by the addition of a dental suffix, but by the alternation of various vowels in the stem syllable e.g. zingen (to sing)/zong (sang)/gezongen (sung). There are seven basic patterns of vowel alternation and consequently strong verbs can be grouped according to which pattern they employ. The class to which a given verb belongs was determined in history by the sounds in the word e.g. drinken/dronk/gedronken (to drink), zwemmen/zwom/gezwommen (to swim) – compare English sing/sang/sung, drink/drank/drunk and swim/swam/swam.

---

5. The stem of the verb is that part which remains when the -en of the infinitive is removed; this often causes certain spelling changes (see p. 37).

6. The explanation given here is in fact a slight oversimplification – compare blaffen (to bark) – blafte and geloven (to believe) – geholmde; kussen (to kiss) – kuste and reizen (to travel) – reisde.

7. The reason for the rather strange terminology weak and strong is explained on p. 173.
swum where a set pattern is adhered to because the verbs in this particular group all share a common phonetic feature i.e. a nasal plus a consonant. The seven groups in Dutch are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bijten</th>
<th>beet/beten⁸</th>
<th>gebeten</th>
<th>(to bite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>schieten</td>
<td>schoot/schoten</td>
<td>geschoten</td>
<td>(to shoot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sluiten</td>
<td>sloop/sloten</td>
<td>gesloten</td>
<td>(to shut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>binden</td>
<td>bond/bonden</td>
<td>gebonden</td>
<td>(to tie, bind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>breken</td>
<td>brak/braken</td>
<td>gebroken</td>
<td>(to break)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eten</td>
<td>at/aten</td>
<td>gegeten</td>
<td>(to eat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>dragen</td>
<td>droeg/droegen</td>
<td>gedragen</td>
<td>(to wear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>slapen</td>
<td>sliep/sliepen</td>
<td>geslapen</td>
<td>(to sleep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hangen</td>
<td>hing/hingen</td>
<td>gehangen</td>
<td>(to hang)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the imperfect there is one form for all persons of the singular and one for the plural. In groups 4 and 5 there is a distinction between the singular and the plural in the vowel of the stem, unlike in German where analogy of the singular to the plural has taken place – compare aß/aßen (ate) where both forms contain a long vowel. German also has a separate second person singular and plural ending in the imperfect giving five different endings in all compared with only two in Dutch e.g.

**Dutch:** ik bond  wij bonden  German: ich band  wir banden
   jij bond  jullie bonden  du bandst  ihr bandet
   hij bond  zij bonden  er band  sie banden

The past participle of strong verbs always ends in -en; compare English stolen, ridden, eaten, taken etc.

**Irregular verbs**

Irregular are all those verbs that, for a variety of reasons, are not regular and yet do not follow any of the above seven patterns of the strong verb. There are (1) monosyllabic verbs e.g. staan/stond/gestaan (to stand); (2) mixed verbs i.e. verbs that were formerly strong but now have a weak imperfect e.g. bakken - bakte - gebakken (to bake, fry); (3) verbs analogous to English brought, thought etc. e.g. brengen/bracht/gebracht (to bring), denken/dacht/gedacht (to think), zoeken/zocht/gezocht (to seek).

The verb 'to be':

As in all European languages, the verb 'to be' is totally irregular:

**present:**  ik ben  wij zijn
   jij/u bent  jullie zijn
   hij is  zij zijn

---

8. The two forms are the singular and the plural forms respectively where the usual spelling rules have been applied.
imperfect: was/waren
past participle: geweest i.e. a weak past part. whereas German opted for a strong one, gewesen.
imperative: wees

It is also interesting to note that the verb ‘to be’ has two infinitives in Dutch i.e. zijn and wezen.

Modal auxiliary verbs
Dutch knows the following modal verbs, which, although also known to both English and German, often have quite different meanings from the cognate forms in those languages:

infinitive: kunnen (to be able) mogen (to be allowed to) moeten (to have to)
present: kan/kunnen mag/mogen moet/moeten
imperfect: kon/konden mocht/mochten moest/moesten
past part.: gekund gemogen gemoeten

infinitive: willen (to want to) zullen (will)
present: wil/willen zal/zullen
imperfect: zou, wilde/wilden zou/zouden
past part.: gewild gezuld

The often peculiar constituent parts of these verbs in both English and Dutch only really make sense when their history is known (see p. 180). Actually the verbs are significantly more regular in Dutch than in English. Zullen, etymologically the same word as English ‘shall’, translates English ‘will’ whereas Dutch willen corresponds to English ‘want’. Consequently zou corresponds to English ‘would’ and zou to ‘wanted’. Similarly, Dutch mocht is a cognate of English ‘might’ (originally the past tense of ‘may’) but in meaning mocht and ‘might’ now have nothing at all in common.

The past participles of modal verbs are seldom used because of the so-called double infinitive rule i.e. when a modal verb in the perfect tense is followed by an infinitive – and by virtue of modals being auxiliary verbs, this is nearly always the case – the infinitive of the modal is used rather than its past participle e.g. Ik heb haar kunnen zien – not gekund zien (I have been able to see her). This rule is known to German too but it is applied more frequently in Dutch because several other common auxiliary verbs that are not modals also require it e.g. Ik heb hem leren zwemmen (I have taught him to swim) – compare Ich habe ihn schwimmen gelernt.

Use of imperfect and perfect tenses
Apart from the complexity of continuous tenses in English i.e. I am writing etc. which are unknown in Dutch as in other European languages, Dutch is also not as rigid in the use of its past tenses as is English. The English sentence ‘He bought a new house yesterday’ can only be expressed in the imperfect because of the presence of the adverb of time; otherwise ‘He has bought a new house’ would be correct. In Dutch such a distinction is unknown: the first example
could be expressed in either the imperfect or the perfect tense but the latter would be more common in speech e.g. *Hij kocht gisteren een nieuw huis, Hij heeft gisteren een nieuw huis gekocht.* The second English example would also have to be expressed in the perfect in Dutch, however. In other words: English imperfect = Dutch imperfect or perfect, English perfect = Dutch perfect.

The tendency to speak and write in the perfect tense, which is also common in German, French and Italian, accounts for the frequent occurrence of the double infinitive construction mentioned above.

Use of ‘to have’ and ‘to be’ as auxiliaries in the perfect tense

Dutch, like so many European languages, also uses either hebben (to have) or zijn (to be) plus the past participle to form the perfect tense of verbs, a distinction which is commonly seen as an almost insurmountable hurdle by native-speakers of English. The criteria for whether to use hebben or zijn with a Dutch verb are similar, but not identical to those in other European languages and are even somewhat different from German. What Dutch has in common with several other languages in this regard is that only intransitive verbs are conjugated with ‘to be’, but this is not to say that all intransitive verbs use zijn; all transitive verbs do, however, use ‘to have’ e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ik ben gegaan} & \quad (\text{I have gone}) & \quad \text{– intrans.} \\
\text{ik heb gelachen} & \quad (\text{I have laughed}) & \quad \text{– intrans.} \\
\text{ik heb het gezien} & \quad (\text{I have seen it}) & \quad \text{– trans.}
\end{align*}
\]

The usual rules of verbs of motion, those indicating a change of state etc. can be cited for Dutch too for those intransitive verbs that take zijn, but in addition Dutch knows another category that is peculiar to it alone. There is a group of verbs indicating motion, which, when indicating motion towards a certain place, always take zijn, but when the destination is not mentioned, they always take hebben e.g. rijden (to drive): *ik ben vandaag naar Amsterdam gereden* (I drove to Amsterdam today) *ik heb vandaag veel gereden* (I have driven a lot today).

Reflexive verbs

Dutch, like all other European languages, knows reflexive verbs, some of which are or can be used reflexively in English, but most of which are foreign to English. The concept in Dutch is, however, identical to that in German e.g. to wash (oneself) – *(zich) wassen*, to remember – *(zich herinneren). A reflexive verb is conjugated like any other verb but the pronouns that accompany it are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ik} & \quad \text{was me} & \quad \text{wij} & \quad \text{wassen ons} \\
\text{ij} & \quad \text{wast je} & \quad \text{jullie} & \quad \text{wassen je} \\
\text{u} & \quad \text{wast u/zich} & \\
\text{hij/zij/het} & \quad \text{wast zich} & \quad \text{zij} & \quad \text{wassen zich}
\end{align*}
\]

9. Germanic languages do not know the distinction between the imperfect on the one hand and the past historic/perfect on the other that is so integral to Latin languages.
The third person reflexive *zich* is a German loan word (see p. 172). The polite form of address can take either a second or a third person pronoun (see p. 171).

The compound reflexive pronoun in -zelf e.g. *mezelf, zichzelf* etc., is only used for extra emphasis e.g. *Ik kleed eerst de kinderen aan en dan kleed ik mezelf aan* (I first dress the children and then I dress myself).

**Passive voice**
The passive voice uses two auxiliary verbs, *worden* (to become) and *zijn* (to be), whereas German uses only the former and English only the latter. In Dutch, *worden* is used for the present and imperfect passive whereas *zijn* is used for perfect passives e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Dutch Form</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td><em>het wordt gebracht</em></td>
<td>it is being brought</td>
<td>with <em>worden</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imp.</td>
<td><em>het werd gebracht</em></td>
<td>it was brought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td><em>het is gebracht</em></td>
<td>it has been brought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plup.</td>
<td><em>het was gebracht</em></td>
<td>it had been brought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut. perf.</td>
<td><em>het zal gebracht zijn</em></td>
<td>it will have been brought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perfect passives above contrast with the English equivalents where the past participle ‘been’ must be used and with the German equivalents below where the past participle *worden* (with loss of *ge-*) must be used e.g.

\[
es \text{ is gebracht worden} \\
es \text{ war gebracht worden} \\
es \text{ wird gebracht worden sein}
\]

The rather simple construction in the perfect passive in Dutch has two interesting side effects: (a) the subtle difference between the two English sentences ‘The door is shut’ and ‘The door has been shut’ cannot be expressed in Dutch; both are translated as *De deur is gesloten*, where the distinction between the state and the action can only be brought out by mentioning the agent i.e. *de deur is door hem gesloten* – the door has been/was\(^{10}\) shut by him; (b) because the passive voice is, by definition, a construction where the object of the active becomes the subject i.e. ‘I read the book’ (active) – ‘The book is read by me’ (passive), only transitive verbs can be used in the passive. Therefore, the perfect passive of a transitive verb ends up identical in form but not in meaning to the perfect active of an intransitive verb that is conjugated with *zijn* e.g. *Hij is gezien* (He has been/was seen), *Hij is gekomen* (He has come/came).

**Subjunctive**
There is no longer an active subjunctive mood in Dutch; in this regard the language has undergone the same simplification as English, but in German it is still very much alive. In Dutch the present subjunctive has fallen together with the present indicative and the same has happened in the imperfect – compare:

10. Notice that even in the passive it is usual to use the perfect tense in Dutch (see p. 65) where in English we would normally use the imperfect.
English: *If I ate that, I would get sick.*
Dutch: *Als ik dat at, zou ik ziek worden.*
German: *Wenn ich das äße, würde ich krank werden.*

and

English: *I ate it*
Dutch: *Ik at het*
German: *Ich aß es.*

But Dutch does have in common with German a periphrastic construction which replaces the imperfect subjunctive when it is considered necessary to express some doubt, although in German it is merely a modern alternative to the above e.g. *Als ik dat zou eten, zou ik ziek worden.* *Wenn ich das essen würde, würde ich krank werden.*
The closest equivalent in English is: *If I were to eat that I would get sick.*
Otherwise subjunctives are only found in isolated expressions e.g. *lang leve de koningin* (long live the queen – pres. subj.), *als het ware* (as it were – past subj.).

Conjunctions

Dutch, like German, distinguishes between subordinating and coordinating conjunctions where the former send the finite verb of the clause to the end but the latter have no effect on word order e.g. *Ik weet dat hij morgen komt* (I know he's coming tomorrow), *Ik blijf hier maar hij gaat naar huis* (I'm staying here but he's going home).

Er

The word *er* is one of the most ubiquitous and essential little words in the Dutch language but is also one of the most enigmatic for the foreign student. The complexity of how to use it stems from its various functions; it has four in all:
1. replete
2. locative
3. pronominal
4. partitive

Functions 1, 2 and 3 corresponds to English 'there', although the third function is now antiquated English e.g.
1. *Er wonen veel mensen hier* (There are many people living here)
2. *Ik ben er nooit geweest* (I have never been there)
3. *Ik schreef de brief er mee* (I wrote the letter therewith/with it)

Partitive *er* functions in a similar way to French *en* and means something like 'of it/of them' e.g.
*Ik heb er tien* – I have ten (of them).
*Ik heb er geen gezien* – I didn’t see any (of them).
It is thus closely related to pronominal *er*.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

The following is a list of the most recent aids to learning Dutch apart from the audio-lingual aids mentioned in the bibliography to chapter 5.

**SHEFTER, W. Introduction to Dutch.**
In my opinion this is still the most palatable introduction to the Dutch language that has yet appeared in any language. It has gone through four editions since 1958 and a fifth, fully revised edition is in preparation. It contains self-correcting exercises and an excellent basic vocabulary.

**SMIT, J & MEIJER, R. Dutch grammar and reader.**
This book has in fact also been around since 1958, when it was first published by the Melbourne University Press. As a grammar it is rather dry, but useful; its greatest strength lies in the excellent graded reading passages and the many passages for translation into Dutch are also very useful.

**WILLIAMS, G.K. A Dutch reader.**
Stanley Thornes, Cheltenham, 1981.
A delightful recent publication that finally offers a sequel to the passages in Smit and Meijer.

**SCHOENMAKERS, A. Praatpaal.**
Stanley Thornes, Cheltenham, 1981.
A pleasant, up to date course that has opted more for the direct approach, avoiding formal grammar as much as possible.

**KOOLHOVEN, H. Teach yourself Dutch.**
EUP, London, 1941.
Because this series is so well known and so readily available, many people are tempted to begin with this book. In my opinion it has had its day, but it does have the advantage of offering answers to the exercises.

**DONALDSON, B.C. Dutch reference grammar.**
The only formal grammar book that can act as a sequel to any of the above. Also useful for those who are beginners but wish to dispense with exercises, reading passages etc.

**DONALDSON, B.C. A Dutch vocabulary.**
Some 3,000 basic Dutch words with which to expand one’s active vocabulary which are grouped under broad subject headings and further divided into groups of ± 10 words for easy learning.

For dictionaries see the bibliography to chapter 8.
7 Word Order

Word order is probably the most difficult aspect of grammar to explain simply and concisely, but in a work such as this it is fortunately not necessary to go into great detail about the syntax of the language. I will confine myself to the main differences from English on the one hand and German on the other, with which language Dutch has much in common syntactically but also several quite striking differences.

The most crucial aspect of word order in Dutch is the place of the verb(s) in a sentence. As in German, the golden rule is that the finite verb usually stands in second position (i.e. is always the second idea in the sentence) e.g.

1 2
He went to school today 1 2
*Hij ging vandaag naar school.*

Compare:

1 2 3
Today he went to school 1 2 3
*Vandaag ging hij naar school.*

Of course in questions the finite verb is always in first position e.g. Did he go to school today? *Ging hij vandaag naar school?* But in subordinate and relative clauses the finite verb stands at the end, as in German e.g. I know that he is going to school today – *Ik weet dat hij vandaag naar school gaat.*

Also as in German, when a compound sentence begins with a subordinate clause, the subject and verb of the main clause are inverted so as to keep the finite verb in that clause in second position in the sentence as a whole e.g.

1. As in English, this word order is also possible in the following rather literary sounding (formerly) subjunctive constructions: *Mocht het regenen, dan zullen we thuis blijven* Should it rain, we'll stay at home; *Komt hij wat later, dan kan hij niet meedoen* Should he come a bit later, he won't be able to take part.

2. There is one notable exception to the rules for placing verbs at the end of clauses: it is common in somewhat longer clauses containing adverbial expressions, to put these adjuncts after the verb, provided they begin with a preposition i.e. prepositional adjuncts. In such cases the verb is not last, but it is also not in the position it is in either English or German e.g. I know he was very interested in music – *Ik weet dat hij erg veel belangstelling had voor muziek,* but also: *Ik weet dat hij erg veel belangstelling voor muziek had;* I then rang him up in the hospital – *Ik heb hem toen opgebeld in het ziekenhuis,* but also: *Ik heb hem toen in het ziekenhuis opgebeld.* In short, this addition of extra information after the verb in instances where it 'should' be last, is quite possible in writing as well as speech and is often preferred. It gives the speaker a somewhat greater freedom of word order than is the case in German.
Word order

1 2
Ik blijf thuis als hij naar school gaat – I stay at home when he goes to school, but

1 2
Als hij naar school gaat, blijf ik thuis.

When there are two or more verbs in a main clause i.e. a finite verb plus a past participle or one or more infinitives, all but the finite verb go to the end of the clause (see example 2 in footnote 2 for an exception) e.g. He wants to go to school today – *Hij wil vandaag naar school gaan*; He has gone to school today – *Hij is vandaag naar school gegaan*.

When there are two or more infinitives in addition to the finite verb which must stand at the end of the clause, the sequence follows English practice, not German i.e.

1 2 3 1 2 3
He will have to do it. *Hij zal het moeten doen*.

Compare German:

1 3 2
*Er wird es machen müssen*.

When one of the verbs that follow the finite verb is a past participle a certain choice is possible, unlike in German e.g.

1 2 3 1 2 3
He must have built the house *Hij moet het huis hebben gebouwd*.

or

1 3 2
*Hij moet het huis gebouwd hebben*.

Compare German:

1 3 2
*Er muß das Haus gebaut haben*.

Separable verbs can behave quite differently in Dutch than in German for once again there is a greater freedom of word order in Dutch e.g. He does not know that I telephoned him yesterday –

*Hij weet niet dat ik hem gisteren heb opgebeld*  
*opgebeld heb*  
*op heb gebeld*.

He said that he also wanted to go along –

*Hij ziet dat hij ook heeft willen meegaan.*  
*mee heeft willen gaan*.

3. English imperfects are often rendered by perfect tenses in Dutch (see p. 65).
The last example in both the above instances is the most common in spoken Dutch, although all three forms are permissible and common in both speech and writing. The splitting up of forms that logically belong together is a characteristic of Dutch, particularly when compared with German; Dutch grammarians have a term for it, *tangconstructies* (*tang* = tongs).

*Tangconstructies* are most frequent with *er* + prepositions (i.e. lit. there + preposition as in thereon, therein etc.) and *waar* + preposition (i.e. lit. where + preposition as in whereon, wherein etc.). Such split constructions are also common in English, but not in standard German, although they are used in the spoken language in certain areas of Germany e.g.

1. I put my money in it but more common is: *Ik stopte mijn geld erin* (lit. therein)
   Compare German: *Ich steckte mein Geld darin.*

2. The table (which) I put the book on is very high – *De tafel waarop ik het boek legde, is erg hoog* (lit. whereon)
   but more common is: *De tafel waar ik het boek op legde, is erg hoog.*
   Compare German: *Der Tisch, auf dem (or worauf) ich das Buch legte, ist sehr hoch.*

After the difficulty of placing the verbs in their correct position comes the problem of where adverbs and adverbial phrases should stand, particularly in relation to each other. Dutch, like German, knows the TMP rule (i.e. Time, Manner, Place) which, although not always adhered to in the case of smaller, very frequent adverbs such as *daar* or *er* (there) and *hier* (here), is a good rule of thumb; English usually employs the reverse order.

- e.g. She goes to school by train every day
  
  *Zij gaat iedere dag met de trein naar school* – PMT
  
  As in English, it is possible to start a sentence with an adverb of time i.e. *Iedere dag gaat zij met de trein naar school.* This is possible in Dutch because time is still mentioned before manner and place.

Adjectival adjectives are possible in Dutch and are quite often found in journalese, but they are not at all common in speech nor as common in writing as in German, relative clauses being preferred in Dutch e.g. *de vijfenvijftigjarige in Haarlem geboren minister van financiën* but more common is the following: *de vijfenvijftigjarige minister van financiën die in Haarlem geboren is* – the fifty-five year old minister of finance who was born in Haarlem.

The loss of case (see p. 59) in Dutch has, as in English, led to a more fixed word order than is the case in German. For example, whereas the German sentence *Der Hund beißt den Mann* can be inverted for emphasis i.e. *Den Mann beißt der Hund* without the basic meaning changing, this is rarely done in Dutch, and never in English, as the word order is the only remaining indicator of the relationship of the nouns to each other e.g. The dog bites the man / *De hond bijt de man.* A more fixed

4. In certain areas in Germany the following construction, which resembles the Dutch, is also heard: *Der Tisch, wo das Buch 'rauf liegt, ist sehr hoch.*
word order has thus been one of the consequences of the loss of case in Dutch and English, as well as in French, Italian etc. compared with Latin. The speaker of English is often inclined to see case as an unnecessary complication, but here is at least one concrete example of the advantages of preserving case.

In the English sentence ‘I showed the boy the group’, it is only the position of boy before group that indicates what is direct and what is indirect object. We know intuitively that it is the group which is being shown to the boy and not vice versa. Exactly the same situation exists in Dutch. *Ik heb de jongen de groep laten zien.* If one wanted to reverse the order, the preposition to/aan would be required in both English and Dutch e.g. I showed the group to the boy *Ik liet de groep aan de jongen zien*; a more frequent use of prepositions is also a consequence of the loss of case.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

There are few studies of syntax but none which would be of any assistance to the non-native-speaker. The index of the author's reference grammar (see p. 69) refers readers to all sections of that book that deal with word order.
8 Vocabulary and word formation

Vocabulary

An English-speaking person embarking on a study of Dutch, because he is confronted, by necessity, with only simple vocabulary to begin with, is likely to be struck by great similarities between the vocabulary of Dutch and that of his mother tongue e.g. *hond, kat, pan, pot, school, tafel, tien*. Such an observation is of course not entirely unfounded – Dutch and English still share a great deal of basic vocabulary as a result of their common Germanic origins. German does too but there the Second German Sound Shift (see p. 123) has modified the form of words somewhat e.g. *Katze, Pfanne, Pfeffer, zehn*. English and Dutch, both Low German languages, did not undergo such changes.

This similarity in vocabulary between English and Dutch does not, however, in the long run prove to be of any great assistance in learning Dutch. The vocabulary of English has been subjected too much for too long to non-Germanic influence for it to have remained as close to Dutch as it was in the Old English period prior to the Norman invasion. Dutch has not been affected to anything like the same extent by outside influences as English; its vocabulary, like that of German, is still overwhelmingly Germanic in origin. Anyone with a knowledge of German will immediately recognise a great number Dutch words, although there are inevitably many apparent similarities which conceal subtle, and sometimes not so subtle differences in meaning e.g. *aardig* (nice) – *artig* (well-behaved); *aandacht* (attention) – *Andacht* (respect); *verzoeken* (to request) – *versuchen* (to try); *durven* (to dare) – *dürfen* (to be allowed to).

But although there has never been an event in Dutch history comparable to the Norman invasion of England, this is not to say that Dutch vocabulary has not been affected, even greatly, by outside influences. No language has ever managed to live in complete isolation from others and it is in the nature of every language to borrow from others to increase its vocabulary if the need arises. Dutch has nevertheless been more susceptible to absorbing foreign words than has German, for example. At various times in history there have been attempts to purify the vocabulary of the language, for example as a result of anti-French sentiments during and after the Napoleonic period and of anti-German feelings after World War II, but such conscious artificial efforts to change the vocabulary of a language seldom meet with any lasting success. Only the people as a whole ultimately decide which words are, and are not to survive. It may thus be in the polyglot nature of the Dutch, the result of no other nationality ever bothering to learn their language – nor have the Dutch ever expected others to – that Dutch has been able to absorb such a large amount of French, English and German vocabulary, to the extent that so many
loan words are now no longer regarded as foreign and are now absolutely indispensible, often being more common and natural sounding than indigenous synonyms e.g. _apart_ (separate) instead of _afzonderlijk_; _proberen_ (to try) instead of _pogen_ or _trachten_; _feliciteren_ (to congratulate) instead of _gelukwensen_.

### Influence of French

Although there is a certain amount of vocabulary of Greek or Latin or Amerindian origin in Dutch which we can best call international vocabulary e.g. _fysiologie_, _visum_, _tomaat_ – it is inevitably the languages of Holland’s immediate neighbours which Dutch has drawn on most for loans, but none has had such a far-reaching effect as French.¹ French has influenced Dutch in a variety of ways²:

1. loan words are by far the most common form of influence e.g. _avontuur_ (adventure), _consequent_ (consistent), _logé_ (staying guest), _royaal_ (generous).

2. loan translations e.g. _schoonvader_ (father-in-law, _< beau-père_), _kleinzoon_ (grandson, _< petit fils_), _het hof maken_ (to court, _< faire la cour_).

3. addition of French endings already occurring in loan words to indigenous Dutch words e.g. _echtgenote_ (female spouse) in imitation of _studente_, _typiste_ etc.; _lerares_ (female teacher) in imitation of _prinses_, _barones_ etc.; _bakkerij_ (bakery), _schilderij_ (painting) in imitation of _patisserie_, _boulangerie_ etc. Both the _-es_ and the _-if_ endings still bear the French stress on the final syllable in Dutch. By analogy with this, the indigenous feminising ending _-in_ now also takes the stress, unlike German e.g. _vriendin_ (female friend), _leeuwin_ (lioness). The ending _-en/jier_, designating a profession, is also commonly found in Dutch words of Dutch origin e.g. _kruidenier_ (grocer), _tuinier_ (gardener), as is the verbal ending _-eren_, although it is more commonly found in verbs borrowed from French e.g. _halveren_ (to halve), _waarderen_ (to appreciate) by analogy with _adapteren_, _studeren_ etc. Very often words of the latter sort alternate with indigenous words with the same or a similar meaning e.g. _arriveren/aankomen_, _rapporteren/berichten_, _respecteren/eerbiedigen_.

An interesting sub-category of French loan words are those which the Germans so aptly call _Rücklehnwörter_ or words of Germanic (usually Franconian) origin, which, once borrowed and assimilated into French, have returned at a later date to Dutch or German in French garb to stand side by side the cognate forms from which they are descended, without the speaker being aware of their common origin³ e.g. _fauteuil_ (armchair) _< *faldi-stöl_ (Dutch _vozstoel_, folding chair), _galopperen_ (to gallop) _< *wola hlaupan_ (Dutch _*wel lopen_, to run well), _graveren_ (to engrave) _< graven_ (to dig), _mannequin_ _< manneken_ (little man).

---

¹ The standard work on the subject is J.J. Salverda de Grave, _L’influence de la langue française en Hollande_, Paris, 1913.

² See p. 33 for influences unique to Belgium.

³ J.H. Huisman’s _Geraamte repatrianten in de Nederlandse woordenschat_ is an interesting account of such words (see bibliography).
Influence of German

Although the eastern borders of the Netherlands must have been open to the immigration of foreign words for as long as the southern borders have been, German loan words are not as evident for two reasons. Firstly, prior to the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it was always France, and not Germany, which disseminated culture to the rest of Europe; Germany was usually also on the receiving end along with the Netherlands. Secondly, because Dutch is as closely related to German as it is, it has been able to absorb words from its eastern neighbour and dress them up in Dutch garb more easily than is the case with French loans; no Dutchman regards overigens (moreover), rugzak (rucksack), tijdschrift (magazine) or warenhuis (departmental store) as foreign words.

There are, however, quite a number of loan words from German which do still bear obvious signs of their origin but which are nevertheless now regarded as indispensable Dutch words e.g. gletscher (glacier), lauine (avalanche), heimwee (home sickness), kitscherig (German kitschig), in zwang (in fashion), unheimisch (uncanny, incorrectly borrowed from German unheimlich), überhaupt (generally, at all).

Influence of English

English, although its influence has not been of such long standing duration as that of French, forms without doubt the most common source of foreign loan words in Dutch today. This is, of course, a world-wide phenomenon because of the over-riding influence of Anglo-American culture in contemporary society. However, probably few languages have adopted English words and made them their own with as little effort as Dutch has; in fact the borrowing is not limited to words but extends to whole phrases and sayings that are now common even in the mouths of those (increasingly fewer) Dutch who speak little or no English e.g. last not least, fifty-fifty, ups and downs, good will, up to date, self made man, big boss. Of course many English words in Dutch are from the world of business, computers, entertainment etc. but there are also many English loans for everyday concepts e.g. tram, jam, flat, cake, pocket(-boek). As with loan words from French, many English words now behave like Dutch words e.g. gehandicapt (handicapped), babysitten (to babysit), claimen (to claim on insurance), gezinsplanning (family planning); but in liften (to hitch-hike) and tanken (to fill up with petrol), we see two verbs formed from English nouns i.e. English words which don’t exist in the same sense in English. The same phenomenon is to be found in English loan words that have reached Dutch via French where they were imperfectly borrowed e.g. parking (parking area), camping (camping ground). Many bisyllabic compound nouns like pick-up have come into Dutch, presumably via French, and thus retain the stress on the final syllable, a stress pattern which is foreign to both the language of origin and the new host language e.g. black-out, close-up, lay-out, all-in.

As is the case with loans from French, English words have sometimes been translated and have thus been totally assimilated e.g. luidspreker (loud speaker), rolschaats (roller skate), voetbal (football), vrijmetselaar (freemason).
Vocabulary and word formation

As quick perusal of any Dutch newspaper or ladies’ magazine will substantiate, the number of English loans into Dutch is legion and there seems to be no counter-movement at all. Undoubtedly not all will stand the test of time, but as a knowledge of English becomes more and more second nature to up and coming generations of Dutch people, for such seems to be the case, holus-bolus adoption of words, expressions and even syntax from English will certainly continue and possibly accelerate. Many nationalities baulk at such prospects but the Dutch are either indifferent to, or proud of their ability to colour their Dutch with as many English words as possible.

That Dutch has been influenced by the languages of its three great neighbours is only to be expected, and here one could expect the tale of foreign influences on Dutch to end. There are, however, two other languages which have contributed in a small, but significant way to the vocabulary of Dutch and both reflect interesting by-gone phases in the history of Holland. I am referring here to Yiddish and Indonesian or, strictly speaking, Hebrew and Malay.

Influence of Yiddish

Although Amsterdam’s Jewish community, which was virtually decimated during World War II, was Sephardic in origin i.e. it consisted in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries chiefly of refugees from Spain and Portugal who were escaping the Inquisition, it absorbed many Ashkenazic Jews from the eighteenth century on, and with these Eastern European Jews came the Yiddish language, a blend of medieval High German and Hebrew plus various Slavonic features. With the decline of Yiddish among the Jews of Western Europe, a result of their emancipation and assimilation which started during the Enlightenment, only isolated Yiddish words remained in the speech of Amsterdam in particular, a city which had one of Western Europe’s largest Jewish communities prior to World War II. Quite a number of Yiddish words, especially those of Hebrew origin, were adopted by Amsterdammers, above all by the lower classes, and from here many have passed into standard Dutch. In the borrowing process, however, these Yiddish-Hebrew words often underwent a downgrading in meaning, reflecting the low social status of those who first borrowed them from Yiddish e.g. kalle (prostitute, < Hebrew for bride), bajes (prison, < Hebrew for house), jatten (to steal, < Hebrew for hand); in feeling, these words are akin to English slut, clink and nick respectively. Some words, such as kalle/temejer (prostitute) and joetje (10 guilders) are still restricted to the colloquial speech of Amsterdam, but many others are now regarded as general, even if usually somewhat colloquial Dutch e.g. roddelen (to gossip), tof (great, fantastic), mesjogge (crazy), gein (fun).

4. What we now call Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia) is the new national language of the Republic of Indonesia based on Malay.
Influence of Malay

The many Malay words that are used in Dutch also fall into two categories; there are those which were or are only commonly used by people who formerly lived in the Indies, called Oud-Indischgesten in Dutch, and there are those which are known to, and used by all Dutchmen. To the former category belong words such as barang (one’s things, junk), kassian (what a shame) and siendang (bag) and to the latter belong soesa (bother, worry), toko (shop, and nowadays also one’s business or field of expertise) and soebatten (to beseech). The latter category includes many words which, unlike the examples already given, can be called cultural loan words and in this context they are indispensable e.g. baboe (nanny), betjah (rickshaw), goeling (Dutch wife), klamboe (mosquito net), moesson (monsoon), sawah (rice field). Many Asian foodstuffs are known to the Dutch by their Indonesian name, for example several of the exotic spices such as ketoembar (coriander) and asem (tamarind) as well as ketjap (soya sauce), klappernoot (coconut), kroepoek (prawn crackers), nasi (fried rice), bami and laugé (bean shoots); the last two are actually Chinese words.

There have been various attempts from time to time throughout the history of Dutch to rid the language of ‘impurities’ such as those discussed in this chapter. Even Jacob van Maerlant, writing in the thirteenth century, advocated wat walsch (= Welsh i.e. French) is, valsch is in warning against excessive borrowing from French. However, the Dutch have never been as obsessive as the Germans about keeping their language free of foreign words, a fact which is clearly reflected in the vocabularies of the two languages – compare, for instance, Bürgersteig – trottoir (footpath), Bahnhof – station, Fernsehen – televisie, Fernsprecher – telefoon, Abteil – coupé (compartment), Zug – trein. Nevertheless Dutch vocabulary is surprisingly puristic on occasions; for example, grammatical terminology and fields of science, referred to in nearly all languages by their Greek of Latin names, are usually expressed in Dutch by indigenous words e.g. voornaamwoord (pronomoun), voorzetsel (preposition)⁵, werkwoord (verb), scheikunde (chemistry), natuurkunde (physics), geneeskunde (medicine), aardrijkskunde (geography).

The loan words and expressions from French, English and German, called gallicisms, anglicisms and germanisms respectively, or sometimes barbarisms collectively, have become an unavoidable and often indispensable feature of Dutch. Many have come and gone through the ages but many have also stayed and been assimilated to a greater or lesser extent. Doubtless the process will continue, in particular borrowing from English as that language has now unequivocably assumed the role of the international language.

Word formation

Word formation in Dutch is very similar to that in German. There are basically two

5. Such words are, of course, translated from the Latin.
sorts of word formation, compound words and derivatives, the latter formed by the addition of prefixes and suffixes. Historically the division is not always so clear cut, nor is the division between word groups and compound words.

By compound words one usually thinks primarily of compound nouns but of course verbs (stofzuigen – to vacuum clean) and adjectives (splinternieuw – brand new) can also be compounds. The potential that German has to make seemingly never-ending compound nouns exists in Dutch too e.g. afvalwaterzuiveringsinstallatie (waste water purification installation) but it seldom goes to such extremes; even compound numerals are not written as one word as they are in German e.g. driehonderd vijfentwintig (325).

In English compound nouns are formed simply by the bringing together of two words without changing them in any way; the only problem we face is whether to join, hyphenate or write them separately. Dutch on the other hand, is both simpler and more difficult than English – simpler because compound ideas are always written as one word, and more difficult because often medial sounds are required between the constituent parts. Which medial sound to use, if any, is often very difficult for the non-native-speaker to know, and even the Dutch sometimes have trouble. Sometimes an (originally) genitive s is required e.g. broekspijp (trouser leg), stadsmuur (city wall) but sometimes it is a gliding e e.g. geitehaar (goat hair), perenboom (pear tree); if plurality is implied in the first part of the compound, an en is required e.g. boekenplank (book shelf), klerenkast (wardrobe, lit. clothes cupboard).

The assortment of prefixes and suffixes at one’s disposal for addition to nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs for the creation of new words and for forming new parts of speech is as diverse as in English.

Abstract nouns can be formed by the addition of -heid (-ness, lit. -hood), -dom or -schap (-ship) to existing nouns or adjectives e.g. viendelijkheid (friendliness), jodendom (Jewry), vriendschap (friendship). Masculine agents are commonly formed by the addition of -er or -aar to the stems of verbs e.g. schrijven (to write) > schrijver (writer, author), wandelen (to hike) > wandelaar (hiker). The suffix -ing joined to verbal stems also forms related nouns e.g. regeren (to govern) > regering (government), uitdrukken (to express) > uitdrukking (expression), wandelen (to hike, walk) > wandeling (walk).

The nominal ending -th which is added to adjectives in English has an etymological equivalent in Dutch (-te) where it is more widely used than in English e.g. breed (wide) – breedte (width), hoog (high) – hoogte (height), lang (long) – lengte (length); groen (green) – groente (vegetables), vlak (flat) – vlakte (plain), ziek (sick) – ziekte (sickness, disease).

Verbs, on the other hand, can be formed by the addition of the infinitive ending to nouns e.g. fiets (bicycle) > fietsen (to cycle), bel (bell) > bellen (to ring), stof

6. Compare the names of the following meats: rundvlees (beef) < rund (cattle) + vlees (meat), varkensvlees (pork) < varken (pig) + vlees, schapenvlees (mutton) < schaap (sheep) + vlees.

7. As final en is usually pronounced as e in Dutch, compounds with e or en are indistinguishable in speech and are thus often written incorrectly e.g. kippepoet (chicken leg, i.e. the leg of one chicken), kippenhok (chicken pen i.e. the pen of several chickens).
(dust) > stoffen (to dust). A countless number of verbs can also be generated by the addition of the unstressed prefixes be-, ge-, her-, ont and ver- to existing verbs or nouns and adjectives. Although each of these prefixes has one or more basic meanings or functions, these are not obvious in all such derived verbs e.g. staan (to stand) – bestaan (to exist), ontstaan (to originate), verstaan (to understand); gaan (to go) – begaan (to commit), ontgaan (to elude), vergaan (to pass); groot (big) – vergroten (to enlarge). These prefixes are of course also found in nouns derived from such verbs e.g. zeker (sure) > verzekeren (to insure), herverzekeren (to reinsure) > verzekering (insurance); kopen (to buy) > verkopen (to sell) > verkoopster (female shop assistant).

In Dutch, English verbs such as ‘to ring up’, ‘to pull out’ and ‘to trade in’ express the preposition as a stressed prefix in the infinitive and the past participle i.e. they are compound verbs e.g. opbellen, uitrekken, inruilen. For syntactical reasons (see p. 71) such verbs are termed separable and those beginning with the unstressed prefixes mentioned above are called inseparable verbs.

There is a vast number of adjectival suffixes, many with cognate forms in English. Among the most common suffixes are -baar (-able) > draagbaar (portable), -ig (-y) > gelukkig (lucky), -lijk (-ly) > vriendelijk (friendly), -loos (-less) > nutteloos (useless), -s (< sch) > Zweeds (Swedish), -vol (-ful) > succesvol (successful).

Adjectival prefixes are not as common as suffixes, nor are they in English, but on- (Eng. un-), which negates, occurs as regularly as in English, e.g. onzeker (uncertain), ondankbaar (ungrateful); the adjectival prefix on- is never stressed, unlike German. Some loan words are negated with in- as in English e.g. inconsequent (inconsistent), intolerant.

English is rich in adjectival similes of the sort ‘as clear as a bell’. These are not unknown to Dutch but compound adjectives are more common e.g. morsdood (as dead as a doornail), apetrots (as proud as a peacock).

It is not uncommon for an adjective, sometimes an inflected adjective, to have joined the following noun to form a compound word; the consequent loss in literal meaning is often reflected in the stress, which has shifted to the nominal part of the compound e.g. hoogleraar (professor), platteland (countryside), rodekóol (red cabbage) (see Stress p. 56).

Although adjectives and adverbs are often the same in Dutch, as described on p. 60, there are nevertheless certain typically adverbal endings e.g. -s > vergeefs (in vain), -halve (for the sake of) > gemakshalve (for convenience’s sake), -lings > blindelings (blindly), -waarts (ward) > voorwaarts (forward).

The diminutive ending, a very important aspect of word formation in Dutch which is not limited to nouns, unlike all other languages that use it, is discussed on p. 59.

Generally speaking it is impossible to prescribe all the principles of word formation in Dutch. Word formation is, perhaps more than any other aspect of language learning, one of those things one ultimately learns by feeling after prolonged exposure to the language, rather than by rules. Van Loey’s Schönfeld’s Historische grammatica van het Nederlands gives an excellent detailed account of the history behind compound and derived words (see bibliography).
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Section 2 The Past

A. External history of the language
Map 9: Tribal settlement in the Netherlands in the early Middle Ages. The map illustrates the situation by ± 800, the time of Charlemagne. Compare map 6 to see how much land was lost to the sea during the later Middle Ages.
9 The effect of the Great Migrations on the Netherlands

A study of the history of the Dutch language is, in effect, a study of the language of the Franks as it was and is spoken along the Lower Rhine i.e. a study of Low Franconian. But the Franks were not the only Germanic tribe to take up residence within the borders of the Low Countries as we know them today; both Frisians and Saxons inhabit areas of the country as well. A knowledge of who the Franks, Frisians and Saxons were, and of when and where these peoples settled in this area, is essential to an understanding of the origins of the Dutch language. This chapter attempts to give a summary of the main historical events that ultimately led to the establishment of Franconian, Frisian and Saxon speech communities in the Netherlands in the early Middle Ages.

The origins of the Franks\(^1\), like the origins of most of the Barbarians\(^2\), are obscure. They did not become a political entity until the end of the fifth century. Whether the Tubantes\(^3\) in the eastern Netherlands, the Canninefates\(^3\) in North and South Holland and the Batavians\(^3\) in the central Netherlands – all Germanic tribes which the Romans inform us were occupying this area when they arrived there in ± 55 B.C.\(^4\) – were what we later come to know as Franks, is not at all certain, but it does seem likely. The same applies to the Chatti (Hessians), the Thuringians and the Chamavi of Germany for instance. It is, however, certain that these peoples were ultimately absorbed by the Franks when the latter took over the Netherlands and central Germany. The Frisians, whom the Romans also found living along the coast of the Netherlands on their arrival there, were definitely a separate Barbarian tribe and were then, as now, speaking a dialect closely related to Franconian. Many of the features that now distinguish Frisian from Dutch have in fact developed since the time of the Franconian conquest.

The Franconian homeland prior to their expansion into Roman Gaul was most probably between the middle and the lower Rhine between Cologne and Xanten and possibly stretching northwards into the east of the Netherlands between the

---

1. The origin of the term Frank is uncertain but it is possible it meant ‘bold, brave’.
2. The word Barbarian was first used by the Greeks to designate any non-Hellene. It has since been commonly used to refer to the Germanic peoples whom the Romans considered their cultural inferiors. The word is often used in English to render the Dutch/German word Germanen which I also use here as a synonym for Barbarian.
3. These names are preserved in the following geographic regions: Twente, Kennemerland, de Betuwe.
4. We owe much of our information about these peoples to the RomanTacitus whose Germania appeared in 98 A.D. He, who had never himself ventured into Germania but who describes the way of life of the Germanen and gives a summary of the tribes, used the Bella Germana of Plinius (= Pliny ± 79 A.D.) as a source of information.
The three-way division of the West Germanic tribes into Ingvaeones, Istvaeones and Herminones stems from the Roman historian Tacitus who was undoubtedly applying cultural or even simply geographic criteria but certainly not linguistic criteria. The reference to the Weser-Rhine and Elbe rivers relates to the possible original location of these peoples at the time of Tacitus (i.e. ± 100 A.D.) prior to their migration southwards in subsequent centuries.

Rhine and the river IJssel. The mouths of the Rhine and the Meuse may also have been in their hands at that time or this may have been a region of Frisian dominance.

The Franks first entered recorded history when they crossed the limes in 256 A.D. and entered northern Gaul i.e. Belgium. From this time it seems the Romans abandoned the linear limes north of Xanten, replaced it with scattered castella along the rivers and withdrew to the interior, protecting in particular the all important road that ran from Cologne via Maastricht, Tongeren and Bavai to Boulogne. It is possible that the area north of this road i.e. Dutch-speaking Belgium and the Netherlands south of the Rhine was virtually evacuated by the Romans. By the middle of the fourth century the Franks had occupied a sizeable area within the limes with the consent of the Romans with whom they lived in close contact and in relative peace until the turmoil of the fifth century. They served in the armies of Rome, notably the Batavians among others, and their culture underwent a high degree of romanisation. They were after all occupying an area, and were soon to take over an even greater area of land, which had been previously populated by Celtic people who had been heavily romanised and are thus better called Gallo-Roman after their absorption by Rome. Celtic speech was destined to disappear under Roman influence, but on both sides of the Rhine Germanic speech was to maintain itself, not however without adopting a great deal of new vocabulary from the Gallo-Roman substrate it found in the territories it conquered. The kinds of

5. Historians have traditionally divided the Franks into Salian and Ripuarian Franks. The distinction is first made in eighth century sources, Salian referring to the coastal Franks (= salt, and thus those that occupied the southern Netherlands). The derivation of the term Ripuarian is uncertain (ripa = bank of the Rhine?), but the name refers in any case to the inland Franks along the Rhine. It is however now doubted whether such a division really existed. Nevertheless it is the so-called Salian Franks who emerge as the leaders in the fourth and fifth centuries, spearheading the invasion of Gaul: they had lived in closer proximity to the Romans for longer and the Ripuarians had remained hostile to Rome.

6. It must be remembered that we are dealing with a relatively ‘dark’ period in European history, as far as the Germanen are concerned, because of their lack of literacy. For some centuries, in fact until they were gradually converted to christianity from circa 500 A.D. on, we are entirely dependent on the literate Romans for information, and they only mention movements of Germanic peoples as and when these movements are of relevance to, or are known to them. Even then we are dependent of course on Roman interpretations of events and classifications of peoples. Once the Romans withdrew from the area, we had to wait for the arrival of christianity to provide us with written texts. It is a tragedy of history that Rome itself was only converting to christianity (Emperor Constantine’s conversion ± 330 A.D.) at the time when it was being forced to withdraw from the Lower Rhine. Had Roman influence been felt a little longer, and thus the influence of a christian Rome, the Germanen of the area would possibly have been converted sooner and thus become literate sooner. The veil that now shrouds the movements of the Germanen in the fifth century might then never have existed.

7. The limes was the border of the Roman Empire which corresponded more or less with a line running from east to west along the Danube and then from south to north up the Rhine to its former mouth near Katwijk in Holland.

8. The Roman road mentioned here corresponds very closely to the original border between Germanic and Latin speech which is still preserved today, although with certain concessions to the latter, in the language border that runs through Belgium from the German border near Aachen to the coast of France near Dunkirk (see map 7).
words the Franks borrowed from the Romans clearly reflect the Roman legacy in Germanic culture, e.g. ezel (donkey), keizer (emperor), keuken (kitchen), kool (cabbage), molen (mill), muur (wall), straat (street), tegel (tile).

The Franks become of interest to general European history from the time of the Merovingians (i.e. after the migrations, which reach their peak during the fifth century after the Romans have withdrawn from Germania). The Merovingian dynasty of the Franks is named after its semi-legendary founder Merovech. It is followed in the mid-eighth century by the Carolingian dynasty which is named after its greatest leader, Charles the Great (Charlemagne). The grave of the son of Merovech, Childeric I (± 457-482), was found near Tournai in Belgium in 1653. The period is still ‘dark’, however, till the time of Childeric’s son, Clovis (456-511). We have a continuous history of the Franks from this time on. We are dependent for much of our early information on Gregory of Tours (538-594) who, writing in Latin, is the chronicler of the Merovingian Franks, but even Gregory, writing as close to the actual time of the events as he was, is not very clear about the origins of the Franks.

All three kings so far mentioned ruled over only part of the people history later, from the eighth century, came to know as the Franks. Clovis, the first whose achievements are well documented, ascended the throne in 481 and during his reign the Franks pushed on into Gaul, Rome’s influence in the area having been gradually whittled away during the fifth century by Barbarian tribes that began crossing the limes in great numbers in 406. As Clovis proceeded deeper into Gaul there are no precise dates available for the Franconian take-over of Gaul – he conquered all other Germanic kings and subjugated the Gallo-Roman population to Franconian overlordship. The date of his conversion to Christianity is the subject of much controversy, it being either 496, 499 or even as late as 506. In any event, with his conversion and the conversion of his subjects to the faith, came literacy. It was a Latin literacy of course, but for centuries literacy was to be limited to the clergy. Texts in the vernacular were firstly non-existent and even then quite rare for some time. Only in Carolingian times, in fact, were there sufficient texts in Germanic dialects for history to manage to preserve anything. The importance of the spread of Christianity to the development of a written literature in the various dialects of West Germanic cannot be overemphasised.

By 508 Clovis was king of all the Franks, a Barbarian people that had by this time lived for centuries in close proximity to the highly civilised Gallo-Romans and which, during that time, had developed a culture which was a synthesis of both worlds. On the soil of Gaul the empire of the Franks developed a distinctive culture we can now call Franconian. For the time prior to that only archeological evidence is available and it is often difficult to distinguish between the Franks and other Germanic peoples, as we have seen. From a linguistic point of view, however, we are ‘in the dark’ for some time to come.

Having conquered Gaul south to the river Loire, and having founded his capital in Paris, Clovis embarked on a campaign to the east into central and southern Germany (including Switzerland and Austria) and south into Gothic Gaul.9 Franc-
onian expansion in these two directions was to be continued by successive rulers of
the Merovingian dynasty. And from the time of Clovis' conversion to christianity,
Franconian expansion took on more and more the air of a crusade. By the end of
the sixth century, in the area north of the Alps, only the Frisians and the Saxons
retained their independence from the Franks, and both these peoples occupied
sizeable portions of the Netherlands.

The seventh century, the period of Franconian occupation of the western and
central Netherlands, is the 'darkest' period in Dutch history. Dagobert I, king of all
the Franks from 629-639, took on the conquest of the river mouths. What he began
in the early seventh century would be completed in the late eighth century by the
Carolingians. Under Dagobert the church took root in the Netherlands, chiefly in
the present-day Belgian territories and Dutch Limburg, with St. Amandus being
the main missionary of the southern provinces. Both the nobility and the church
forced a gradual expansion northwards to the Old Rhine (see map 4); Dagobert
built a church for a mission to the Frisians in Utrecht in 625. North of the Old
Rhine, however, the Frisians undoubtedly occurred in greater numbers and expan-
sion beyond that line was slow and had to be achieved by warfare. Any other tribes
in the area that were not Frisian were, we can assume, either themselves branches of
the Franks or were absorbed by the invading Franks from the south. It was
particularly the coastal region, possibly even Zeeland, that the Frisians had settled.
Even today the top of North Holland is still called West Friesland. (see p. 13)

There were continual rebuffs of Franconian expansion into the area by the
Frisians and objections to the introduction of christianity in particular. The
Anglo-Saxon mission to the Frisians began in 678. It is possible that the Franks
commissioned Anglo-Saxon clerics, who had already played an important role in
converting the Franks themselves and their newly conquered territories in central
and southern Germany, to lead the Frisian mission because of their linguistic
affinity to the Frisians. Both English and Frisian being Ingwaenic dialects of
Germanic (see p. 128), it is possible that the two were still mutually intelligible at
that time or that the missionaries could at least learn Frisian with little difficulty.

Under Charles Martel (i.e. Charles the Hammer, 688-741), the last of the
Merovingian dynasty, definite advances were made north of the Rhine against the
Frisians under King Redbad (or Radboud) who died in 719. From that time on, the
history of the northern Netherlands is dealt with in Franconian annals. The spread
of christianity through these territories that accompanied the Franconian take-
over also helped to clarify the situation somewhat. Under Charles Martel, Holland
up as far as the Lauwers in Friesland in the west, and up to the river IJssel in the
east, came under the Franks; there is no doubt that Friesland up to the Lauwers
was definitely in their hands after the Battle of the Boorne in 734.

Willibrord (died 739), to whom there is a monument on the Janskerkhof in the
centre of Utrecht, is regarded as the true father of the Anglo-Saxon mission to the
Frisians. In 695 he arrived in Utrecht at the request of Charles Martel and was to be
followed in turn by two other great names in this mission (later extended to the
Saxons), namely Boniface (or Bonifatius, died 754) and Liudger (died 809), himself
a Frisian educated at York. All three were to be active in Germany as well.

The conversion of Friesland up to the Lauwers was to be the work of Boniface
and it would ultimately cost him his life. He had begun his work in the Netherlands
in 716 and then went on to Germany where he became bishop of Mainz. He returned to the Netherlands later in life to continue the Frisian mission.

There are many Latin manuscripts from this time on, many still preserved in the archives of the monastery at Echternach in the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, a monastery that Willibrord founded and where he died in 739. Utrecht is also quite well provided with manuscripts from the period for it is the oldest centre of Anglo-Saxon missionary activity on the Continent.

The conquest and conversion of Friesland east of the Lauwers – i.e. the present-day province of Groningen and the north of Germany – belongs to the history of Charlemagne and his struggle against the Saxons. Till his reign (768-814), the Lauwers and the IJssel had been the borders of the Franconian empire in the Netherlands. Beyond those limits lived the Saxons, a third linguistically closely related Germanic people who still occupy the territories today that they did at the time of Charlemagne. We know them to have been present there from at least 350 A.D., perhaps taking over areas in the east of the Netherlands left vacant by the Franks when they first moved over the limes into Belgium and Gaul. Once again, as with the Franks earlier in history, we do not know for sure what form of federation they had. The Saxons who inhabited the north of Germany were also approached on another front, namely from central Germany (Thuringia and Hesse), which the Franks had occupied during the Merovingian period. By the time of Charlemagne’s campaigns against the Saxons, the last front to be fought in his holy wars of expansion, the whole western and southern periphery of Lower Saxony had been converted to Christianity by Willibrord and Boniface. The Saxons were continually in revolt but their king Widukind was finally defeated in 785 and converted to Christianity. Northern Germany to the Elbe was then subjected to Franconian rule. The missionary Liudger, a Frisian, was appointed to the area to convert the Saxons.
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10 Sources of written Dutch prior to 1100

The arrival of the church in the Netherlands, and the establishment of monasteries and nunneries that accompanied it, brought literacy back to the area for the first time since the departure of the Romans. But this does not, unfortunately, mean that there are texts in the vernacular surviving from this time. Although it is highly likely that texts were written in Low Franconian during the so-called Carolingian renaissance, none have come down to us from this early period. They can never have been great in number because of the predominance of Latin, and those that did exist would most likely have been in the possession of religious centres, the bastions of literacy. One can assume that psalms and prayers, biblical passages and possibly even some secular literature were written down in the Low Franconian dialects of the Netherlands; we know that this was definitely the case in other parts of the Franconian empire, namely France and Germany, where some texts have been preserved. It is quite likely that the accessibility of the monasteries of the Netherlands by water made them easy and attractive prey for the heathen Vikings who continually plundered the Dutch coast for a period of two hundred years (circa 800-1000), stealing from the monasteries and even razing them to the ground. This is the very period from which the earliest High German texts date – monasteries in the south of Germany were safe from Viking attack.

The lack of any Low Franconian texts from the earliest period has meant that historical linguists have had to make do with Dutch names and glosses in the Latin texts that have been preserved from this period. In this regard G. Mansion’s *Oud-Gentsche Naamkunde*, a study of Low Franconian names in Latin documents from Ghent in the ninth and tenth centuries, has become an indispensable source of information on the earliest Dutch. Germanic words denoting typically Germanic concepts in Latin texts such as the *Lex Salica*, for example, are another source of information. Often Germanic glosses, i.e. translations written between the lines or in the margin of Latin manuscripts for better understanding of the text, have been preserved and offer some compensation for the lack of running texts in the vernacular; part of the Wachtendonk Psalms, an Old East Low Franconian text

---

1. It is customary to refer to Dutch during this period as Old West Low Franconian.
2. Charlemagne’s biographer, Einhard (died 840), mentions that Charles ‘directed that the age-old narrative poems... in which were celebrated the warlike deeds of the kings of ancient times, should be written out and so preserved. He also began a grammar of his native tongue’. (*Einhard and Notker the Stammerer: Two Lives of Charlemagne*, Penguin, London 1969, p. 82)
3. The study of people’s names and place names, a popular academic pursuit in the Netherlands, is called onomastics.
from the German Rhineland, has come down to us in this form. There have been several attempts by philologists to compile a grammar of Old Dutch based on these meagre remains. The student of Old English or Old High German is much more fortunate in this respect.
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VOOYS, C.G.N. de Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse Taal.
The best known and most readable account of the external history of the Dutch language. Regarded as a standard work. Chapter 1 deals with the sources of written Dutch prior to 1200.

GIJSSELING, M. Corpus van Middelnederlandse teksten (tot en met het jaar 1300).
This momentous work is a collection of every Dutch text, whether a literary or lay document, that has been preserved from prior to 1300.

LOEY, A. van 'Altniederländisch und Mittelniederländisch', in Kurzer Grundriß der germanischen Philologie bis 1500, Band I. L.E. Schmitt (ed.)
The written sources of mediaeval Dutch that have been preserved from the ravages of time tell us much, but they also present many problems for the historical linguist. Firstly, whereas the student of English or German has texts available in those languages from as early as the eighth century, i.e. from soon after the conversion to Christianity and thus the introduction of writing, the oldest preserved running text emanating from the Low Countries dates from the hand of the Limburger Hendrik van Veldeke. But precisely because his native tongue was Limburgs, that being a transitional dialect between Low and High Franconian (i.e. between Dutch and German), and because so much of his work has come down to us in 'germanised' form, there has always been a tug-o'-war between neerlandici and Germanists as to whether he belongs to Dutch or German linguistic and literary history. Be that as it may, from the end of the twelfth century a number of texts have been preserved which are recognised in Dutch linguistic circles as the oldest examples of writing in Dutch i.e. which can be termed Middle Dutch for the sake of convenience and thus texts which are considerably younger than the earliest preserved sources of English and German.

From ± 1200 more and more texts have survived, although these can only be a small proportion of what must have been written at the time. Of course this was a period in time before printing and the wide-spread use of paper – every document had to be painstakingly written out by hand on expensive parchment. It was also a time when few could write and when writing was a prerogative of the clergy on the whole.

The sources of Middle Dutch are of two kinds – official documents and literary texts. Both have their uses, but also their limitations for the historical linguist. Firstly the official documents, although not quite as old as the oldest literary sources because of the early (and even later) mediaeval practice of using Latin for such purposes, are usually dated and the place of origin is usually known. One can then, with much more certainty than is the case with literary texts, ascertain what the Dutch of a particular place at a particular point in time was like. On the other hand a considerable handicap in such research can be the unnaturalness of the language due to conservative written style or even documentary jargon such as is still often employed today in official writings. There are also various other factors which can affect the reliability of those sources: the scribe is seldom known, the scribe and dictator of a particular document are not necessarily one and the same person and thus an unnatural mixture of linguistic forms can occur. The difficulties the non-standardised spelling present are valid for the literary texts too.

On the other hand, the original version of the literary text is seldom preserved. Usually what has come down to us is a copy, or a copy of a copy (of a copy) where
De Boeckdrucker.
Schept uw Geluck, Uit pers en druck.

Drukt uw Gemoed op ’t Woord des Heeren,
Soo, dat, de heilzge Letter, net,
Int Herte over word geset,
Waar na ghy u moogd reguleeren,
En dat ghy’t geen wat God behaagd
Geduurig in uw boesem draagd.

The importance of the invention of the printing press to the standardisation of Dutch is discussed on p. 96. The Plantin Museum in Antwerp is devoted to the history of printing in the Netherlands.

Taken from J. and C. Luiken, 100 Ambachten, Amsterdam, 1694.
such copies are often much younger and often contain inconsistencies in language due to the differences in dialect between the writer of the original and the copyist(s). It is also often impossible to determine the precise date and place of compilation and even the author is commonly anonymous. The rhyme in such texts can, however, be a reasonably reliable guide to how certain sounds were pronounced at the time i.e. words that rhymed then but don't now or vice versa. The word order is not generally as reliable a guide to the natural word order of the time as it is in the official documents due to the contraints of rhyme.

Although the earliest literary texts are Limburgs in origin, the Limburgs dialect is of less importance for the later development of ABN than the other two southern dialects, Flemish and Brabant. As far as the recorded written word is concerned, the Middle Dutch Period is represented overwhelmingly by texts of southern (i.e. Flemish and Brabant) origin. From the thirteenth century it is texts of predominantly Flemish origin which have come down to us, from the fourteenth a combination of Flemish and Brabant texts, whereas by the fifteenth century a clearly Brabant hegemony can be ascertained. This situation corresponds with the economic prosperity of the areas concerned, with the predominance of Flemish texts occurring simultaneously with the hey-day of Bruges and Ghent, while the increased frequency of Brabant from the mid-fourteenth century corresponds with the shift in economic fortune from the cities of Flanders to those of Brabant, Brussels and Antwerp in particular. This is one of the many examples of the indivisibility of Belgium and Holland when it comes to historical issues. The fortunes of the county of Holland also began to improve in the fifteenth and sixteenth century, due to increased trade, and this too is reflected in the frequency of texts in the dialect of Holland.

The difficulties the spelling of Middle Dutch presents are the difficulties that all languages experience when one attempts to put down in writing the sounds of one language with the alphabet of another. In other words, the beginnings of the written word in the Low Countries, as in the rest of western and northern Europe, were an attempt to record a Germanic language with the letters of the Latin alphabet which was one of the most important legacies of the Roman Catholic church. Both the consonants and particularly the vowels presented difficulties for the scribes as there were originally only 23 letters in the Latin alphabet at their disposal. Thus the following letters alternate in Middle Dutch for example: c/k/ck, i/j, u/v, s/z; [u], spelt oe in modern Dutch, could be written as u/oe/ue while [o], spelt eu in modern Dutch, appeared as ue/oe/eu.

Trading links between the cities of the northern and southern Netherlands and between these and the Hansa cities of the north of Germany and the Baltic must already have contributed in the Middle Ages to exchange of vocabulary and to a certain standardisation in language, at least in the towns. The creation of a truly standardised Dutch was still a long way off, however.

The development of the towns, based on trade, and consequently the ever increasing role of the bourgeoisie, was of utmost importance to the cultivation of the vernacular as a written, as well as a spoken language for official transactions. Latin, the language of the church and thus of education, had been employed in administration too because it had already enjoyed the status of a written language for many centuries. But a knowledge of Latin was a prerogative of the clergy chiefly
and also to a lesser extent of the aristocracy. But with the growth of the towns and 
the wealth, and consequently the importance, of the third estate, this class too 
needed to master the skills of reading and writing for the recording of business 
transactions etc. Not having a knowledge of Latin at their disposal, however, the 
bourgeoisie was compelled to conduct its affairs in the vernacular. Having learnt to 
read and write, the burghers were in a position to desire and require texts on every 
possible topic in their mother tongue, thus giving rise to a supply and demand 
situation which would become common place from the end of the fifteenth century 
after the invention of the printing press. With Dutch, or Diets as it was commonly 
called at that time (see p. 4), having attained the status of an administrative and 
business language, non-literate, lay documents became even more frequent from 
about 1250. Latin was not completely replaced in this regard for a long time to 
come, however. In the south, French also began to compete with Dutch in this 
capacity as Latin was gradually abandoned in favour of the vernacular (see p. 21).

Even in the religious sphere Dutch began to be used to a degree for the benefit of 
the bourgeoisie although on the whole the church and the universities were to 
remain the last bastions of Latin in Europe. The writings of Erasmus of Rotterdam, 
the well-known Dutch humanist who lived from 1469 to 1536, were entirely in 
Latin. The long written tradition of Latin was also reflected in the written style of 
the vernacular in that Latin constructions were often employed and otherwise 
extinct case forms in Dutch were retained in imitation of Latin. This phenomenon 
is found to a greater extent in Renaissance writings and is one of several reasons 
why those texts are often less intelligible to the modern reader than many Middle 
Dutch texts written centuries earlier.

Throughout the above descriptions of the development of Dutch as well as 
throughout what follows, it should be remembered that at any given time in history 
the majority of Dutch speakers were the peasants, living on the land and often 
isolated from developments taking place in the cities. A spread in the skills of 
writing and reading, the adoption of foreign loan words due to international 
contacts, attempts to standardise the language etc., all passed the peasant by. As 
the majority of the people were not literate until the late nineteenth and early 
twentieth century and were thus unable to record their thoughts and speech, the 
linguistic historian, like the socio-political historian until recently, often tends to 
ignore them. But this attitude is determined by what is available in writing.

The first lay schools where writing in the vernacular was taught, but even then 
only to very few privileged middle class children, appeared in the late thirteenth 
century as a result of the demand emanating from the newly important position of 
that class. The education was undoubtedly very basic – the position of schoolmees-
ter was regarded as a trade. Meanwhile, however, Latin schools which were run by 
the church, continued to flourish and out of these the first universities would 
emerge in the humanist period, the first being the Catholic University of Louvain 
which was founded in 1425.

The importance of the printing press to the development of the vernacular as a 
fully fledged tool of cultural expression and the role printing played in the 
standardisation of the written word cannot be overestimated. Whether it was 
Johannes Gutenberg of Mainz or Laurens Coster of Haarlem who first developed a 
printing press with movable letters, is a long-standing debate that is of little
concern here. It is certain, however, that the Netherlands were well to the fore at a very early date in exploiting the potential of the new invention. Particularly the cities of the north, such as Delft, Utrecht, Leiden and Haarlem, were quick off the mark. In the south the main centres were Leuven and above all Antwerp.

The role which the printers played in standardisation was as follows. No longer was a text painstakingly copied by a scribe for the exclusive use of the person who commissioned the work and thus books had been beyond the financial means of most. With the arrival of the printing press, many copies of a given book could be produced and reproduced and circulation over large areas was possible. This was not only important for the spread of knowledge, but if a book was now to be read in areas as far apart as Antwerp, Amsterdam and Zwolle, there was a practical need to attempt to standardise the language and of course the spelling. Such standardisation was often applied by the printer to a work another had written. As Brabant, particularly Antwerp, gradually emerged as the capital of printing in the Low Countries after 1500, Brabants forms became so commonplace in printed texts that many are still with us today and are regarded as so-called schrijftaal (see p. 103). The earliest books are either Brabants or Brabants-Hollands. Amsterdam soon began to take over as the most important centre of printing in the north; even in the east of the country, i.e. by the printers of Zwolle and Deventer, attempts were made to follow the west in the printed word. This meant that the Saxon dialects of the east were never to enjoy a written status, unlike Frisian in the north. Antwerp, boasting names like Plantin and Mercator in the sixteenth century, was to remain Europe's capital of printing until its fortunes declined during the Eighty Years' War and much of its importance in this, as well as in many other fields, shifted to the north. Even today there is a disproportionate number of important international publishing houses based in Holland e.g. Martinus Nijhoff, Brill, Mouton.

The printed book, above all that in the vernacular, brought a knowledge and enjoyment of the written word within reach of everyone – and demand created supply. Herewith a new age in the development of all the vernaculars of Europe had dawned.
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12 The sixteenth century
- a period of transition

As mentioned previously, a combination of linguistic and socio-political factors enable us to see the close of the fifteenth century as the end of the Middle Dutch period and the end of the Middle Ages. The century ahead was to be one of enormous social upheaval in Europe in general, but in the Netherlands in particular. The Reformation, the so-called Renaissance in European thought, as well as the Eighty Years' War, were all to contribute to revolutionary changes in the economics and society of the Low Countries. Several of these changes were reflected in the language in various ways and thus make sixteenth century Dutch a worthy yet often neglected object of study.

Just as the sixteenth century is a period of transition in society, a period in which, certainly in the Netherlands, economic prosperity and thus political power shifted once and for all from the first and second estates to the third, to the bourgeoisie, so it can also be regarded linguistically as a period of transition. For obvious reasons, the division one traditionally makes between Middle and Modern Dutch in 1500 is in fact an artificial one invented by scholars of a later age. In reality there was a continuum and many of the characteristics of Modern Dutch were not commonplace until well into the sixteenth century.

The Reformation, sparked off by the publication of Martin Luther's 95 theses in Wittemberg in 1517, soon made itself felt in the Netherlands. With the new faith came a desire to have a new Bible in the vernacular, tailored to the needs of the Protestants. The 1520's already saw the first Bible translations, chiefly the New Testament, into Dutch. Such translations, of which the best known is the Van Liesveldt Bible (1526-42) from Antwerp, inevitably drew on their Latin and Luther's German predecessors. However, the advent of Calvinism in the Low Countries necessitated a new translation, preferably side-stepping the Lutheran precedents and going back to the original languages. This was not to be the case until the Statenvertaling was compiled in the seventeenth century, however. The Calvinist Bible was ultimately a revised version of the Van Liesveldt Bible. This Bible remained the most popular translation in the Protestant northern Netherlands until the completion of the Statenvertaling in the 1630's. The Catholics of Brabant had their own translation, the Bible of Louvain (1548).

At this time there were attempts by Protestant groups, for example the Mennonites, to reconcile eastern Dutch and Low German in religious publications in order to increase the area of influence. There was, for instance, a Low German translation of Luther's Bible which could be better understood in the east of Holland than those in Dutch. But eastern linguistic forms were not acceptable to western printers and readers; ultimately the overwhelming influence of Brabant and later Holland was not to be halted.
De Leeraar.
Die gaaren Eeuwige Welvaart sag,
Die Preek sich zelf den gansen dag.

Die't Volk ter heemelwaard sal leiden,
Moet zelfs van't Stof der Aarde scheiden
Dat Leer, en Leeven, 'samen gaa:
En Elck is hier de Wacht bevoelen,
Om door quaa Voorgang niet te doolen.
Men volg het Voetspoor Christi naa.

Leeraar, now spelt leeraar and meaning (secondary) teacher, formerly meant preacher, as it still does in Afrikaans. In 17th-century Holland many preachers were southern émigrés who were thus in a position to contribute further to the influence Brabants was having on urban Hollands (see p. 101).

Taken from J. and C. Luiken, 100 Ambachten, Amsterdam, 1694.
Not only the Dutch of the scriptures but also that of the predikanten exerted an influence on the language of the people at large. Once the Eighty Year’s War began in 1568 and more and more emigrants began to leave the southern Netherlands for the north, a disproportionate number of southerners were to be found in the pulpits and schoolrooms of the north where their Brabants dialect was revered and considered worthy of imitation.

Also the chambers of rhetoric, although known in the closing stages of the Middle Ages, had their hey-day in the sixteenth century. These chambers were in effect societies of usually well-to-do people who regularly held gatherings at which they put on plays or recited and sang their latest literary creations; cultivation of the vernacular as a worthy instrument of cultural expression was encouraged. The chambers, called rederijkerskamers in Dutch, originated in the south and when the idea took hold in the north, there was inevitably a linguistic legacy to the south here also which was strengthened by the ever increasing number of Flemings and Brabanders that arrived in the northern Netherlands after 1568. By this time Flemish had already lost the battle to Brabants as the dialect on which emergent standard Dutch seemed as if it was going to be based.

One should remember at this point that by the middle of the sixteenth century, Antwerp had developed into the most important city in Europe north of the Alps. As part of the Habsburg Empire, which included Spain and her colonies and also included Portugal after 1580, Antwerp formed the economic hub of a world-wide trading empire with contacts stretching from the Baltic and the Mediterranean to the Americas and the Far East. The merchants and bankers of Antwerp were the financial backers of both Spanish and Portuguese mercantile ventures in the New World.

When Antwerp finally fell to the Spaniards in 1585 and the mouth of the river Scheldt, on which all of Antwerp’s good fortune hinged, was blocked, the bell had tolled for the trend-setting dialect of Brabant. A mass emigration of wealthy, respectable burghers, many of them Protestants or Jews, left the southern Netherlands for the cities of the north, above all Amsterdam. From this time on, the position which Brabants had enjoyed in the Netherlands prior to 1585 was assumed by the dialect of the province of Holland. The number of southern immigrants, and above all the influence which the southerners continued to exert in the north after 1585, meant however that Hollands now underwent considerable brabantisation. The fact that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the cities of the north became melting pots for Netherlanders from all over the Low Countries, due to the prosperity which accompanied Holland’s mercantile enterprise, is undoubtedly one of the most important reasons why the language of that region was to form the perfect basis for the standard language. London had already fulfilled a similar function in England prior to this time, as had Paris in France.

The southerners in the cities of the north, occupying as they did many important

1. The letter y is used in this book to indicate the high rounded vowel which is written as u/u in Dutch e.g. muren/muur – a value it has in the International Phonetic Alphabet. In German and in other texts the symbol ü is sometimes used to render this sound but that is avoided here because I have attributed a different value to it (see p. 48). Map 10 does, however, use ü for the sound which I reproduce here with y.
De Schoolmeester. 64

Maakt medecyn, Niet tot feryn.

Door Letterkonst, soo hoog verheven,
Is ons veel nut en heyl gegeven,
Dat ons de Weg ten heemel toond:
Maar, om het Schuim van't Goud weghalen
Is't misbruick deezer kunst te myde,
Op dat de Wysheid ons bekröond.

Education in the 17th century was still quite rudimentary on the whole (see p. 96), but here too the contribution of the southern Netherlands to northern culture was considerable (see p. 101).

Taken from J. and C. Luiken, 100 Ambachten, Amsterdam, 1694.
positions in trading circles, government, education, the army and the church, enjoyed an elite status. Although of course never in the majority, they formed nevertheless a sizeable minority of the population – in 1622, 30% of the population of Amsterdam were immigrants. But the influence they exerted, not least in linguistic issues, was enormous. It is believed, for instance, that the shifts of \( i > ij \) and \( \hat{y} > ui \) which occurred in the post Middle Dutch period and are now part of \( ABN \), were new fashionable pronunciations introduced into the north by the Brabanders in whose dialect the sounds had already shifted some time before; this in turn can account for \( \hat{y} \) (also \( \hat{u} \)) having been retained in rural areas outside the province of Holland where the influence of the urban southerners was less felt (see map 10). Equally many of the words nowadays often labelled as schrifttaal, i.e. words that are seldom used in the everyday spoken Dutch north of the rivers, are in fact words of Brabant origin which are still common in southern speech, while their equivalents in natural speech are the indigenous Hollands forms e.g. \( \text{gans} \) – \( \text{heel} \) (whole), \( \text{gaarne} \) – \( \text{graag} \) (gladly), \( \text{tans} \) – \( \text{nu} \) (now), \( \text{liden} \) – \( \text{lui} \) (people), \( \text{welen} \) – \( \text{huilen} \) (to cry), \( \text{gij} \) – \( \text{jij} \) (you), \( \text{reeds} \) – \( \text{al} \) (already), \( \text{schoon} \) – \( \text{mooi} \) (beautiful), \( \text{werpen} \) – \( \text{gooien} \) (to throw), \( \text{zeer} \) – \( \text{heel} / \text{erg} \) (very), \( \text{zenden} \) – \( \text{sturen} \) (to send). The ‘reverence’ with which such words are now regarded is reminiscent of the status Brabants must have enjoyed in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.

One of the most important sources of sixteenth century Dutch is the Dictionarium (1574), known after the reprint of 1599 as the Etymologicum, by Kilian who worked with Plantin in Antwerp. This book stands at the beginning of a long tradition of lexicography in the Netherlands. In the dictionary all Dutch words are accompanied by their equivalents in Latin, as well as attempts to classify the words as Flemish, Hollands, Frisian etc. The etymologies are often unreliable, however. This important sixteenth century book remained a standard reference work for centuries, particularly before the appearance of Verdam’s Middelnederlands Woordenboek. In addition, it was frequently used in the north as a Latin-Dutch dictionary, a Dutch that was distinctly Brabants in flavour.

The sixteenth century also saw the first serious attempts to standardise spelling, in imitation of Latin and French. Spelling was to be of greater importance to many language reformers in the centuries ahead than grammar. On the other hand, there were to be writers who delighted in the very fact that the spelling could be varied. Most attempts to standardise, however, were based on a particular dialect.

The first important work that attempted to evolve a national spelling that stood above the individual dialects was Pontus de Heuiter’s Nederduitse Orthographie (1581). De Heuiter, a cleric who was born in Delft but who had travelled widely throughout the northern and southern Netherlands, was far ahead of his time in, for example, recommendations to write single \( e \) and \( o \) in open syllables (see p. 40) and to abolish superfluous letters in common combinations such as \( gh \) (Ghent – now Gent), \( ck \) (ick – now \( ik \)).

But attempts to standardise language that are not based on real circumstances are seldom successful. However H.L. Spieghel’s Tweespraak van de Nederduitsche Letterkunst (1584), probably the best known of all early books on the Dutch language, was based on the language of Amsterdam. This meant it was, in effect, just as parochial as the other works of the time, but Amsterdam was moving economically and thus socially more and more into a position to be able to dictate,
also in linguistic issues, to the rest of the country. This book is an important source of information on the sounds of the dialect of Amsterdam in the late sixteenth century; for example, Spieghel mentions that *ij* and *ui* were still pronounced as *i* and *j* and were thus not yet pronounced as they are now. But Spieghel discusses grammar too. He, like many after him, felt that certain simplifications which spoken Dutch had undergone by that time amounted to an impoverishment of the language. For example, he advocated reviving the distinction between the nominative and the accusative, but then in a way that had never existed even at the time before the two had fallen together – namely both masculine and feminine nouns could, according to Spieghel, take *den* in the accusative; he also recommended genitive forms such as *des vrouwen*, in imitation of the masculine and neuter. In prescribing such artificial forms, he represented the current Renaissance philosophy that it was the task of grammarians to cultivate the vernacular, regardless of what the practice in everyday speech was. Spieghel’s language was that of the upper circles of Amsterdam society with the addition of learned distinctions that had either disappeared from, or never existed in the language. This attitude to the written language was to remain for a long time to come, in fact till the truly scientific approach to language study in the nineteenth century.

The Renaissance encouraged nationalism and with nationalism came a greater interest in the vernaculars of Europe. Thus the above attempts to standardise the spelling and grammar of Dutch, but this philosophy was also reflected in growing purism, above all in moves to purify the language of French loan words. It was common at this time, however, to resort to German words in an attempt to rid Dutch of French influence, the division between Dutch and German not being felt to be as strong in the sixteenth century as it is now. (See the term *Nederduits* p. 4). An important name in the context of purism is that of the mathematician Simon Stevin, a Fleming who migrated to the north. He preferred *Hollands* to his native Flemish and many of his purisms in the language of mathematics are still with us today e.g. *driehoek* (triangle), *afrekken* (to substract), *delen* (to divide), *wortel* (root).
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13 The seventeenth century
- the birth of ABN

The seventeenth century is the period in which the language of the mediaeval county of Holland, together with Utrecht, found itself in an unchallenged position to take the lead and assert itself as the basis for the standard. There is by this time no shortage of texts in the Hollands dialect. Even something of the language of the lower echelons of society, particularly in Amsterdam, is known thanks to the popular farces which were produced in public for the entertainment of the common people. Many of these farces, which attempted to capture the colour of local speech, were written by the great pens of the day.

In upper circles the seventeenth century was a period in which southern and northern elements, but particularly the latter, combined to form the basis of what we will come to know as ABN. For a long time, however, the Brabanders and Flemings lived in specific areas and tended to marry also within the émigré community.

In the Spaanse Brabander, one of the best known comedies of the age, which was written by the northern playwright G.A. Bredero, some of the humour is derived from ridiculing the exaggeratedly Antwerp speech of the main character, above all the excessive number of French loan words. However, this is but one reflection of the attitudes to language in the literature of seventeenth century Holland.

From this time on in particular, the gap between the language of the cities of Holland with their large immigrant populations, and that of the surrounding countryside must have begun to widen. The east and even the south could no longer compete with the cities of Holland in the formation of a standard Dutch. Beschaafd was the language of the upper urban circles, where a certain blend of northern and southern forms had occurred, whereas plat was the language of the common people, where the differences from the language of the adjacent platteland were minimal. This is similar to the situation today where the speech of the lower classes of Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Utrecht, for example, is not what one can call ABN, although those dialects are readily intelligible to speakers of western ABN. In time the language of the upper classes of the cities of Holland was to grow together, but for a long time the strong particularism of the various regions of the Netherlands, still evident today, acted as a brake on such developments.

Dutch vocabulary underwent enormous expansion at this time due to advances in all aspects of science and learning and as a result of contact with an ever widening world. From the end of the sixteenth century, the Dutch were no longer functioning merely as middlemen but were themselves actively trading in the Far East and the Americas. This is also the time in which French established itself unequivocally as the language of diplomacy and international dealings. Thus the influence of French also came via channels other than the often bilingual southern émigrés who were
resident in the north. Although French loan words were more common in the language of the upper circles, a certain number were to percolate down to the lowest levels on the social ladder in the course of time, sometimes to the extent that even there such loans were able to displace indigenous Dutch words e.g. abuis (mistaken), chagrijnig (cantankerous), lerares (female teacher, where the French ending -es has replaced the indigenous ending -in), proberen (to try – the Dutch words pogen en trachten now belong to more elevated style).

From the middle of the sixteenth century, but particularly after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, many French Huguenots, who, like the Brabants-Flemish refugees of a century before, were wealthy, upper class people, began to arrive in the northern Netherlands in search of religious tolerance – more than 100,000 after 1685. They formed yet another element that favoured the position of French as an upper class language and thus worthy of imitation and borrowing. A final echo of their arrival in the Netherlands, and the respect they and their language enjoyed, is to be found in the presence of a Waalse Kerk¹ (where Waals = French) in all the larger towns; attendance at the French language services in these churches still seems to have a certain snob value.

The citizens of the Dutch Republic, the beginnings of which had been the Union of Utrecht in 1579, realized very early that racial and religious tolerance was more profitable than the alternative which was the norm in most other countries. The religious tolerance that reigned in seventeenth century Holland was of course only a relative tolerance i.e. relative to the situation in Spain and France at the time for example, for only Calvinists could occupy public office. The resulting influx of immigrants that began in the late sixteenth century and continued on through the seventeenth century attracting southern Netherlanders, Huguenots and Iberian Jews to Holland brought unprecedented prosperity to the country. The presence of such large minority groups, and the international contacts they brought with them, contributed to the development of an ABN based on the language of the cities of Holland and consequently the common assertion that Hollands is Nederlands and Holland is the Netherlands (see p. 6). The great men of letters of the day, for this was the Golden Age in literature too, were of various backgrounds typical of the times: Constantijn Huygens, whose mother was from Antwerp and whose paternal relatives were originally from Breda, was brought up in The Hague; G.A. Bredero was a Hollander through and through who reacted against the Brabants dialect in his writings; P.C. Hooft was an Amsterdamer and leader of the influential circle of writers known as the Muiderkring; J. Cats, although a Zeelander, was educated at Leiden University and spent most of his life in South Holland; J. van den Vondel, the son of Brabanders, lived and wrote in the Brabants-Flemish community of Amsterdam but even he shows a clear preference for northern forms in his later works. Such people, in cultivating a standard written Dutch, often advocated forms for the written language which had either never existed or no longer existed in the spoken language. They played an important role in the development of a grammar of standard Dutch and their literary work would be revered for generations to come as the classical period in Dutch letters. Many of the archaisms which

¹ Simply French-speaking congregations of the Nederlands Hervormde Kerk.
became part and parcel of written Dutch at this time were to burden the language right up to the present century.

Of course the written word always lags behind the spoken word in all languages, preserving certain traditions that are no longer current in speech, but in the case of Dutch this was particularly so because of the reintroduction of archaic distinctions in gender and case inflections that had ceased to be functional during the development of mediaeval Dutch into a more analytical language. For example, one such artificial distinction that still exists in written style today is that between *hen* (accusative) and *hun* (dative) when in effect the former is simply a phonetically unrounded variant of the latter.

At the Synod of Dordrecht, which took place in 1618-19 at the end of a long period of internal political conflict between orthodox and liberal Calvinists which saw the former victoring, it was decided that a new standard Bible, translated directly from the original Greek and Hebrew of the scriptures, was required for the Republic of the Seven United Provinces. The language of all existing Bibles up to that time was heavily southern. A committee of translators from all over the Netherlands was commissioned by the States General, the government of the Republic, to translate both the New and the Old Testaments into a modern Dutch which would not favour the dialect of one area over that of another. Thus concessions were made on and off to Flemish, *Brabants*, *Hollands* and Frisian. Of the various forms of a word that often existed, a choice was made and many standard *ABN* forms we now know are the result of these often arbitrary decisions e.g. for the past tense of *beginnen* (to begin) a choice had to be made between *begon*, *begost*, *begonst* and *began* – *began* was chosen and is now *ABN*. Similarly *du* was not given official recognition but was replaced by *gij* (see p. 171). After years of debate and revision the so-called *Statenvertaling* (StateTranslation) appeared in 1637; because of its predecessors it was however still quite southern in flavour. The role that it played in the establishment of the standard language is as important to the history of Dutch as Luther’s Bible to the history of German, although appearing more than one hundred years later than Luther’s (1522), it was not as innovative as that Bible. The influence of the Church, and thus of the language of the church, was still considerable. Now that a knowledge of reading was more wide-spread, one text that was read by all, regardless of standing and place of abode, was the State Translation of the Bible. This seventeenth century translation was to remain the authoritative Dutch Bible right up to the mid-20th century. In this sense it can be compared with the King James’ version of the English Bible.

From what has been discussed so far, it can be seen why there was such a legacy to the southern dialects in the emergent *ABN* of the north, a legacy which was not contested until the literary revival of the late nineteenth century known as the *Beweging van Tachtig* and the linguistic consciousness that accompanied it. Nevertheless the *Brabants* contribution to *ABN*, especially in the written language, has survived and cannot be missed (see p. 103).

---

2. Such attempts to standardise a language remind one that the standard forms of all the languages of Europe and their relationship to their dialects is as follows: dialects are not deviations from the norm but the norm is itself the product of a combination of these variations.
The seventeenth century still saw no Dutch-Dutch dictionary. For the time being, as in the sixteenth century, dictionaries were seen as a means of learning foreign languages, primarily French and Latin. Holland would have to wait for a long time before a dictionary would appear whose aim it was to record and enrich the mother tongue.

Grammars too had to date been aimed at an elite public, the authors and scholars of the day. Not till the nineteenth century would there be an attempt to prescribe grammatical forms in texts intended for the general public and the developing schools system. Such attempts would be based, however, on the 'classical' language of the writers of the Golden Age.

The influence of Dutch outside the Netherlands at the time of the Republic

The influence of the Dutch language was felt even beyond the borders of the Republic in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the north of Germany, particularly in East Friesland, Dutch was the language used in the churches of the non-Lutheran protestant groups right into the eighteenth century. Through trade with the cities of the Hanseatic League, and thus contact with the Baltic, the Dutch language was well known in the mercantile centres of the region. Many Dutch-Low German\(^3\) words that have to do with sea-faring as well as with mercantile activity made their way at this time into High German, the Scandinavian languages and Russian – Czar Peter the Great himself spent some time in Zaandam learning the basics of Dutch ship-building.\(^4\) Nor did English escape influence from Dutch in the seventeenth century; nautical vocabulary was adopted into English from Dutch, e.g. boom, skipper, yacht. Leiden University attracted many a student from England but particularly co-religionists from Scotland. The bitter rivalry between the English and the Dutch that began under Cromwell from the mid-1600's also led to negative expressions in English incorporating the word 'Dutch' e.g. Dutch wife, Dutch courage, Double Dutch. The influence of Dutch on the sea-faring vocabulary of England was less in the eighteenth century when the English themselves began to replace the Dutch as the maritime nation of Europe.

The Dutch, unlike the Spanish, Portuguese, French and above all the English, seldom actually colonised the areas they actively traded in overseas. Their settlements in South America, West Africa, India, Taiwan and Japan were in most cases little more than trading posts, or factories as they were called. Thus the influence of the Dutch language in these areas was minimal and is difficult or impossible to trace nowadays. The only exceptions to this are South Africa, New Netherlands,

\(^3\) The distinction as this stage can still be artificial at times – remember the Dutch themselves commonly called their language *Nederduits* even in the nineteenth century.

\(^4\) The following are examples of the Dutch words Czar Peter introduced into Russian in the early eighteenth century: капитан (kapitein, captain); матрос (matroos, sailor); мачта (mast); струбберг (stuurboord, starboard); бакборт (bakboord, port); achterstevens (achtersteven, stern); vorstevens (voorsteven, bow); тремшют (trek-schuit, tow-boat); сель (zeil, sail); фоксель (fokzeil, foresail); гроотсель (grootzeil, main sail).
the Antilles and the East Indies. Even South Africa, the largest linguistic legacy left by Holland’s overseas empire, became a colony against the express wishes and intentions of the East India Company that founded the Cape settlement. In New Amsterdam (now New York) and the adjacent mainland (then called New Netherlands), which were in Dutch hands from 1624-1664, a considerable number of colonists settled who remained when the English took control of the territory; names such as Roosevelt and Vanderbilt, descendants of the first Dutch colonists, have become legendary names in the U.S.A.; old maps of New Amsterdam show that present-day Wall Street, Broadway and Long Island, for example, are translations of the original Dutch names Walstraat, Breede Weg and ’t Lange Eiland; also the names Brooklyn, Harlem, Flushing and Staten Island preserve a lasting reminder of the origins of New York. The Dutch formed an elite in New York society right into the eighteenth century and Dutch was spoken by the majority of the population until the middle of that century. The town of Albany on the Hudson river, formerly called Beverwijk, has documents in Dutch in the municipal archives from as late as the late eighteenth century.

In the Dutch Antilles, Dutch was retained as the official language (see p. 3), whereas in Surinam (Dutch Guyana), which the Dutch got from the English in return for New York, it has been subsequently introduced and is now the official language although the original creole languages of the country are English-based (Sranan Tongo, Taki-Taki), the result of English activity in the area prior to the Dutch take-over in 1666; nowadays of course many Dutch words have made their way into these languages as they have into Papiamento, the creole of the Antilles.

When in 1612 the Danes arrived in the Virgin Islands (St. Thomas, St. John and St. Croix), islands which they later gave to the U.S.A., they found a group of Dutch colonists, mainly from Zeeland and Flanders, and a native slave population speaking a pidgin Dutch now called Negerhollands. This language, now unfortunately virtually extinct, shares many of the simplifications that Dutch in South Africa also underwent.

Emigration of actual colonists to the East Indies belongs more to nineteenth century history when the Dutch first began to assume control of the entire Indonesian archipelago.

The considerable influence the Dutch language has had on Malay (Bahasa Indonesia) is thus also of later date, as is a great deal of the influence of Malay on Dutch (see p. 78), although undoubtedly Malay words for new concepts such as kapok, for instance, must have been known in Holland from the time of the first contacts.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Chapter 4 of this book deals with the seventeenth century.

This is a good, practical little book which emphasises the differences in the pronunciation, spelling, grammar etc. of seventeenth century Dutch compared with the modern language. Intended for use by students.

A good, practical guide to the reading of seventeenth century Dutch texts. Part one is a grammar and part two consists of passages for translation with a vocabulary. Van de Ketterij has produced something similar for Middle Dutch as well (see p. 97).


This deals in some detail with aspects of seventeenth century Dutch grammar and the writings of grammarians of the period.

General history books with background information on the Netherlands in the seventeenth century are recommended on p. 104. Chapter 5 of Meijer’s *Literature of the Low Countries*, details of which are also given on p. 104, deals with the seventeenth century in some detail.
The eighteenth century, a century of general stagnation in the history of Holland, saw a much more conscious effort to standardise the language than had ever been the case before, and the Dutch of the classical writers of the seventeenth century, particularly that of Hooff and Vondel, was greatly revered. A similar situation existed in France at the time too where the language of Corneille and Racine enjoyed great respect. This century was to see a considerable number of publications on the subject of language reglementation. Only the most important are dealt with here.

Throughout the eighteenth century Europe was to witness the dominance of French language, letters and manners – the Dutch refer to it as the pruikentijd (the era of wigs). This was to have an inevitable effect on the frequency of gallicisms in Dutch, particularly in the language of the upper classes. Many of the writings of the period show an exaggerated use of French vocabulary. There is also ample evidence that the feeling for gender and case was being kept alive only artificially – there are, for instance, gross inconsistencies in the application of the accusative and dative $n$ endings to articles and adjectives.

The most important Dutch grammarian of the century was the Amsterdammer Balthasar Huydecoper (1695-1778). He was the first to make a thorough study of Middle Dutch; he believed that one should look to the past to find guidance for the future in linguistic issues. His book, Proeve van Taal- en Dicht-kunde (1730), was regarded as a standard work throughout the century. Huydecoper took as his basis the language of Vondel, but he proceeded to point out where Vondel’s grammar had digressed from the rules. The language of one of Holland’s greatest seventeenth century authors, tidied up to fit in with the traditional categories of grammar, however artificial and obsolete these may have been by the eighteenth century, was considered an ideal worthy of imitation. At least it provided the people of the time with a basis for a standard written form of the Dutch language. Huydecoper was not the only grammarian to take this approach; David van Hoogstraten (1700) and Arnold Moonen (1706) had had the same idea.

Throughout the nineteenth century, as in the century before, Latin still enjoyed a privileged position in scholarly and legal circles. To a considerable degree it was the knowledge of Latin (and Greek) and the admiration for the standardised formal grammar of that language that lay behind the desire to impose rigid grammatical rules on the vernacular, although they were often at odds with the natural spoken language of the day. It was considered a means of displaying scholarship.

After Huydecoper, the other great grammarian of this period was Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731) who was ahead of his time in so many ways; for example, his study of phonetics, Klankkunde (1699), was not typical of the eighteenth century.
He saw beyond spelling, realising that it is but an arbitrary convention for rendering the sounds of a language in writing and that these sounds are themselves worthy of scientific analysis. It was also Ten Kate who first studied the similarities between Gothic and Dutch (1710) and in so doing pre-empted the scientific study of the history of Dutch in its Germanic context that was to blossom in the nineteenth century. In his opposition to the prescription of archaic grammatical rules that bore little relation to everyday speech, he was also a radical; he maintained that cultivated speech should be a suitable medium for writing. His main work was the momentous 1500-paged Aanleiding tot de kennis van het verhevene deel der Nederduitse sprake (1723). This is one of the most important works ever written on the Dutch language.

Of Ten Kate and Huydecoper, the former was more important from the point of view of modern scholarship, although he too looked back to Dutch as it had been written in former times when questions of doubt arose, and even he did not advocate complete abolition of grammatical inflection. But in the eighteenth century it was Huydecoper who enjoyed the greater reputation.

Adriaan Kluit (1735-1807), an historian from Leiden, was a scholar in the tradition of Huydecoper whose 1777 treatise, which attempted to standardise spelling and determine genders for Dutch nouns, was to be taken by Professor Siegenbeek early in the next century as the basis for the so-called Spelling Siegenbeek which was to be regarded as the official spelling of Dutch until it too was revised by De Vries and Te Winkel in the 1850’s.

Towards the end of the century, by which time Europe was in the grip of the Enlightenment, there was an ever increasing repudiation of the stiff, unnatural mode of written expression that had burdened the language to date. Although some archaic forms would be maintained in the written language for a long time to come – the last were only abolished once and for all in 1947 – a conscious attempt to bring the written and spoken languages closer together in favour of the latter, had begun by this time and was to continue. Also by this time, the influence of German and English philosophy and literature, and thus ultimately the borrowing of words from those languages, had begun and was soon to rival and finally overtake the influence of French. This was a period of tremendous philosophical and political upheaval in Europe, culminating in the American and French revolutions; such drastic changes in society inevitably brought new vocabulary with them to all the languages of Europe.
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15 The nineteenth century – birth of the modern age

By the time the Batavian Republic was declared in 1795, an immediate effect of revolutionary events in France, the Dutch nation was in possession of a reasonably standard written form of its vernacular, based predominantly on the dialect of the former county of Holland; a standard form of the spoken language, however, was still far off and has, in some ways, still not been attained.

In 1797 the University of Leiden created, for the first time in history, a chair of Dutch. The foundation professor was the Reverend Mattheüs Siegenbeek (1774-1854). The creation of such a post for authoritative regulation of linguistic issues was important at this point in history because this was also the dawn of general education for the masses. Siegenbeek was commissioned to draw up proposals for a standard spelling of the Dutch language; his *Verhandeling over de spelling der Nederduitsche taal ter bevordering van eenparigheid in dezelve* (Treatise on the spelling of the Dutch – lit. Low German – language for the furtherance of standardisation) appeared in 1804. Siegenbeek was of course a product of the eighteenth century and this was evident in his approach to his subject, but nevertheless he favoured a thorough revision of the principles of orthography, a philosophy current in Germany where the science of philology was being born at this time. However, Siegenbeek based his proposals on the suggestions which Kluit had made in 1777; for example, on the spelling of long vowels, he advocated that *aa* should not be written as *ae* and that *a* and *u* should not be doubled in open syllables but that *e* and *ee*, *o* and *oo* should alternate in open syllables in accordance with the etymology of the words concerned (see p. 40). This distinction in spelling, which was dependent on a distinction in pronunciation made in only a few dialects, found great opposition and was a constant handicap in the writing of Dutch until it was finally abolished in 1947.

Simultaneous with Siegenbeek’s commission to draw up proposals for a standard orthography was the directive of the Reverend Petrus Weiland of Rotterdam to write a grammar of standard usage. This was duly completed in 1805 but was very eighteenth century in approach, still prescribing many antiquated forms.

One of Siegenbeek’s and Weiland’s greatest critics was the poet Willem Bilderdijkstra (1756-1831) who, in advocating ‘spell as you speak’ and not the reverse as was often practised by teachers and ministers of religion at the time, represented the modern view i.e. that the sounds of a language are primary and the symbols with which one commits these sounds to paper are secondary; he also opposed the view that Latin should serve as a model for Dutch grammar. His was a nineteenth-twentieth century approach, theirs was an eighteenth century one. Bilderdijkstra too, however, had opponents as well as supporters – his poetic works were well known for their frequent borrowings from other languages and creation of new derivatives. In this too he set an example for later generations.
The long period of excessive exposure to the influence of French, starting with the foundation of the Batavian Republic, a French inspired creation, and culminating in Napoleon’s incorporation of Holland into his empire, sparked off numerous reactions to the ‘bastardisation’ of the Dutch language which had occurred in the period 1795-1813.

The nineteenth century also saw an ever increasing influence of German on the vocabulary of Dutch due to the important role Germany was playing in various scientific fields at the time. Many of these German loan words, now dressed in Dutch garb, have become part and parcel of Dutch and are no longer recognised as German in origin (see p. 76). The growing influence of German also had its critics. Siegenbeek, for instance, compiled a *Lijst van woorden en uitdrukkingen met het Nederlands taalteigen strijende* (List of words and expressions incompatible with Dutch idiom) in which he concentrated on loans from German.

In the nineteenth century an enormous amount of new vocabulary made its way into the language, either in the form of loan words or new compounds of indigenous words, to cover the wide range of new social, political and scientific developments – the French revolution had sparked off irreversible changes in the social and political organisation of Europe and the industrial revolution had also dawned bringing about tremendous advances in communications and manufacturing.

The brief period of unification with Belgium under King William I and that king’s valiant efforts to promote the Dutch language are discussed on p. 25.

By the mid-nineteenth century, as a reaction to romanticism, a literary movement that had favoured the revival of archaisms, came the period of realism. One of the consequences of this development was the frequent attempt to record natural speech, and even dialect, in novels which gives some insight into the spoken language of the day. How great the gap was at various times in history between what people actually spoke and what was written, and thus preserved, is usually impossible to know, but the realistic literature of the nineteenth century goes some way towards enlightening us on this point. One example of the sort of difference that still existed between written and spoken Dutch was the use of *gij/ij* and *jij/jou* respectively. Only after 1840 did the written language begin to move closer to the spoken language, thanks to the efforts of popular authors such as Nicolaas Beets, alias Hildebrand (1814-1903). He, for instance, maintained of the language used in his famous *Camera Obscura* that he had stripped it of its ‘Sunday dress’. However, the greatest milestone in this regard was the novel *Max Havelaar* (1860) by Eduard Douwes Dekker, alias Multatuli (1820-1887).

The truly scientific study of Dutch commenced at this time too. The first chairs of Dutch at the universities of Leiden, Utrecht and Groningen, manned by products of eighteenth century scholarship as they were, were concerned more with issues of written expression and style than with language history. That science did not develop until the early nineteenth century, and even then it first saw the light of day in Germany. The first linguistic periodicals were soon founded, inviting contributions on all aspects of the Dutch language, including dialects. In fact, right from the beginning there was great interest shown in Holland for dialectology.

Two scholars who were involved in the serious study of Dutch from the birth of the new science were Matthias de Vries (1802-1892) and Lammert Allard te Winkel (1806-1868). The former, professor of Dutch in Leiden from 1853, is regarded as
the father of the scientific study of Dutch. He had made a thorough study of Middle Dutch and was to devote his life to the compilation of an authoritative Dutch dictionary, something the nation had never really had.¹ He harboured a respect for both the classical written language of the past and the living language as it was spoken by his contemporaries.

In 1851 De Vries published his Ontwerp van een Nederlandsch woordenboek. Te Winkel joined him in helping to realise this dream, but first a standard spelling had to be agreed upon and the contributions these two scholars made in this arena are discussed on p. 40. The first, extremely detailed section of the Nederlandsch Woordenboek finally appeared in 1864 but not till 1882 did the first volume of this monumental work appear. De Vries took as the starting point of this dictionary, which he saw as a sort of museum of the Dutch language, the year 1637, the date of the State Translation of the Bible. After his death his work was continued by others who then limited the scope of the dictionary somewhat. Work on it continues to the present day and meanwhile supplements have also appeared – the language has inevitably changed, even drastically in some ways, since the 1860’s. In addition, Dutch spelling has since been reformed but all new sections of the dictionary published today must, by necessity, be printed in the spelling used by De Vries.

De Vries’ attitudes to grammatical inflection, still very conservative, were hotly opposed by the orientalist Taco Roorda. The ruling opinion, as in the previous century, was still that simplification of the inflectional system would result in impoverishment of the language. Roorda, like so many others before him, was ahead of his time in what he advocated.

Roorda’s ideas on written expression were to become the norm in the 1880’s when the literary movement known as the Beweging van Tachtig began. The writers who constituted this movement, the birth of the modern Dutch literary tradition, broke radically with past conventions in linguistic issues. Realism, and now also naturalism, demanded of the nineteenth century novelists an absolutely natural rendition of the normal spoken word in writing, whatever the subject matter. Thus, from this time dates written Dutch more or less as we know it today, although a lapse back into the written style of former times is still commonly found in letters, legal documents and government proclamations.
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Chapters 6-10 deal with various aspects of the history of Dutch in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including the differing or parallel developments and attitudes in Holland and Belgium.


¹ One previous attempt at compilation of a comprehensive Dutch dictionary deserves mention here, Petrus Weiland’s Taalkundig Woordenboek (1799-1811), but this work relied heavily on the corpus of older dictionaries.
Section 2  The Past

B. Historical grammar
16 Dutch as a Germanic language

Within the branch of Indo-European languages known as Germanic, Dutch occupies an important but often neglected position. In terms of number of speakers, it is the third largest Germanic language after English and German. Popularly speaking, one can say that its relationship to the other West Germanic languages is fraternal, whereas its relationship to the North Germanic or Scandinavian languages is more that of a cousin. The study of the historical grammar of Dutch sheds much light on identical or related developments in the other Germanic languages, particularly the other West Germanic languages. It is intended here to look at the phonological and morphological development of the language from the time of the break-up of Germanic into its present constituent parts. Only once this early historical development has been traced can one fully understand how and why Dutch emerged as a separate entity within the West Germanic branch. Of course socio-linguistic factors have also played a role in the emergence of Dutch as a separate language and these are dealt with in chapters 9-15.

Firstly, however, it is important to know what distinguishes a language as being Germanic i.e. what characteristics does Dutch share with the other members of the Germanic branch, both West and North, which the Romance, Celtic, Slavic and other divisions of Indo-European do not contain. The following phenomena are characteristic of all Germanic languages:

1. They have taken part in the First (German) Sound Shift.
2. With the exception of certain prefixes and many foreign loan words, the stress has been fixed on the first syllable of a word.
3. The imperfect indicative and the past participle of weak verbs are formed by the addition of a dental suffix (i.e. t or d).

The similarities with each other and the differences from other Indo-European languages do not stop here, but these three criteria are universal within Germanic and exclusive to it.

1. A synonym for Indo-European is Indo-Germanic. It is commonly used in (often older) Dutch and German literature. It too derives its name from the geographic extremities where these languages are spoken i.e. India (Hindi) and Iceland (Icelandic, a Germanic language).
2. Peculiar to Dutch is a shifting of stress away from the first syllable in certain compound and derived words (see p. 56).
3. Initial stress in Germanic languages nowadays contrasts with the stress on the final syllable in French and the penultimate syllable in Italian, whereas in Russian it is still free as in Indo-European.
We will look here firstly at the Sound Shift, as it is only after the completion of this shift that we can talk of Germanic at all. The fixing of the stress on the first syllable is indirectly connected to the Sound Shift and will also be dealt with here before proceeding to an analysis of the historical phonology of Dutch. The dental suffix of weak imperfects and past participles is discussed in the chapter on historical morphology (see p. 175).

Before looking at the details of the so-called First German Sound Shift, also known as Grimm’s Law as Jakob Grimm was the first to formalise and logically describe what had occurred, it is perhaps useful to look briefly at what the possible causes of such sound shifts are. Historical phonology is based on the observation that over a certain period of time and/or geographical distance, the sounds of a given language or dialect are likely to change. Such changes may occur spontaneously but usually there are outside influences playing a role. The shifting of the point(s) of articulation can lead to the shifting of another sound in order to avoid a falling together of sounds, which can give rise to homonyms and disturb mutual understanding. It is probably in this light that we should see the First Sound Shift.

When the Indo-European peoples began arriving (from the Caucasus?) on the European subcontinent from ± 2000 B.C., inevitably a proportion of them made their way into the Baltic basin, occupying the south of Sweden, Norway, Denmark and the southern Baltic coast. Others settled further south, covering all of Europe including the British Isles. Archeology tells us, however, that these regions were inhabited long before this wave of immigrants arrived – the Basques, the Finns together with the Estonians and the Lapps, for example, could well be, at least as far as their languages are concerned, remnants of the pre-Indo-European aborigines of Europe. The original inhabitants of the western and southern Baltic basin, whether they were predecessors of the Lapps, the Finns or of other peoples that have since been wiped out or absorbed, adopted Indo-European speech, and in so doing, caused certain sounds, which were unknown or different in their language(s), to shift. It is the stops or plosives which were affected and which set off the chain reaction illustrated below. However the process occurred – one can only rely on hypotheses when discussing such prehistoric changes – the consonantal shift that had occurred in Indo-European speech in the Baltic region by ±500 B.C., occurred only there and enables us to label that speech with its shifted consonants as Germanic.

4. An interesting modern example of this phenomenon is the shifting of initial g to h in Flemish dialects (also in Zeeuws); thus the word geel (yellow) is pronounced heel (very, whole) and could lead to confusion, but in the dialects concerned initial h has been dropped, so heel (geel) contrasts with eel (very, whole).
5. Finno-Ugristik is the name given to the study of Finnish and Hungarian, the two main non-Indo-European languages of Europe; the Magyars of Hungary did not take up residence in Europe until the ninth century, however. Finnish has attracted the interest of Germanists because of its early contact with Germanic speech in the Baltic at a time before the fixing of stress on the first syllable and thus a time when the endings of words were better preserved in Germanic. Finnish, also having no fixed stress on the first syllable, has often preserved these early loan words in a more original state than the Germanic languages themselves e.g. koning (king) – Finnish kuningas.
1 The First German Sound Shift or Grimm’s Law

The stops (plosives) of Indo-European were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>labial</th>
<th>dental</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>labio-velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>gw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bh⁶</td>
<td>dh⁶</td>
<td>gh⁶</td>
<td>gwh⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These stops became the following sounds in Primitive German⁷:

\[
\begin{align*}
  f & \rightarrow b^h \\
  p & \rightarrow t \\
  b & \rightarrow d
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  h^o & \rightarrow h \\
  k & \rightarrow kw
\end{align*}
\]

The shift of these sounds from Indo-European to Germanic can be schematically represented as follows:

1 Gmc.  &  \[\text{f} \quad \text{b} \quad \text{h} \quad \text{hw}\]
2 IE.    &  \[\text{p} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{k} \quad \text{kw}\]
   Gmc.   &  \[\text{p} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{k} \quad \text{kw}\]
3 IE.    &  \[\text{b} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{gw}\]
   Gmc.   &  \[\text{b} \quad \text{d} \quad \text{g} \quad \text{gwh}\]
4 IE.    &  \[\text{bh} \quad \text{dh} \quad \text{gh} \quad \text{gwh}\]

Most of line 1 has, in fact, since shifted again in Dutch, a shift which occurred some time prior to 1100:

\[
\begin{align*}
  v & \rightarrow d \\
  h & \quad \text{unchanged} \\
  w & \rightarrow \text{hw}
\end{align*}
\]

Together with the shift of \(f^*>v\), \(s\) also shifted to \(z\) in Dutch; in other words, a voicing occurred e.g. voet (foot), denken (think), hond (hound), wat (what)⁹, zeep (soap). In German in Anlaut \(v\) is often written, but is pronounced \([f]\), whereas \(s\) is written, but is pronounced \([z]\) e.g. Vater (father), Seife (soap).

It is line 2, the new \(p/t/k\) from IE. \(b/d/g\), which later took part in the Second German Sound Shift (see p. 123).

What the above paradigm represents is the following: IE. \(p\) shifted to \(f\). This left the position formerly filled by the phoneme \(p\) vacant. Consequently a further shift occurred where \(b\) moved in to fill the gap left by \(p\) i.e. it became a \(p\) in Germanic in

6. The \(h\) here represents aspiration which was phonemic in IE.
7. Also called Common Germanic or Oegermaans/Urgermanisch; it is the hypothetical language from which all Germanic dialects are descended cf. Indo-European.
8. This runic symbol, called thorn, is used to render unvoiced \(th\).
9. Depending on the position in a word, this \(h\) can render either \([h]\) or the voiceless fricative \([X]\) i.e. hond but acht.
10. Here English shows a metathesis of the original \(hwat\), still sometimes heard in hypercorrect pronunciation in England.
all words where in IE. b was/is found. That, in turn, meant that the aspiration of bh, formerly of phonemic importance to distinguish it from b, could be dropped and bh could shift to b without any danger of homonyms occurring. And so the process was repeated simultaneously with the dentals and velars.

To give a few examples, the shift of p > f is illustrated when one compares the following Latin words with their cognates in any of the Germanic languages: piscis – fish (vis, Fisch), pater – father (vader, Vater), per – for (voor, für) etc. The shift of t > ś: tu – thou (du), tres – three (drie, drei), tensis – thin (dun, dünn). The shift of k > h: octo – eight (acht), casa – house (huis, Haus), canis – hound (hond, Hund) etc. Such comparisons with cognate forms in other Indo-European groups are not always satisfactory as often changes have occurred within those groups which, in turn, are the reasons for those groups being recognisable as such e.g. five/vijf/fünf can’t be compared with Latin quinque, where an internal change has taken place, but can be compared with Greek pente to reveal that here too is a case of IE. p > Gmc. f.

When the Germanic peoples began to move south away from the Baltic from about the time of Christ, they took with them this particular form of Indo-European speech to which we have given the name Germanic. Not all the Germanic peoples left the Baltic region in the period concerned and consequently those that stayed behind were to become the ancestors of the present-day North Germanic peoples, the Scandinavians. These migrations, which are discussed in detail in chapter 9, account for the occurrence of Germanic speech in Holland.

The fixing of stress on the first or main syllable of a word in Germanic is a development which occurred later than the above sound shift, as Verner’s Law proves. Verner’s Law is a complicated but important explanation of what seemed to be a discrepancy in the sound shift as the latter had been formalised by Jakob Grimm. Karl Verner, a Dane, postulated that IE. p/t/k did not shift to the voiceless fricatives f/p/X, as Grimm’s Law suggests, but rather to the corresponding voiced fricatives b/d/g (now found as v/d/g in Dutch) when the stress in the word did not immediately precede the sound in question, but followed in a later syllable.  

For example:

IE. *bhrätēr – Goth. brōpar
IE. *paṭēr – Goth. fáder (pron. d)

Although the Dutch cognates of the these two words both now contain d (broeder, vader), the different origin, the result of Verner’s Law, is still to be seen in German (Bruder, Vater). A further example to help clarify this difficult concept is the word oog(eye – Germ. Auge). The Latin cognate, oculus, still contains the original IE.k sound, which, according to Grimm’s Law, one would expect to find as h or X in Germanic; if the stress followed the plosive, however, one would find g, not X, as is the case in Dutch and German.

The alternation of voiced and unvoiced consonants in related words which is the result of Verner’s Law is termed ‘grammatical change’. It explains the alternation of s and r, for example, where r has evolved via a process called rhotacism from a

11. Vocabulary of non-Germanic origin in English often preserves the floating stress of Indo-European e.g. exercise/exérét, absólve/absólute, contrôversy or controversy/controversial.
12. The fact that the g of Dutch oog is now voiceless and that it became a stop in German are secondary developments.
former z i.e. voiced s e.g. was/waren (was/were), verliezen/verloren (to lose/lost – compare forlorn).

The Second or High German Sound Shift

The Second or High German Sound Shift, which only affected the dialects of central and southern Germany (plus Austria and Switzerland) does not, it may seem at first glance, warrant discussion in a book on the history of Dutch, but an understanding of what took place there helps to clarify how and why Dutch and German have evolved as separate languages, as well as to clearly identify certain German loan words in Dutch; in addition it can be used as a means of dating the borrowing of loan words from Greek and Latin into Dutch.

Germanic p/t/k, which, in accordance with Grimm’s Law, had evolved from Indo-European b/d/g, underwent a further shift in central and southern Germany; depending on their position in a word, they shifted either fully to ff, ss, ch (i.e. fricatives) or only partially to pf, ts\textsuperscript{13}, kch (i.e. affricates) – compare Pfeffer (pepper – Dutch peper), essen (eat – Dutch eten), setzen (set – Dutch zetten), machen (make – Dutch maken). The affricate kch (e.g. Kchind – child, Dutch kind) is only found in the dialects of the far south and is not extant in standard German. This shift started in the fifth or sixth centuries in the extreme south of the German-speaking area and gradually made its way northwards, having less and less effect as it progressed. The shift of k > ch was the last to peter out. It is possible to draw a line across continental Germany dividing the area where k shifted from that where it remained unchanged. Because the shift started in the mountainous south and left its mark clearer there, those dialects which contain shifted p/t/k are called High German. Later, because standard German would be based on those shifted dialects, High German or Hochdeutsch would become synonymous with standard German and people would put a sociological interpretation on the word ‘high’, where in origin it was but geographical.

But if the dialects of central and southern Germany are known as High German, then those of the north are called Low German i.e. of the low-lying plains and coastal belt where p/t/k were retained. Philologically speaking therefore, all the unshifted Germanic dialects of the north can be termed Low German i.e. also English, Dutch and the Scandinavian languages although the latter, being North Germanic dialects, have by definition not been in a position to be affected by the Second German Sound Shift.

The ultimate border between Low and High German is usually taken to be the Benrather Line (i.e. the maken/machen line) which is named after the small town near Düsseldorf where it crosses the Rhine. Only Kerkrade and Vaals in the far south-east of the Dutch province of Limburg lie south of this line and can thus formally be classified as High German. But although the Benrather Line marks the northernmost extent of the Sound Shift in the east of Germany (i.e. near Berlin) and is regarded by the Germans to all intents and purposes as the border between

\textsuperscript{13} Modern German orthography uses the letter z to designate the affricate e.g. zehn (ten – Dutch tien).
Low and High German, in the west the Uerdinger Line (named after the town of Uerdingen on the Rhine north of Krefeld) crosses into Holland near Venlo and most of Dutch and Belgian Limburg lies south of it; this is the line that divides *ik/ook/-lijk* forms from *ich/auch/-lich*. Thus, although one does not normally regard the dialects of Limburg as High German, the province does share some important phonological (and morphological) features with its eastern neighbour (see p. 16).

The following words, which are no longer regarded by speakers of Dutch as foreign, betray High German origins because they bear evidence of having taken part in the Second Sound Shift e.g. *verschaffen* (to procure), *spies* (spit), *pech* (bad luck), *sich* (himself), *beiten* (to stain). Equally, the lack of the Sound Shift in some standard German words indicates a Low German or Dutch origin e.g. *Flotte* (fleet – Dutch *vloot*), *Treppe* (stairs – Dutch *trap*), *Wappen* (emblem – lit. weapon, Dutch *wapen*).

As mentioned previously, the High German Sound Shift also enables us to narrow down the time of borrowing into Dutch of particular Latin or Greek words which contain a *p*, *t* or *k*. Because, for example, German words such as *Bischof* (bishop – Dutch *bisschop*), *Ziegel* (tile – Dutch *tegel*) and *Kelch* (chalice – Dutch *kelk*), which are all loan words from Latin, contain shifted sounds, they must have been borrowed by German prior to the sixth century and therefore must also have been borrowed at that early time by Dutch. On the other hand, German loans from Latin such as *Pilger* (pilgrim – Dutch *pelgrim*) and *Palast* (palace – Dutch *paleis*), for example, indicate that they were borrowed after the Sound Shift had taken place in German and therefore they were undoubtedly borrowed at that later date by Dutch too. Because both *bisschop* and *paleis* still contain a *p* in Dutch, without resort to comparison with the shifted and unshifted forms respectively in High German, it would be impossible to determine the time of borrowing.

Also as a result of the High German Sound Shift, vowels in root syllables were often locked into closed syllables in German and could not lengthen when short vowels in open syllables were lengthened in the late MHG period. This lengthening which took place prior to the Middle Dutch period in Holland, was not impeded by such double consonants e.g. *wapen* (weapon) – *Waffe*, *geroken* (smelt) – *gerochen*, *bieten* (bit) – *bissen*.

3 The importance of Gothic to the study of Germanic languages

A knowledge of Gothic is actually essential for the serious student of the historical grammar of any Germanic language. At Dutch universities all students of Dutch are required to follow a course in Gothic in their first year. Consequently all Dutch text books on the historical development of Dutch refer copiously to Gothic. A knowledge of Gothic is not as common at Anglo-Saxon universities and thus a word of explanation about its importance is perhaps wise at this point.

One can say that Gothic is to the student of Germanic languages what Latin is to the student of Romance languages, with one essential difference: whereas the student of French, for example, can regard Latin as being the legitimate predecessor of French, and thus the language from which French evolved via the Vulgar
Latin of northern Gaul, the student of Dutch (or German or English) cannot draw such direct comparisons. Gothic merely represents the earliest recorded Germanic language that has come down to us, but as such it is several hundred years closer to Common or Proto-Germanic as spoken by all Germa­ner prior to their migration southwards; relative to the other Germanic languages it is consequently very conservative in its phonology and morphology and thus ideal for comparative study.

Who were the Goths? The Goths, whose original homeland was possibly in southern Sweden, were already living, however, on the southern Baltic coast before the time of Christ. By the middle of the second century they were moving in a south-easterly direction down the great rivers of eastern Europe to the Black Sea, thus forming the spearhead of the Great Migrations that were to reach their peak in the fifth century. By the beginning of the third century they had created a great Gothic empire on either side of the Dnjestr and a division had occurred into Ostro- and Visigoths.14

In 375 this empire was disturbed by the invading Huns and the Goths migrated further via the Balkans into Italy (Ostrogoths) and southern France and Spain (Visigoths). In Italy they were defeated and absorbed by the Eastern Roman Empire in 555 and in Spain, where they had lived since the middle of the fifth century, in 711 by the invading Moors.

At the time the Visigoths were in the Balkans, under the influence of Constantinople, they were converted to Christianity and their bishop, Wulfila (311-382?), based in Moesia (present-day Serbia/Bulgaria), translated the Bible from Greek into his native Gothic for his mission. This Bible translation, of which only a very small amount of the Old Testament and not all the New Testament are preserved in manuscripts of somewhat more recent origin, forms the basis of our knowledge of the Gothic language. There are several other minor sources as well, however.

Philologists have been able to compile a reasonably complete grammar of Gothic on the basis of these sources and this grammar forms the basis of all comparative studies of the phonology and morphology of Germanic languages. Thus extensive reference is made to Gothic in standard Dutch works such as Van Loey’s Schönenfeld’s Historische Grammatica van het Nederlands and De Vries’ Nederlands Etymologisch Woordenboek. The following reservation must be kept in mind, however, when drawing comparisons with Gothic: it is not the language from which all other Germanic dialects are derived, which is the case with Latin and its offspring. In addition, the Gothic we have access to is also far enough removed in time and location from Common Germanic to have undergone certain changes and simplifications which can be misleading or unhelpful to the comparativist. Despite this handicap, however, Gothic remains invaluable to the student of Dutch and, although no thorough knowledge of it is presupposed in the following chapters on historical grammar, Gothic examples will occasionally be used to illustrate changes which have occurred within Dutch.

14. Ostrogoths = Eastern Goths; Visigoths, whose etymology is not clear, are commonly called Western Goths as this corresponds roughly to their geographic location at the time of the split and during later migrations.
4 Periodisation of Dutch

It is traditional to regard the development of Germanic languages as falling into three distinct periods, or strictly speaking four if one includes the initial period common to all. The first period is that from the time that the First Sound Shift had occurred (± 500 B.C.) to the end of the Great Migrations (± 500 A.D.) – this is the period of Common Germanic, a prehistoric era in linguistic terms as there are no texts available in any West Germanic language from that time. Reconstruction of original forms has indicated also that, with the possible exception of some slight dialectal differentiation, all forms of Germanic were still similar enough to be grouped together under the name Common or Proto-Germanic. Such reconstructed Common Germanic forms are often given for comparison in linguistic works, but are always, as are reconstructed Indo-European forms, accompanied by an asterisk to indicate that they are merely hypothetical forms.

By ± 500 A.D. the Germanic peoples had taken up residence more or less in the areas they occupy today (see p. 85 for details of Holland), the Second or High German Sound Shift (see p. 123) had taken place and the second stage in the periodisation had dawned. This is known as the ‘old’ period, the time of Old High German, Old English (also called Anglo-Saxon) and Old Dutch, known more specifically as Old West Low Franconian. 16100 is traditionally regarded as the end of the old period as Dutch, German and English all share a phonological development which seems to have been completed by this date, namely the weakening of full vowels in unstressed syllables. In the case of Dutch, both this development as well as other classic Middle Dutch characteristics are present by 1100. Due to the definite fixing of stress on the first or main syllable of a word, the full a, e, i, o or u of (preceeding or) following syllables were weakened to a schwa (ə), usually written e. This was to have tremendous implications in later stages of the development of these languages, because it was in the various vowels of the endings that case and stem classification of nouns and person and class of verbs were indicated; this would ultimately be the cause of a simplified morphology in all three languages – in fact in all modern Germanic languages except Icelandic – which is not evident in Gothic.

There are several other phonological developments in the Old West Low Franconian period which are complete by 1100 and are thus characteristic of the following period, the Middle Dutch period:

(a) The Germanic p and ẞ have become d, as occurred in all the continental Germanic languages (thus not in English and Icelandik) e.g. doorn (thorn), vader (father). This development, which started in the south of Germany and Austria first, took several centuries to reach the Netherlands and only conquered this area very late in the old period. Simultaneously initial s and j became voiced and are thus now written as z and v.

(b) Due to the ‘thick’ pronunciation of l after a and o, the combination a+1+

---

15. Several brief runic inscriptions that predate the handwritten texts of early Christian Europe have been found, however.

16. Old East Low Franconian, the language of the Wachtendonk Psalms, is the Low Franconian on German soil i.e. the area around Cleves.
dental or $o + l +$ dental developed into $ou +$ dental during the old period and is thus the only form found in Middle Dutch e.g. Germ. alt/Dutch oud, Germ. Gold/Dutch goud. A similar development is found in French too e.g. chaud (hot -It. caldo).

(c) Original (i.e. Germanic) $\delta$ had been raised to $\hat{u}$, but was and is usually still written $oe$; original $\hat{u}$ had been spontaneously palatalised to $\hat{y}$.

(d) Finally the lengthening of short vowels in open syllables, a very important development which took place in High German only gradually during the middle period, was already complete in Dutch by the end of the old period; whereas the change from $p > d$ had started at an early date in the south of continental Germany, the lengthening of short vowels in open syllables started in the north.

The student of English is fortunate enough to have texts in Old English dating from the late seventh century; German texts begin about the middle of the eighth century and texts in both languages become more and more frequent towards the end of the old period. In Dutch we are not so fortunate. With the exception of isolated Old West Low Franconian glosses in Latin texts, and quite a sizeable number of names in Latin documents\(^{17}\), the only remnant of Dutch prior to 1170 – the approximate date of the first Middle Dutch literary text – which has been preserved, is an eleventh century sentence in West Flemish which was found in an English manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford in 1932. It reads: *Hebben olla vogala nestas bigunna hinase hi[c] (e)nda thu...*\(^{18}\). De Vooys\(^{19}\) renders this into Middle Dutch to illustrate the essential differences between Old and Middle Dutch which have been discussed above: *Hebben alle vogele neste begunen het en si ic ende du*. Full vowels in open syllables have all become $e$ and $th$ has become $d$.\(^{20}\)

Note: M. Gyseling has produced, in the series *Corpus van Middelnederlandse Teksten*, a volume in which every trace of Old Dutch, from runic inscriptions through glosses and the Wachtendonk Psalms to the closely related Old Saxon *Heliand*, has been collected. This collection of fragments includes every available text up to 1300 (see bibliography).

The period 1100-1500 is the period of Middle Dutch, Middle High German and Middle English. It is a term of convenience used by philologists but the unity of form the term may suggest is not present at all. There is no standard Dutch as such at this time and, what’s more, certain characteristics of even a given Middle Dutch dialect may have been quite different in 1400 from what they had been in 1200. But nevertheless the term has gained a certain currency and is useful if this reservation is kept in mind.

The earliest Middle Dutch texts that have been preserved are written in *Limburgs*. By far the majority of the corpus is, however, in Flemish and *Brabants*. The division between the middle and the modern period, 1500, is based on a combination of factors, both linguistic and otherwise. The non-linguistic factors, such as

---

17. G. Mansion’s *Oud-Gentsche Naamkunde* attempts to shed light on the earliest period of Dutch by analysing Low Franconian names in Latin documents from Ghent (see p. 91).
18. Literal translation: Have all birds begun nests except 1 and thou.
20. The weakening of those full vowels was already well underway in the old period.
increasing standardisation due to the invention of printing, are discussed in chapter 12. The linguistic criteria for this division are the following: at the end of the Middle Ages, which are also regarded as having come to an end at around about 1500, a shift occurred almost simultaneously in Dutch, German and English in the long \( i \) and \( \acute{y} \). In Dutch, \( i \) shifted to \( ij \) and \( \acute{y} \) to \( ui \), although both modern spellings are already found in Middle Dutch texts; the present-day spelling of \( ij \) and \( ui \) is in fact a remnant of mediaeval tradition of writing an \( i \) (for \( j \) is merely a scribal variant of \( l \)) after a vowel to indicate it is long. The Middle Dutch text known as the Beatrijs should thus be read, strictly speaking, as Beatrijes, as it predates this diphthongisation which is so typical of Modern Dutch (called Nieuwederland in Dutch).

There are also certain morphological differences between Middle Dutch and Modern Dutch. As a result of the vowels in unstressed syllables having weakened to \( e \), or even having dropped off by this stage, there was a great deal of falling together of forms. The distinction between masculine and feminine nouns had already broken down to a great extent and case was no longer applied as strictly as it had been earlier in the Middle Dutch period, also a result of the falling together or loss of endings.

Summary: prior to 500 Common Germanic
500 - 1100 Old West Low Franconian
1100 - 1500 Middle Dutch
1500 Modern Dutch

5 Ingwaecions

The word Ingwaecionic, borrowed from Pliny and Tacitus who used it to designate the Germanic tribes of the coast from the Rhine to the Weser (see p. 86), is now employed by modern dialectologists with a linguistic connotation in which case it is synonymous with North Sea Germanic. It is a somewhat vague, but nevertheless convenient label for certain linguistic phenomena, which, although not necessarily found exclusively in the North Sea Germanic languages par excellence, i.e. English and Frisian, are more frequent in the coastal dialects of continental Germany and are not found at all in High German. Although it is a term which only really has currency in a West Germanic context, several of the characteristics are also found in the Scandinavian languages.

The following are generally considered to be Ingwaecionic or North Sea Germanic sound changes:
(1) The unrounding of \( \ddot{u} \) (i.e. < Old Gmc. \( \ddot{u} + \) Umlaut) to \( i \) or \( e \) – compare Engl. fill/Dutch vullen, Engl. thin/Dutch dun.
(2) Old Gmc. \( ai \), which usually became \( e \) in Dutch (occasionally \( ei \), see p. 146) is found as \( a \) in some Ingwaecionic forms e.g. ladder, klaver (clover).
(3) \( ie \) for \( ui \) (<uu>) – compare Flem. Diets/Holl. Duits (see p. 4), liedien/lui (people).
(4) Palatal \( j \) instead of \( g \) – compare Dutch jegens (towards) and German gegen.
(5) Compensatory lengthening\(^{21}\) (Ersatzdehnung) of a short vowel after the disap-

\(^{21}\) Not all compensatory lengthening is Ingwaecionic; in certain instances even Gothic shows signs of this sound change e.g. \( \ddot{a}hta \) (< \( \ddot{a}g \)kjan, where \( g \) had a nasal pronunciation) = Eng. thought/Dutch dacht.
pearance of a following $n$ before fricatives – compare Eng. *mouth, Dutch* *muid* (in place names such as *Muiden*)/Dutch *mond*, Germ. *Mund*; also Dutch *vijf*, Eng. *five*/Germ. *fünf*.

There are also certain morphological phenomena which are considered to be Ingwaenic:

1. The general simplification of forms, particularly the falling together of masculine and feminine gender and a reduction in the number of personal endings in verbal conjugations.

2. Plurals in *s*, derived from the former masculine *a*-stems. One such form is even present in that West Flemish sentence which is generally considered to be the only remnant of Old West Low Franconian (see p. 127) – *nestas*, nowadays *nesteren* in *ABN*.


In addition there are various other items of vocabulary and word formation which can be considered Ingwaenic.

Dutch cannot be called a North Sea Germanic language but it does contain some of the characteristics of same, more so at the level of dialect, however, than at that of the standard language. The same applies to the Low German of Niedersachsen and Schleswig-Holstein.
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17 Historical phonology

The field of science known as historical phonology is based on the observation that the sounds of a given language, or dialect of that language, have changed somewhat over a given period of time or over a given geographic distance and/or through contact with other languages or dialects. What follows is a diachronic analysis of the main sound changes in Dutch, or lack thereof, which often explain the differences between Dutch on the one hand and English and German on the other. Because both German and English, but most especially the latter, are progressive languages phonologically speaking, and Dutch has a particularly conservative sound system, comparison with Dutch can often be quite rewarding for people studying the historical developments of those other Germanic languages. For example, the First Germanic Sound Shift, as described above, can be found reasonably intact in Dutch, and all other Low German and Scandinavian languages for that matter, but in German a further shift of $p/t/k$ occurred which momentarily obscures the origin of some sounds (see p. 123).

In the following discussion of the development of the sounds of Dutch I have decided to work back from the sounds as they are today, and thus as they have been discussed in chapter five, rather than to work forward from the sound system of Common Germanic as it has been reconstructed by philologists on the basis of comparative linguistics. My approach differs from that of all the standard works on the topic, which all employ the latter method. To work forward, rather than back, is, I must admit, a very tidy method of approach, but it presupposes that the reader has a thorough knowledge of Gothic, as indeed all neerlandici and Germanists in Holland do. As this is not normally the case in Anglo-Saxon countries, it seemed to me that the utility of this book would be better served by working out from that which is known, the sounds as they are now, but inevitably I have on occasion had to draw on Gothic examples to illustrate certain points. The standard works mentioned above also draw heavily on examples from dialects, older forms, or place names; I have endeavoured to illustrate the concepts purely with modern, everyday words that the non-Dutch reader may be acquainted with.

It is usual and advisable for the sake of clarity in such studies to separate the vowel system from that of the consonants, although this should not imply that there is no mutual influence; more often than not vowel changes, for example, are the direct result of the consonantal environment those vowels find themselves in; consonants too can change under influence of preceding or following vowels, sometimes to the point of becoming vowels themselves. Generally speaking, however, and in this Dutch is no exception, it is the vowels of a language which undergo more changes in the course of time than the consonants; compare, for example, British and American English where the consonants are virtually identical but the
vowels have diverged considerably in the four hundred years of separation. It is undoubtedly the nature of the articulation of vowels which makes them more prone to shift – slight shifts in the shape of the mouth lead to vowel changes whereas consonantal changes usually involve more active employment of the organs of speech (i.e. teeth, lips, tongue etc.) and thus do not occur as easily.

When discussing vowels, one has to do with two aspects: quality (i.e. whether an \( a, e, i, o \) or \( u \)) and quantity\(^1\), (i.e. whether short, half long or long). The symbol \( \hat{v} \) is commonly used by philologists to indicate short vowels, and either \( \hat{v} \) or \( \hat{\hat{v}} \) indicate long vowels. In Dutch philological works a distinction is made between \( \hat{a} \) and \( \hat{\hat{a}} \), for example, where \( \hat{v} \) is written above vowels which have always been long or were formerly diphthongs (i.e. in Common Germanic) and \( \hat{\hat{v}} \) is written above those which for one of any number of reasons (see below) have become long i.e. so-called lengthened vowels. This convention has been preserved here.

Although most of the linguistic phenomena one meets in the study of sound changes are described in the glossary, there are several other concepts which will occur repeatedly in the analysis of the sound changes of Dutch; they are looked at in general terms here first.

(a) Monophthongisation
A process of vowel assimilation whereby the two elements of a diphthong blend to form one sound, a monophthong, which is always a long vowel e.g. \( au>\hat{\hat{a}} \).

(b) Diphthongisation
A process whereby the speaker glides the articulation of one vowel into the articulation of a following vowel to form one long vowel sound consisting of two elements, a diphthong e.g. \( i>j \) (pron. [ei]).

(c) Lengthening of short vowels in open syllables
When comparing the quantity of Dutch vowels with the quantity of those in cognate words in Gothic or even Old High German, one will often find that Dutch has long vowels where the languages mentioned have short ones. This is usually the result of the lengthening of short vowels in open syllables (see p. 127) which occurred much earlier in Dutch than in German. It is also often the explanation for apparently exceptional forms e.g. \( pad \) (path) but \( paden \) (paths); \( dag \) (day) \( > \) \( vandaag \) (today) \( < \) \( van dage \) (+ dative e ending).

(d) The falling together of sounds
Sometimes two (or more) historically different sounds fall together through the later shifting in articulation of one to coincide with the other. e.g. Germanic \( d \) and Germanic \( \theta \) are both found as \( d \) in Dutch as \( \theta > d \) at the end of the OLWF period.

---

\(^1\) The spelling system of Dutch, as described in chapter 4, is much more efficient than is that of German or English in indicating the length of vowels. In this sense the all important historical distinction between short and long vowels is conveniently preserved in the modern written word in Dutch.
(e) Contracted forms – syncope/apocope
Intervocalic consonants can be assimilated to the point where they disappear, a process known as syncope, whereas the dropping off of a final sound, whether a vowel or a consonant, is known as apocope e.g. zeil < zegel (sail), vrouw < vrouwe (woman). Another form of contraction is the syncope of a vowel in a preceding unstressed syllable e.g. kroon < corona (crown), bril < beril (spectacles).

(f) Umlaut
Umlaut, or as it is sometimes called in English, vowel mutation, is a very important phenomenon in the historical phonology of Germanic languages. It is a process whereby the quality of a stressed vowel is pulled in the direction of a following unstressed vowel; it is in other words a form of vowel assimilation. The Umlautsfaktor in the following syllable can be an a, u or an i/j but the most common form of Umlaut is i-Umlaut. The following simple vowel chart will help to clarify the process:

```
   top of mouth
    /
   / \
   i y u
```

front of mouth

```
   / \
   a
```

back of mouth

bottom of mouth

The umlauted form of u is y, of o is ö (a lower variant being ø) and of a is ä i.e. all are drawn towards the high front vowel i.

i-Umlaut, which is present in all Germanic languages except Gothic, is restricted on the whole in Dutch to short vowels; there is virtually no Umlaut of long vowels in Dutch, which contrasts strongly with German and English e.g. D. kaas – E. cheese, G. Käse < Lat. caseus; D. horen – E. hear, G. hören. The absence of umlauted long vowels and the lack of the Second German Sound Shift in Dutch are the main reasons for being able to call the phonology of that language conservative.

Umlaut of short vowels is, however, very common, although a knowledge of Gothic and/or Latin is often necessary to be able to see that umlauting has occurred e.g. Gothic badi - D. bed, Lat. asinus - D. ezel (+ lengthening of the short vowel).

---

2. It is common for the layman with a knowledge of German to regard the "ö" on German back vowels as an Umlaut. Words containing "ö" in their spelling have indeed been umlauted and this sound change is indicated by "a" (derived from the e in Gothic handwriting, i.e. ë = ä). It is however the changed sound, from a back to a front vowel, which is the Umlaut and not the symbol "ö". Thus Dutch and English words also contain Umlauts but other orthographical means are employed to indicate them e.g. cheese (comp. Käse).

3. As i-Umlaut is a form of fronting (palatalisation) it is consistent with the articulation basis of Dutch that it occurred less there than in English and German which are noted for their more palatal pronunciation (see p. 45).
vowel in an open syllable). The Umlautsfactor has usually been reduced to e (see p. 126), or been apocopated in Auslaut. Whereas German ü is the result of umlauting, the same sound in Dutch (written u/uu and pronounced [y]) is the result of a spontaneous palatalisation of Germanic û without any Umlautsfaktor ever having followed.

(g) Analogy
The role that analogy has played in both phonological and morphological change is not to be underestimated. Very often it is the explanation for apparent exceptions to various sound change laws e.g. the imperfect of binden (to tie) in Middle Dutch is bant (sing.)/ bonden (pl.) but in Modern Dutch it is bond/bonden.

Note: in reading the following analysis of the sounds of Dutch, these points should be kept in mind:
(a) Where there are several origins of a particular sound, these are numbered; generally speaking, the lower the number, the more numerous are the words in that category. In addition, for the sake of clarity, the list of possible origins of a given sound is not always complete but it does include the vast majority of words.
(b) a, o, or u + i/j means that the new sound is the result of an Umlaut where either i or j or both have been the Umlautsfaktoren.
(c) The change from a monophthong to a diphthong or vice versa has often passed through more medial stages than the examples may suggest.

1 Short Vowels

Grapheme a

(1) < Gmc. û which was also û in Indo-European
(2) < Gmc. û which was û in Indo-European
(3) < Gmc. e + r + dental
(4) < Gmc. û which was in turn the result of compensatory lengthening.

Examples and notes:
(1) akker (field – acre), arm (arm), dag (day), tand (tooth). The vowel in German Tag, also in kam and nahm (compare Dutch dag, kwam, nam) has been lengthened as a result of analogy with the plural form where lengthening of short vowels in open syllables has taken place in both Dutch and German i.e. dagen/Tage, kwa-
men/kamen, namen/nahmen.
(2) acht (eight), gast (guest), nacht (night), lang (long), wat (what). The cognate forms of these words in Latin preserve the original short o of Indo-European – octo, hostis, nox, longus, quod. The English cognates of the first three words all contain more palatal or fronted vowels; German, however, is the same as Dutch in this case but the plurals of Gast and Nacht, for instance, also show fronting i.e. Gäste, Nächte.

4. In such cases the first word is the translation of the Dutch word in question and the second is the cognate form in English if it happens to be different from the literal translation.
This change of short e before r + dental is not very common but it is found on
occasions in ABN and is quite frequent in the dialect of Holland – thus its
occurrence in ABN.
(4) bracht (brought), dacht (thought), zacht (soft).
The Gothic forms brähta and dähta show a long vowel which is the result of
compensatory lengthening, Ersatzdehnung i.e. the vowel has been lengthened to
compensate for the loss of a nasal. In Dutch and German the -cht cluster has then
calmed a shortening of the long vowel. English ‘thought’ and ‘brought’ still retain a
long vowel sound. Compare Dutch zacht and German sanft, where the nasal has
been preserved (see p. 154 for the change of -ft > -cht). In English a before n often
changed to o, which is not uncommon in Dutch dialects (docht, brocht) and Frisian.

Grapheme e
(1) < Gmc. ē
(2) < Gmc. ā + i/j
(3) < Gmc. ā + r + consonant
(4) e in unstressed prefixes and suffixes has various origins

Examples and notes:
Historically and even today in the mouths of some speakers the vowels e and i,
which are phonetically closely related, often alternate, depending on the consonan-
tal environment: compare Dutch brengen – Eng. bring / Germ. bringen / Afr. bring,
Dutch hem – Eng. him, Dutch gisteren – Eng. yesterday / Germ. gestern; also Dutch
recht (right) and the verb richten (to direct, lit. righten).
(1) geld (money), helpen (to help), nest (nest), zes (six-Greek hex). Gmc. ē is found as
i in Gothic except before r, h and hv where it is written ai e.g. hilpan (to help), saih
(six). Many other short e’s and i’s in Gothic have ended up as long e in Dutch as a
result of lengthening in open syllables e.g. Gothic itan > eten (to eat), Gothic stillan
> stelen (to steal).
(2) bed (bed), hen (hen), mens (person); dekken (to cover), denken to think), kennen
(to know), leggen (to lay), zetten (to put).
As Gothic does not know i-Umlaut, all cognate forms of the examples given still
contain an a in that language e.g. badi (bed), manniks (mens, adj.), satjan (zeten).
This Umlaut is very common in verbs which formerly belonged to a class of weak verbs
whose infinitive ended in -jan and thus contained an Umlautsfaktor. Compare the
umlauted and unumlauted forms within Dutch itself: dak (roof) – dekken (to
cover), hals (neck) – omhelzen (to embrace), lang (long) – verlengen (to lengthen); the
last English example also shows Umlaut.
(3) erg (terrible – Germ. arg), merk (brand – mark), scherp (sharp), sterk (strong –
Germ. stark), verf (colour – Germ. Farbe), zwerm (swarm).
ā + r + consonant often led to a palatalisation of the a to e. Such an e is often heard
in Dutch dialects where ABN has retained an a e.g. Ernhem (= Arnhem), standerd
(= standaard), perd (= paard, horse; see p. 137 for long a from short a in ABN).
Dutch er often occurs as ir in German e.g. berk – Birke (birch), hert – Hirt (deer),
kerk – Kirche (church), werken – wirken (to work).
(4) The origin of e (pron. a) in unstressed syllables is also discussed on p. 126. The
prefixes be- and ge- and the suffix -en are found in Gothic as bi-, ga- and -an i.e. with full vowels; even the prefix ver- is derived from unstressed voor (for). In some instances the prefix has been unstressed to the extent that there has been a contraction with the following syllable e.g. buiten < bi-uijen (outside), gunnen < ge-unnen (to grant); compare also Dutch geloven and Germ. glauben (to believe). Other examples of such contractions are bril < beril (spectacles), klant < calant (customer), krant < courant (newspaper).

Grapheme i
(1) < Gmc. ı which was also ı in Indo-European
(2) < Gmc. Ĳ which was derived from IE. ė + n + consonant or IE. ė + i/j
(3) < Gmc. ı with shortening before the cluster -cht

Examples and notes:
For the interchange of ı and ė see p. 134.
(1) dis (dish – Lat. discus), pil (pill), vis (fish – Lat. piscus).
(2) a – binden (to tie), drinken (to drink), kind (child – Lat. gens), twintig (twenty).
  b – is (is – Lat. est < *esti), midden (middle – Lat. medius), nicht (niece, cousin – Lat. nepitis).
  c – gilen (to yell), gist (yeast), gisteren (yesterday).

  The change of IE. ė > ı before a nasal + consonant (group a), but not in other positions, accounts for the division in group 3 of the strong verbs i.e. vinden (to find), zinken (to sink) but helpen (to help), sterven (to die) (see p. 178).

  Group b gives examples where the Latin cognates still show the Umlautsfaktor.

  Group c contains examples of the change of ė > ı before -st and -ll which occurred in a few instances.
(3) licht (light – Germ. leicht, Gothic leihts).

This change occurs rarely. Note that the unstressed ending -ig, which contains an original short ı, has undergone the same fate as the ending -lijk, which contains an original long ı – both have been weakened to schwa; it is pronounced [aX], whereas in English the g was palatalised under influence of the preceding i to produce the ending -y. Similarly Dutch -lijk = Eng. -ly.

Grapheme o
(1) < Gmc. õ
(2) < Gmc. ū
(3) < Gmc. õ with shortening before the cluster -cht

Examples and notes:
Just as ė and i have alternated historically, and still do in dialects, so have and do ū and ū. Many Dutch words containing o will be found to have u in their cognate forms in German and English e.g. borsiel – Bürste (brush), dorst – Durst (thirst), mond – Mund (mouth), ons – uns (us), worm – Wurm (worm).

5. It is interesting to note that the reverse is sometimes the case in Germanic loan words in French e.g. canif (pocket knife) < knif, hanap (goblet) < hnap; the insertion of such a vowel glide is known as anaptyxis or svarabhakti, a Sanskrit term.
6. Note that the spelling ei in Gothic stands for long ı.
The two pronunciations of o in the Dutch of many speakers are discussed on p. 48. The difference, which is partially due to different origins of o (i.e. from o or u), but in some instances is the result of the phonetic environment, is not usually phonemic and is thus usually ignored in ABN; certain dialects, particularly Zuid-hollands, do not distinguish between the two either. The more closed ó (i.e. < û) is always heard before nasals, regardless of origin; preceding labial consonants also tend to favour the more closed sound e.g. bók (goat), wólf (wolf), vós (fox) – compare klók (clock), dól (mad).


The German examples show that there has not been the same degree of falling together in that language as in Dutch, as indeed do the English translations, although, as is so often the case, the spelling of the English words is not a very reliable indicator of the pronunciation. Pairs such as druppel/droppen (drop/to drip), vullen/vol (to fill/full) and nut/genot (use/enjoyment) show o as the usual development of û in Dutch; however, it became u (pron. û) when the original û underwentumlauting.

3. zocht (past tense of zoeken, to seek), ochtend (morning – Gothic ûchtwo).

There are a few instances of an original long o which has undergone shortening before the consonant cluster -cht – compare bracht and dacht p. 134.

**Gramheme u**

1. < Gmc. û + i/j
2. < Gmc. -wi-

**Examples and notes:**

There is no short u as such in Dutch as all Germanic û’s changed to û (see û); the grapheme u in Dutch usually represents û’s which have undergone umlauting.


The German forms all show Umlaut also. English ‘thin’ and ‘midge’ show unrounding of umlauted u, as does Germ. Hilfe.

Sometimes in dialect, and thus in Afrikaans, this u appears as o e.g. konst (kunst – art), mos (mus – sparrow).

2. tussen (between – betwixt, Germ. zwischen), zulk (such – Goth. swaleiks), zuster (sister – Germ. Schwester).

### 2 Long Vowels

**Grapheme a/aa** (also written ae in older texts; this is still the case in some proper nouns)

7. The long vowels a, e, o and u also know an allograph aa, ee, oo and uu. (see p. 37)
Historical phonology

1) < Gmc. ā (but ë in West Germanic8)
2) < Gmc. ā with lengthening in open syllables
3) < Gmc. ā or ē + r + dental

Examples and notes:
1) daad (deed), jaar (year), laten (to let), schaap (sheep), slapen (to sleep).
The falling together of 1 and 2 in ABN is not reflected in all dialects; some preserve
a long ē (< Westgmc. ë), as do English and Frisian. This more palatal vowel can
thus be regarded as an Ingwaeronism (see p. 128). Hypercorrect Hèëgs (i.e. Haags,
p. 18, footnote 14) accentuates this palatal pronunciation of long ā and attempts
to elevate it out of the realm of dialect speech.
2) dagen (< sing. dag, day), kamer (room), maken (to make), vader (father), water
(water). Forms like Germ. machen and Wasser retain a short vowel because of the double
consonant in them which is the result of the Second German Sound Shift (see p.
123); the double consonant locked the vowel into a closed syllable and thus
lengthening could not occur. Also Germ. Tag (with a long ā) is by analogy with the
plural (Tage) where lengthening in an open syllable has occurred; Dutch, however,
preserves the original short vowel in the singular.9 This is a further example of the
phonological conservatism of Dutch as opposed to German.

Grapheme e/ee
1) < Gmc. ai
2) < Gmc. ē or i with lengthening in open syllables
3) < Gmc. ī + r + dental
4) < Gmc. ā + i/j with lengthening in open syllables

Examples and notes:

The monophthongisation of Gmc. ai > ē did not take place equally in all words
in all dialects of Dutch. Even in ABN one finds the diphthong ei (see p. 146) where
one would expect ē e.g. bereid (prepared, ready) beside gereed (finished, ready), eik
(oak) beside eekhoorn (squirrel). Afrikaans has taken teiken (target – token) and
vleis (meat – flesh) from Dutch dialects whereas ABN has teken (sign) and vlees
in these instances.

In the dialects of the west of Holland (N. and S. Holland and Utrecht), there is a
tendency to give ē a diphthongal pronunciation. It could thus be said that a
complete monophthongisation of ai never took place in these regions (see p. 13).
This is even heard somewhat in the ABN of the west, but to a lesser extent. The

8. This sound is found as long ē in Gothic and is called e₁, (see p. 138, footnote 12)
9. Similarly in the fourth and fifth Ablaut series Dutch nam/namen (< nemen, to take,
group 4) and lag/lagen (< liggen, to lie, group 5) contrast with Germ. nahm/nahmen and
lag/lagen where the vowels in both are long because analogy with the plural has taken
place in the singular.
distinction in pronunciation between \( \dot{e} < ai \) and other long e’s, which is known to some dialects (e.g., Zeeuws), was the reason behind the following distinction in the spelling of De Vries and Te Winkel i.e. *been* (legs, \( \dot{e} < ai \)), *eten* (to eat, \( \dot{e} < \dot{e} \))

In Frisian and Saxon the change from \( ai > \dot{e} \) was complete, unlike in Dutch, whereas in German \( ai \) remained a diphthong (now spelt ei) and was usually only monophthongised before final h, r, w and in Auslaut e.g. *Ehre* (honour), *See* (sea), *Zehe* (toe).

Cognate forms in English usually show o (sometimes spelt oo) as Gmc. \( ai \) was monophthongised to \( a \) in Old English and changed to \( o \) in Middle English (see above examples). In a few Dutch words and place names Gmc. \( ai \) appears as \( a \), as in Old English e.g. *klaver* (clover – Germ. *Klee*), *ladder* (ladder – Germ. *Leiter*), *Haamstede* (haam = heem, home); these forms are regarded as Ingwaehonisms.

(2) From \( \dot{e} \): *breken* (to break), *eten* (to eat), *zeven* (seven).
(3) From i: *hemel* (heaven), *scheep* (ships, plural of *schip*).

In open syllables Gmc. \( \dot{e} \) and \( i \) fell together, as did \( o \) and \( u \) in that position (see p. 140).

(3) *veertien* (fourteen), *veertig* (forty) – compare *vier* (four).

This change is not common.

(4) *beter* (better – Gothic *bātiza*), *rede* (speech – Gothic *rāþjo*).

This is also the result of lengthening in open syllables and is not common; most cases of Gmc. \( a + i/j \) are found as short e in Dutch (see p. 134).

**Compound grapheme ie**

(1) < Gmc. *eu*
(2) < Gmc. *i* before *r*
(3) < Gmc. \( \dot{e} \) (so-called \( e_2 \))
(4) In contractions
(5) In French words borrowed after the Middle Dutch period

Examples and notes:

(1) *bieden* (to offer – Gothic *biudan*), *dief* (thief – Gothic *piufs*), *diep* (deep – Gothic *diups*), *gieten* (to pour – Gothic *giutan*), *ziek* (sick – Gothic *siuks*).

The Old Germanic diphthong *eu*, which occurs in Gothic as *iu*, developed in two ways in Dutch; there were already two variants in Proto-West Germanic. In Middle Dutch it is found as two separate monophthongs, \( \dot{i} \) and \( \dot{y} \). Those with \( \dot{y} \) diphthongised in Modern Dutch to *ui* (see p. 142) and those with *i* in Middle Dutch still have *i* today; the falling together with words with original long *i*, which is present in Middle Dutch, has been avoided in Modern Dutch by the diphthongisation of original *i* to *ij* (see p. 142). In Flemish, *Zeeuws* and *Brabants* *i* alone was preserved

10. A similar distinction in spelling existed for long o (see p. 140).
11. Of all the long vowels in Dutch only *ie*, *eu* and *oe* are written the same whether they occur in open or closed syllables. These sounds are all rendered by compound graphemes in Dutch. Their equivalents in German orthography are *ie*, \( \delta \) and *u* respectively. NB: an alternative for \( \delta \) in German is *oe*.
12. In Gothic, Westgmc. *æt* (\( \dagger \) in Dutch) and *ê* (\( \dot{e} \) in Dutch) fell together as \( \dot{e} \); to distinguish between the two, philologists gave them the names *e₁* and *e₂* respectively.
and thus one sometimes finds double forms in ABN where those with ie (<eu) are southern forms and those with ui or û (see p. 4), dierbaar/duur (dear), lieden/luiden (people), rieken/ruiken (to smell).

The two-way development of the original Germanic diphthong accounts for the two sorts of verbs in Ablaut series two (see p. 64) e.g. schieten (to shoot), buigen (to bend).

(2) gier (vulture), mier (ant), spier (muscle), wierook (incense). Gmc. ë, which was diphthongised to ij in early Modern Dutch (see p. 142), remained a monophthong before r (see footnote 13); wierook thus contrasts with the cognate form wijden (to consecrate) which contains a hypercorrect d (see p. 156) – compare Middle Dutch wien (= wijden).

(3) a – Fries (Frisonian), Grieks (Greek), hier (here).
   b – biet (beet), brief (letter), riem (belt), spiegel (mirror).
   c – held (held), liet (let – past tense)

Old West Germanic ë (i.e. e2), which was not very common, developed into a new monophthong in Dutch and German, probably via a series of diphthongs – compare the development of Gmc. ð > ù, p. 141. This ie has fallen together with ie < eu but not with Gmc. ë which has shifted to ij. The words in group b. are early Latin loan words where Latin had ë or ë and those in group c. are preterites of some formerly reduplicating verbs in Ablaut series seven (see p. 180).

(4) tien (ten – Gothic talhun), zien (to see – Gothic saihvan). A few Dutch words with ie are the result of a contraction having occurred in bisyllabic words; there are many more such contractions in Middle Dutch e.g. bevrijen (to liberate – Dutch bevrijden14), gescien (to happen – Dutch geschieden14), tien (to pull – Gothic tiuhan).

(5) kritiek (critical), petieterig (tiny), romantiek (romance), trampolien (trampoline).

Words of French origin containing long i which were borrowed in the Middle Ages underwent the shift of i > ij (see p. 142). French loan words of younger origin retain the French vowel and have usually been adapted to the spelling rules of Dutch. In addition, French words ending in -tion/-sion occur in Dutch with -tie e.g. oppositie (opposition), relatie (relation) etc.

Grapheme oo (also written oe or oi in Middle Dutch texts15)

(1) < Gmc. au
(2) < Gmc. ð or û with lengthening in open syllables
(3) < Gmc. ð + r + dental

Examples and notes:


13. ã did not diphthongise to ui before r (see p. 142).
14. Bevrijden and geschieden contain a hypercorrect d – compare Germ. befreien and geschehen (see p. 156).
15. The spelling oe is often ambiguous in Middle Dutch; it can designate either long o or long u whereas these days it stands only for the latter. The alternative spelling oi, which is not quite as common, is preserved today in certain place names and a few archaic words e.g. Oirschot, Oisterwijk (compare Germ. Voigtländer), oir (descendants – a legal term). Some Dutch people are misled by the spelling into pronouncing such words aiy instead of ë.
The monophthongisation of Gmc. *au* > ź runs parallel with that of *ai* > ê except that in this instance the shift was complete in Dutch\(^{16}\), unlike *ai* > ê (see p. 137).

In German, as with *ai* > ê, the diphthong was preserved, except before *h* and dental consonants e.g. *Auge* (eye – Dutch *oog*), *Haupt* (head – Dutch *hoofd*), *laufen* (to run - leap, Dutch *lopen*)\(^{17}\) but *hoch* (high – Dutch *hoog*), *hören* (to hear – Dutch *horen*), *tot* (dead – Dutch *dood*). As with long *e* in Dutch, long *o* also has a somewhat diphthongal pronunciation in the *Randstad* and even its pronunciation in *ABN* is not, phonetically speaking, an absolutely pure monophthong; this applies equally to the words with long *o* < ź or < ų. This long *o* is heard as *eu* (i.e. ź) in quite a number of dialects – compare Afrikaans *deur* (= door, through) and *seun* (= *zoon*, son) (see p. 141). Long *o* < *au* and long *o* < ź/ũ are pronounced differently in some dialects (e.g. *Zeeuws*) i.e. they have not fallen together; this is also the case with *e* < *ai* and *e* < ź/i in those dialects. The distinction was still made in *Hollands* too until the seventeenth century. The two spellings of long *o* in open syllables in the spelling of De Vries and Te Winkel was based on the different origin of the two sounds and the distinction made between them by some speakers i.e. *boomen* (trees) but *boter* (butter) (see p. 40). In English Gmc. *au* > *ea* e.g. bread (Dutch *brood*), dead (Dutch *dood*), lead (Dutch *lood*) etc.

In a few Dutch words and place names *au* is found as ź e.g. *baken* (beacon), *Kaag* (= *koog*, polderland); these forms are regarded as Ingaeonisms since Gmc. *au* developed regularly into ź in Old Frisian, for example; it has since diphthongised again in Modern Frisian *beaken*.

(2) *boter* (butter), *koning* (king), *noot* (nut), *zoon* (son, Gothic *sunus*), *vogel* (bird-fowl, Gothic *fugl*).

As with *ê* and *i*, ź and ų fell together when lengthened in open syllables; the long vowel in monosyllabic *noot* and *zoon*, both closed syllables, is the result of analogy with the lengthened vowel in other cases forms and/or the plural where the addition of a syllable placed the vowel in the root of the word in an open position (see p. 37).

(3) *doorn* (thorn), *noord* (north), *oord* (place), *poort* (gate – portal), *soort* (sort).

Lengthening of *o* before *r* + dental also occurred with ź and ê and is a typically Dutch phenomenon.

**Compound grapheme oe** (also written *oo*, *ue* and *ou* in Middle Dutch texts)\(^{18}\)

(1) < Gmc. ź

Examples and notes:

(1) *bloem* (flower – bloom, Gothic *blôma*), *broeder* (brother – Gothic *brôpar*), *boek* (book – Gothic *bôka*). The German cognates all also have ź, written *u* i.e. *Blume, Bruder, Buch*.

16. There is one minor exception, however: before *w* a diphthong was preserved e.g. *houwen* (to hew), *beschouwen* (to regard).

17. In German, original *au* as illustrated here, fell together with *au* < ź (*ui* in Dutch) e.g. *faul* (lazy – Dutch *vull*), *Raum* (room – Dutch *ruim*). Dutch thus preserves an important historical distinction here. The same is the case with German *ei* < *ai* and *ei* < *i* e.g. *Stein* (stone – Dutch *steen*), *Eis* (ice – Dutch *ijs*). As the examples show, English also preserves the distinction.

18. Even today recent loan words from French can be written with *ou* or *oe* e.g. *tourist/toerist, bouquet/boeket*. 
Germanic ȝ was able to develop into û in Dutch because Gmc. ȝ had undergone spontaneous palatalisation to [y] (later > ui, see p. 142). Words such as groen (green – Germ. grün), zoet (sweet – Germ. süß), moe (tired – Germ. müde) show Umlaut in German, and Umlaut plus unrounding in English; Dutch consistently shows no Umlaut of long vowels.

The change from ȝ to ū in Dutch was already complete by the tenth century i.e. prior to the Middle Dutch period. In German the same change occurred via various diphthongal forms which are clearly given in Middle High German texts (spelt oа, au, uо) and can still be heard in southern German dialects today. A change via such intermediary stages may also have been the case in Dutch, or else this change, and also ê > i (see p. 139), may have been direct in coastal areas. Possible evidence of this is the spelling oo for ū in Holland until quite late (± 1500). The present-day spelling oe may be a remnant of an intermediary stage or else a remnant from the time when long o (as well as long a) were indicated by placing an e (also an i) after the vowel rather than doubling it as is done today. A considerable amount has been written on the so-called oe-relicten i.e. words and place names (mainly in North Holland) containing oe < ū in areas where Gmc. ū > ţ or ui. ABN words with oe < ū must have been borrowed from the dialects (mainly the east of the country, see map 10) where ū was not palatalised to [y] e.g. boer (farmer) versus buur (neighbour), poes (puss), schroef (screw), smoel (mug i.e. face), snoet (snout); Souburg (pron. ū, a place name).

**Compound grapheme eu** (adopted from French orthography since the end of the Middle Ages and also found as ue in Middle Dutch texts and thus easily confused with oe and uu)

1. < Gmc. ū + i/j with lengthening in open syllables
2. < Gmc. ȝ [+ i/j] with lengthening in open syllables
3. < Gmc. ê with lengthening in open syllables + rounding

4. In French loan words

Examples and notes:


   Forms such as breuk (a break) versus broken (to break), keur (choice) versus kiezen (to choose), sleutel (key) versus sluiten (to lock) show eu in Ablaut variation with other sounds.

2. zeug (sow), veulen (foal).

   Generally speaking oo forms (unumlauted) often vary with eu forms (umlauted) from dialect to dialect, with a preference for the latter in the coastal areas, sometimes even without the presence of an Umlautsfaktor e.g. deur (= door, through), veugel (= vogel, bird). The eu forms are not common in ABN where the Brabants forms with oo have won out – zeug and veulen are exceptions in this regard. Afrikaans sometimes has the eu forms e.g. deur (through), seun (son).

3. leunen (to lean), reus (giant), steunen (to support), zeven (seven).

   Gmc. ê in open syllables was usually lengthened to ê (see p. 137); however, in quite a number of dialects this e was rounded to eu and as this phenomenon is not uncommon in Hollands, some words with eu < ê (< ê) have made their way into ABN.
A rounded pronunciation of *seven* is common throughout the country now when saying telephone numbers etc. (Compare Germ. *zwo/zwei*). Similarly *speelen* (= *spelen*, to play) and *veule* (= *vele*, many) are dialectal in origin but commonly heard (never written, however).

(4) *fleur* (bloom, hey-day), *kleur* (colour, < *couleur*), *directeur* (director).

The original French spelling and pronunciation with *eu* is preserved in loan-words of French origin. Greek words with *eu*, however, are pronounced *ui* in Holland e.g. *fysiotherapeut*, *eunuch*.

**Grapheme u/uu**

Examples and notes:

(1) *duur* (dear), *duwen* (to push), *muur* (wall), *nu* (now), *puur* (pure), *u* (you).

Germanic *ü* was spontaneously palatalised to [y] in Low Franconian in the pre-literary period. As the same occurred in the Vulgar Latin of Gaul (compare French *mur, pur*) it has been suggested that this sound in Dutch may be the result of Celtic substrate, all the more so as it is not evident in the Saxon-based dialects of the east where there is also less archeological evidence of Celtic presence (see map 10). Forms such as *huus/huus/muus* (house/house/mouse) are the norm in Middle Dutch but the diphthongisation of this *y* to *ui* (see *ui*), except before *r, w* and in Auslaut, accounts for the relative scarcity of the sound in Dutch today. The diphthongisation of *i > ij*, which was concurrent with *y > ui*, also did not occur before *r* (see p. 139).

In *Hollands* *y* in Auslaut and before vowels is often heard as *ou* e.g. *douwen* (to push), *nou* (now); also the form *jou* (you, obj.). The first two forms are very common in the spoken *ABN* of the *Randstad*, and the third is of course both spoken and written *ABN*. In the spoken language one often hears *duvel* (= *davvel*, devil), *duzend* (= *dz zend*, thousand) and *buiten* (= *buiten* e.g. *een boertje van buiten*, a yokel), but these are forms borrowed for euphemistic or humorous effect from dialects that did not diphthongise.

### 3 Diphthongs

Because of certain parallels in the development of the diphthongs *ui* and *ij*, it is advisable to look at this important development in the phonology of Dutch in general terms before looking at the two sounds individually. Certain sociolinguistic factors have played a role and there are also interesting parallel and contemporaneous developments in English and German.

It is difficult to date precisely when *y* and *i* diphthongised to *ui* and *ij* respectively, not simply because we only have the written word to go by, but also because the spellings *ui* and *ij* had been used throughout the Middle Ages to indicate long *y* and *i*; *i* was often used as a lengthening symbol in the same way as *e* was, and *j* was considered simply a scribal variant of *i*. (Compare long *ʃ* and *s* at the end of words in older English, Dutch and German texts.) It is, however, generally regarded as a post Middle Dutch/early Modern Dutch development and can thus be said to have been gathering ground during the sixteenth century. It is believed to have begun in Brabant and that its spread in the north, and thus its ultimate incorporation into
ABN, is possibly the result of the immigration of the Brabanders into the cities of the north during the Eighty Years' War. The diphthongisation undoubtedly took root in the urban areas of Holland first, where the Brabanders formed a large influential proportion of the population, a group worthy of emulation (see p. 101). It did not reach all parts of the country, nor do the i̯ isoglosses completely overlap with those of u̯ (see maps 10 and 11). Generally speaking however, it is possible to say that ſ and ſ̯ diphthongised at much the same time over much the same area starting in the south in the sixteenth century and becoming the norm in both the north and south (urban areas) during the seventeenth century. It was complete among the upper classes by the beginning of the eighteenth century. West Flanders and Zeeland (as well as Friesland) are the best known, most cited cases of areas where this diphthongisation did not occur.

One of the most interesting and yet puzzling aspects of this diphthongisation is that the same sounds were affected in English and German at more or less the same time and in the same way i.e. in English mŭs/hŭs/lŭs > mouse/house/louse; is/wif/pip > ico/wife/pipe and in German mŭs/hŭs/lŭs > Maus/Haus/Laus; is/-wib/pfîfe > Eis/Weiβ/Pfeife. In England and Germany too, the development started in the south and spread rapidly over large areas but certain important areas were unaffected, notably Scotland in the case of English, and the Low German area and Switzerland in the case of German. It seems unlikely that such a change could occur over such a large area affecting three related but separate languages without there being some connection, but the precise course of events is unknown. The connection is probably to be found in sociolinguistic factors, if at all.

**Compound Grapheme u̯**
(1) < Gmc. ſ (via ſ in Middle Dutch)
(2) < Gmc. eu + i/j (via ſ in Middle Dutch)
(3) < Gmc. ſ + n + ſ (only in place names)
(4) A small group of words that have always contained a diphthong

Examples and notes:
(1) bruīn (brown), huīs (house – Goth. hûs), muīlezel (mule – Lat. mŭlus), ruīm (room – Goth. rûms), vuīl (dirty – foul, Goth. fûls).

Gmc. ſ, which underwent spontaneous palatalisation in Dutch in the pre-literary period, was diphthongised in the west and south to u̯ (pron. ſ) shortly after the end of the Middle Dutch period. The spellings u/uu/ue/uī are all found in Middle Dutch texts for the monophthongal predecessor of the modern u̯. The exceptions to this shift are dealt with under long ſ on page 142.

The new diphthong is heard clearest in Auslaut e.g. lŭi (people); in Inlaut it is not as open and is closer to a monophthong.

In German and English, Old Germanic ſ remained ſ, i.e. it was not spontaneously palatalised as in Dutch, and thus shifted directly to au (written ou or ow in English) at the end of the middle period.

(2) Düts (German), duīvel (devil), kruīpen (to creep, crawl), lŭi[den] (people), ruīken (to smell), slûiten (to close).

In class 2 of the strong verbs there is a two-way division into those with ie (see p. 64) and those with uī. Both are derived from Germanic eu and occur in Gothic with
Map 10: The ui isogloss, as in the word muis (mouse), showing the areas unaffected by the diphthongisation of [y] to [œy] where several monophthongal variants still exist. Taken from A. Weijnen, Nederlandse Dialectkunde, Assen, 1966.
iu. Those followed by the Umlautsfaktoren i/j were monophthongised to ĭ (written u) in OWLF, whereas the others were monophthongised to ie. This division is not limited to verbs of this class but applies to all words e.g. ziek (Goth. suiks), Middle Dutch Duutse (< Gmc. *piudisk) etc. The distinction is also found in German as eu/ie.

With the diphthongisation ĭ > ui words in this group shifted together with those in group 1. There is thus a falling together in Dutch of ui < â and ui < eu which is not present in German – compare ruim/Duits, Raum/Deutsch, huis/buit (booty), Haus/Beute. German saugen/sauen (Dutch zuigen/zuipen) prove that the ui in these two verbs developed from â and not from eu.

(3) Arnemuiden, IJsselmiuden, Muiden, Plymuiden (Plymouth), zuiden (south).

Place names in Holland and Zeeland in particular with varieties of the word muid (mouth, Dutch mond) preserve a compensatory lengthening of Gmc. ū, an Ingwaenic feature – compare Gothic munþs, Old English mūþ, Modern English mouth (with diphthongisation). This means that toponymically a form muud existed alongside mond in Middle Dutch and these forms too diphthongised to ui. Dialectically in coastal regions uus/uis is also found for oons – compare Old English ûs, Modern English ‘us’. A non-Ingwaenic example, because it also occurs in German, is zuid(en) < *sunþ (Germ. Süd).

(4) bui (storm), fluit (flute), fruit (fruit), lui (lazy), ruilen (to exchange).

These words (list not complete) have always contained a diphthong, even in the Middle Dutch period before the diphthongisation of ĭ > ui; Middle Dutch texts show a great variety of spellings for this sound: oi/oy/oei/oey/eui/euy/eu. Some, like fruit and fluit for example, are early borrowings from French.

**Compound grapheme ij** (for the history of the symbol ij see p. 38)

1. < Gmc. ĩ
2. < Gmc. i in Auslaut
3. < Gmc. i + n + f

Examples and notes:


The post Middle Dutch diphthongisation of ĭ > ij (except before r, see p. 139) caused a falling together with ei, an original diphthong, but the written word distinguishes between the two. In German the new diphthong (written ei) < ĭ fell together with ei < ai (in Dutch ai > ě); Dutch did not experience a falling together of these two important sounds and comparison with Dutch cognate forms can thus be a quick method of determining the origin of ei in German e.g. Eis/Stein,

19. Proto-West Germanic must also have known this division: eu > iu + i/j (> â) and eu > io (> ie).

20. There are a few verbs in group 2 that contained a monophthong ū even in Gothic and which thus occur in Middle Dutch with [yː] e.g. luiken (to shut – Goth. lāken), zuigen (to suck), zuipen (to booze).

21. In German ĭ > ei in all positions e.g. gier/Geier (vulture), wierook/Weihrauch (incense).

22. In Middle Dutch there were two long i’s: i < Gmc. eu or < ei (now ie) and ĭ < Gmc. i (now ij). They must have been pronounced differently, however, because the former did not undergo diphthongisation.
In English the two did not fall together either e.g. ice/stone. Note the English tradition of putting an -e at the end of the word to indicate the long vowel.

The fact that habij (nun's habit), patrijs (partridge), appetij (appetite) and other such French loan words contain the new diphthong indicates that they were current in Dutch before the diphthongisation of i > ij took place; likewise with the place names Berlijn and Parijs. French loan words of more recent origin preserve the long i of the original language e.g. paniek (panic), sjiek (chic), statistiek (statistics).24

The adjectival-adverbial ending -lijk (pron. -lak) contains an etymologically long vowel (Goth. -leiks = body) and thus the present spelling, although the ending is now pronounced short due to the lack of stress – compare gelijk (pron. ei) and iets dergelijks (pron. a).

(2) hij (he), mij (me), zij (she).

The stressed pronominal forms with final ij underwent lengthening of i > i in Old Dutch and were thus later also diphthongised (see p. 61).

(3) vijf (five), vijftien (fifteen), vijftig (fifty).

The word vijf and its compounds is the only example of an ij < i which is the result of an (Ingwaenoic) compensatory lengthening – compare: Eng. five/Fris. fiif and Germ. fünf/Goth. fimf.

Compound grapheme ei

(1) < Gmc. ai [+ i/f]
(2) < Gmc. ãgi (via the umlauted form ëgi)

Examples and notes:

(1) a – bereid (ready), eik (oak), geit (goat), -heid (-hood), klein (small), scheiden (to separate).
   b – dreigen (to threaten), eigen (own), heilig (holy), leiden (to lead).

Germanic ai monophthongised to ë; before i/j, however, a diphthong was preserved (group b above) but other words without an Umlautsfaktor also show ei (group a above – see p. 137).

In ABN there has been a falling together in speech of the old diphthong ei and the new diphthong ij (see p. 145) but Lambert ten Kate, writing on Dutch ± 1700 (see p. 112), maintained that the two sounds were then still separate except in Amsterdam (and thus now in ABN) and plat Brabants. In Amsterdams the fall was towards [ei] and in plat Brabants towards [ai], still one of the characteristics of the dialect of Antwerp today.25

(2) meid (maid – German Magd/Mädchen), peil (level – pail, Germ. Pegel), steil (steep), zeil (sail – Germ. Segel), zeil[de] (said).

In a few words the diphthong ei is the result of a contraction of ë + g + i (< ãgi) where the g has been palatalised after Umlaut and syncopated.26 English ‘rain’

23. Similarly the diphthongisation of û > au in German caused a falling together with the original diphthong au; in both Dutch and English this did not occur – compare Haus/ Baum, huis/boom, housebeam.
24. Sound shifts can be a useful means of dating borrowings; see p. 124 for the importance of the Second German Sound Shift in this regard.
25. Compare the pronunciation of ‘to die’ and ‘today’ in Australian English; here both also tend towards [ai].
26. See p. 153 for the palatalisation of g in coastal areas.
Map 11: The ij isogloss, as in the word ijs (ice), showing the areas unaffected by the diphthongisation of [i:] to [ei]. Taken from A. Weijnen, Nederlandse Dialektkunde, Assen, 1966.
(regen) and 'hail' (hagel) show a similar development. Meisje (girl) < meid (milkmaid) < maagd (virgin), and zei < zegde < *zegde. In plat speech hij zeit (he says) and hij leit (= hij ligt/legt, he lies/lays) are commonly heard; such forms can be regarded as Ingwaenisms.

Compound graphemes ou(w)/au(w)
(1) < Gmc. al or ol + t/d
(2) In a few Dutch words with peculiar etymologies
(3) In foreign words

Examples and notes:
The diphthong [au] is more commonly represented by ou than au in Dutch spelling; there are very few indigenous words with the au spelling.
(1) goud (gold), houden (to hold), hout (wood – holt), koud (cold), oud (old), vouwen (to fold).

Already in the pre-literary period al and ol must have fallen together (e.g. mout – malt, goud – gold) – the pronunciation of the English examples gives evidence of a similar development in that language. Also prior to the first texts, 1 after o before t and d was vocalised to produce a new diphthong ou, which did not fall together with original Germanic au, as this had changed to o(see p. 139). Thus the above Dutch examples contrast with the following German cognates: alt, fallen, halten, kalt; Gold, Holz. French shows a similar alternation of u and l e.g. beau/belle, veau/veal (Norman French), chaud/Ital. caldo.

(2) beschouwen (to view), houwen (to hew); gouw (province – Germ. Gau); blauw (blue), klauw (claw), wenkbrauw (eyebrow); gauw (soon); jou (you, obj.), nou (now).

Those few Dutch words with ou which are not derived from ol + t/d show either ou or au in spelling and are of various origins.27 Beschouwen and houwen, for example, retain an original au which did not change to o before w; gouw is a contraction of -awi (Goth. gawi); the diphthong in blauw, klauw, brauw is the result of o + w and gauw (< MNL gd) is by analogy with such words; for jou and colloquial nou see p. 142.
(3) auteur (author), auto (car), automatisch (automatic).

Such words are usually pronounced [au] but some people still preserve the French pronunciation [o:].

4 Double Vowels

Peculiar to Dutch are the double vowels which are different in origin and pronunciation from the true diphthongs since they are formed from two phonemes. They have various etymological histories.

27. The difference in spelling reflects a difference in pronunciation in Zeeland and the islands of South Holland – the different origin of each is obviously still felt by those speakers.
The distinction was also preserved in ABN until the beginning of the nineteenth century.
Compound grapheme aai
(1) < Gmc. ā + j (especially in verbs)
(2) < ād- in open syllables (only in speech)

Examples and notes:
(1) draaien (to turn – Germ. drehen), kraaien (to crow – Germ. krähen), maaïen (to mow – Germ. mähen), zaaien (to sow – Germ. sähen). Also in related nouns: draai (a turn), kraai (a crow) etc.
(2) The double vowel aai is heard in such words as raden (to guess – pron. räaïen), laden (to load – pron. laaïen), kwade (evil – pron. kwaaië) where d is vocalised – see p. 155. This is not reflected in the standard written language.

Compound grapheme ooi
(1) < Gmc. au + j
(2) < ōd- in open syllables

Examples and notes:
(1) dooien (to thaw), hooi (hay), kooi (cage), strooien (to strew).
   There are etymological connections between these words and those with ouw (see p. 148, group 2).
(2) dooier (yolk – Germ. Dotter), ooievaar (stork, < MNL ôdevâre), rooie (red, < rode), rooien (to clear forest, < MNL rôden).
   Unlike aai < ōd- (see above), ooi < ōd- has made its way into written ABN in certain words; rooie, a colloquial pronunciation of the adjective rood + inflectional ending, is seldom written however.

Compound grapheme oei
(1) < ō + j
(2) < oed- in open syllables (only in speech)

Examples and notes:
(1) bloeien (to bloom), gloeien (to glow), groeien (to grow), roeien (to row).
   Such words show a regular development of ō to oe; German cognates show regular uumlauting due to j – blühen, glühen.
(2) goeie (good, < goede), poeier (powder, < poeder).
   Occasionally in speech, d after oe in an open syllable is vocalised to i, or more correctly the semi-vowel j.

Compound grapheme eeuw
(1) < Gmc. ai + w
(2) < Gmc. ē + w

Examples and notes:
In OWLF intervocalic w developed into an u and gave rise to this double vowel (see also the diphthong ou(w)/au(w) and the long vowel u).
(1) eeuw (century), Zeeuw (Zeelander, < zee), sneeuw (snow – Goth. snáw–), meeuw (seagull).
(2) leeuw (lion – Lat. leo), geeuwen (to yawn).
5 Consonants

The consonantal system of Dutch has remained unchanged since the beginning of the Middle Dutch period with the phonemically insignificant exceptions of the pronunciation of r and w, as well as the devoicing of voiced spirants in certain positions (see g in all positions, v and z in Anlaut). There is, however, more uniformity in spelling now than in the Middle Dutch period – for example, the devoicing of voiced stops in Auslaut was often reflected in the spelling in Middle Dutch texts (lanc < lang, hep < heb, hant < hand) but nowadays the 'rule of uniformity' (regel van gelijkvormigheid) is adhered to. But it is not applied in the case of spirants e.g. ik geef (< geven), ik reis (< reizen).

The consonants are best dealt with not alphabetically but in groups of graphemes that alternate historically for various reasons.

Grapheme b

Dutch b is the product of a complicated pre-history in Old Germanic times involving the First German Sound Shift (see p. 121). Final b was devoiced, as in German, and thus often appears as p in Middle Dutch texts (see above).

Graphemes v and f

Dutch v in Anlaut corresponds to English f and German f or v (pron. f). It is derived from Germanic f which in turn is derived from Indo-European p via the First German Sound Shift e.g. vader – Eng. father, Germ. Vater but Lat. pater; voet – Eng. foot, Germ. Fuß but Lat. ped.28 In the pre-literary period, the f in Anlaut and Inlaut became voiced e.g. vogel (bird – fowl, Goth. fugls), wolf/wolven (wolf/wolves). The famous West Flemish sentence from the Old West Low Franconian period (see p. 127) also has uogala (where u = v).

Nowadays in the ABN of the Randstad initial v is usually devoiced to f, possibly due ultimately to Frisian substrate in Holland. The dialects of this region have thus probably never voiced it. The same applies to z (see p. 13).

Grammatical change (see p. 122) often accounts for the occurrence of a v intervocally (Goth. b) where German has b e.g. geven (to give, Germ. geben), sterven (to die – starve, Germ. sterben). In such words v alternates with f in Auslaut e.g. ik geef (I give); also lief (dear, Germ. lieb) but liever (dearer, Germ. lieber). Compare also Dutch zeven (seven, Germ. sieben), zilver (silver, Germ. Silber), doof/dove (deaf, Germ. taut/tauhe).

Otherwise f is only found in the following cases:

1. gemination: heffen (to lift, Goth. hafjan), laffe (cowardly, < laf, a checked vowel).
2. very occasionally before t: bruiloft (wedding), vijftig (fifty) (see p. 154).
3. in words of foreign (often Frisian) origin: folteren (to torture, Germ. foltern), foerl (trout, Germ. Forelle), frank (< French franc), fris (fresh, compare Dutch vers), Fries (Frisian, compare the surname De Vries); in older texts Friesland and

28. When such comparisons are made with Latin or Greek, the layman often believes this to mean that the Germanic word has been derived from that Latin or Greek cognate form. This is not the case, as Latin and Greek, belonging to different sub-divisions of IE, have simply preserved related words which the shifts that have taken place in Germanic have not affected.
Frankrijk often appear with the truly Low Franconian spelling Vriesland and Vrankrijk – they are often pronounced that way today too. (4) in a few indigenous words of obscure origin: fiets (bicycle), foei (an exclamation). This f may have something to do with accentuation in pronunciation.

Even in areas where initial v is normally pronounced as v and not as f (i.e. south of the rivers), v is often devoiced when a voiceless consonant precedes i.e. assimilation: hij ziet veel – pron. hij ziet feel.

There are parallels between the alternation of f/v and s/z where the phonetic similarity is also one of voiceless versus voiced spirant.

Graphemes z and s
As with f, Germanic s in Anlaut and Inlaut was voiced in the pre-literary period, as it was somewhat later in German too; it is still written as s in German, however, as it was in Middle Dutch. This accounts for the many words beginning with the letter z in Dutch. S did not become voiced in Auslaut e.g. huis (house), reis (journey), gans (goose), vers (verse) – compare the plural forms huizen, reizen, ganzen (see sch below), verzen. S also did not become voiced in the combinations sch (sk), sl, sm, sn, sp and st e.g. schoen, slapen, smijten, snijden, spelen, steen. In the combination sw, s did become voiced e.g. zweren (to swear), zwemmen (to swim). Here German shows no deviation from the other combinations – all underwent palatalisation in early New High German e.g. Schuh, schlafen, schmeißen, schneiden, spielen, Stein; schwören, schwimmen (see sj for the situation in Limburg).

Otherwise the exceptions to Germanic s > Dutch z are similar to those for Germanic f > Dutch v:
(1) in words of foreign origin e.g. suiker (sugar), soep (soup)
(2) before a syllable with a short vowel followed by gemination e.g. beseffen (to realise), sommige (some), sukkelen (to be ailing, < ziek).
(3) in positions where it is assimilated to neighbouring unvoiced consonants e.g. ik heb ze – pron. ik heb se, 's zondags – pron. sondags, samen (together < tezamen).

Final s in Dutch is often the product of an assimilation of Germanic -hs (pron. Xs). This assimilation is unique to Dutch as English, High German and Frisian all preserve -ks e.g. Dutch bus, vos, was, zes versus English/German box/Büchse, fox/Fuchs, wax/Wachs, six/sechs. The Dutch island Texel (occasionally spelt Tessel) is pronounced in two ways – Teksel (Frisian pronunciation) or Tessel (Low Franconian pronunciation). Any other occurrence of the combination ks in ABN must also be due to foreign influence e.g. boksen (< Eng. to box), heks (witch, < Germ. Hexe), tekst (< Latin).

See p. 122 for Dutch z in verliezen/vriezen versus r in German verlieren/frieren.

Compound grapheme sch
The shift of Germanic sk to OWLF sch (pron. sx) was a partial assimilation of the stop k to the preceding fricative s. This shift only occurred at the beginning of stressed syllables (e.g. schoen – shoe, schip – ship, landschap – landscape) and sch was otherwise assimilated completely to s. In North Holland, probably due to Frisian substrate, sk has been preserved (see p. 13).

The increasing frequency of the uvular pronunciation of r (see p. 54) has brought
with it an assimilation of the gutteral fricative in the combinations gr and schr e.g. schrijven (to write, pron. sReivən).

That words such as mens (person), vers (fresh) and ruisen (to rustle) retain s when a vowel follows\(^{29}\), is also to be attributed to the fact that these words did not originally end in s but in sch; they were probably still pronounced as sk or sX in the pre-literary period. This spelling, which appears as sc in Middle Dutch, was retained right up till 1936 (see p. 41) but was not reflected in pronunciation e.g. menschen, versche, visch – vischen, ik wasch – wassen.\(^{30}\)

Hypercorrect spellings such as langs (\(<\) langs, along) and lansch (\(<\) lands, gen. of land) in Middle Dutch texts prove that the final ch had already been assimilated to s.

In English and German, Germanic sk was palatalised to sh in the pre-literary period. Early English orthography still often used the compound grapheme sc, however, and German now uses sch were English uses sh e.g. Dutch schip (pron. sXIp), Eng. ship (pron. jIp) and German Schiff (pron. jIf).

**Compound grapheme sj**

As the above development of sch in Dutch illustrates, the sound [ʃ] is generally speaking foreign to Dutch and typical of its more palatal relatives, English and German.\(^{31}\) The compound grapheme sj is used, however, in foreign loanwords (sometimes of Frisian origin) where the spelling of the host language has been abandoned for a ‘Dutch’ spelling: sjaal (shawl), sjoelbak (a Frisian game), sjouwer (dock-hand). It also occurs incidentally in the diminutive of nouns ending in s e.g. huisje, reisje.

It is interesting to note at this point that the shift of initial sl, sm, sn, sp\(^{32}\), st\(^{32}\) and sw to schl, schm etc. in early New High German\(^{33}\) also partly affected the Dutch and Belgian provinces of Limburg (see the Panninger Line on map 5); initial [ʃ], in lieu of Dutch [sX], is found over an even larger area of Limburg.

**Grapheme g**

Dutch g is identical in origin to g in the other Germanic languages as it too is the product of the complicated pre-history involving the First German Sound Shift (see p. 121).

Historically the graphemes ch and g alternate, as do s/z and f/v, to indicate the voiceless and voiced gutteral fricatives respectively. As mentioned on p. 51, both ch and g are now pronounced voiceless in ABN, a pronunciation which is considerably harder than even the German ach-Laut. In Middle Dutch texts the ‘rule of uniformity’ (see p. 150) did not apply to ch/g and thus alternations of the following kind

---

29. Compare gans (goose) – ganzen, vies (dirty) – vieze, verhuizen (to shift house).
30. As Germanic -ks > s and -sch > s in Dutch, the following words fell together: wasschen (Eng. to wash, Germ. waschen) > wassen and wassen (< *waksen, Eng. to wax/ grow, Germ. wachsen).
31. This sound followed by another consonant (as in Spiel, Stadt etc.) causes Dutchmen more problem than any other when speaking German.
32. Words such as Spiel and Stein are still pronounced without the palatal spirant by many educated speakers of High German in the north of the country.
33. i.e. the sixteenth century, the period parallel with that of early Modern Dutch.
are found: loech/loeghen, sloech/sloeghen (singular/plural of the preterite of lachen – to laugh and slaan – to hit); nowadays one writes sloeg/sloegen.\textsuperscript{34}

The spelling gh is common in old Dutch texts, particularly before e and i – compare the spelling of Van Gogh and Breughel as well as the English spelling of Ghent (now Gent in Dutch).

Certain peculiarities of Middle Dutch spelling suggest that g in gemination and after [ŋ] was still pronounced as a plosive at the time; for example, spellings like lieghen (= liggen – to lie) and dinc (= ding – thing) with Auslautverschärfung, suggest alternation with g not g, as is still the case with b/p and d/t.\textsuperscript{35} G, or rather X, has taken over since the seventeenth century in gemination (e.g. liggen, zeggen – to say), and ŋg has assimilated to ŋ (e.g. dingen – things); note however the pronunciation of the loan words evangelisch and geëngageerd as well as Gronings surnames in -ga e.g. Huizinga (all with ŋX).

The devoicing of g to X, which runs parallel with the devoicing of v and z, has however occurred in all positions in ABN. It cannot be directly due to Frisian influence, as is the case with v and z, but g has probably followed by analogy v and z, whose devoicing is believed to be due to Frisian substrate in Holland.

For the syncope of intervocalic g > e see p. 146.

Dutch words with g often contrast with English words with y, a sound for which the Dutch alphabet uses j e.g. gist (yeast), gisteren (yesterday), dag (day), zeggen (to say). The contrast is one of palatalisation in English versus gutteralisation in Dutch. Palatalisation of g > j, like several other forms of palatalisation, is an Ingwaeonic phenomenon and is present only to a certain degree in Dutch (see j). On the other hand, in OWLF sometimes g < j occurred before stressed palatal vowels gij (Goth. jus), gene (that – yon, Germ. jener), ginder (yonder).

**Compound grapheme ch**

See g for the historical relationship with that grapheme.

Germanic X (now written ch in Dutch) has undergone various developments in Dutch depending on where it occurs in a word. Dutch ch has two possible origins:

1. < Gmc. X
2. < Gmc. -ft.

(1) Germanic X was preserved in gemination e.g. lachen (to laugh – Goth. hlahjan) and before the dental -t e.g. acht, nacht (compare Lat. octo, nox, see p. 122). In Anlaut it shifted to h (see h). In all the following cases, Germanic X was syncopated or apocopated:

(a) in Anlaut before a consonant, a combination common in Old Germanic, it dropped off e.g. waar (where\textsuperscript{36} – Goth. hwar) lachen (Goth. hlahjan), roepen (to call – Goth. hrôpjjan). As a result of metathesis occurring before the loss of h before r in English, English 'horse' contrasts with Dutch ros.

(b) in Inlaut between vowels e.g. slaan (to hit – Goth. slahan) – compare geslagen,

\textsuperscript{34} Even in Northern Germany g in Auslaut is pronounced as [X].

\textsuperscript{35} Note the modern spellings jonkheer (< jongheer, junker), koninkje (< koning, king).

\textsuperscript{36} The English compound grapheme wh (with metathesis) and the hypercorrect pronunciation of it taught by some elocution teachers are remnants of this Germanic sound combination.
an example of grammatical change; *sehen* (to see) – compare Germ. *sehen*, where the *h* is still written but no longer pronounced.

(c) *X* + *s*, which appears as *ks* (sometimes written *x*) in other Germanic languages, was assimilated to *s* in Dutch e.g. *vos* (fox), *wax* (wax) – (see *s*).

(d) the combination *-sx* in Auslaut was also assimilated to *s* (see *sch* p. 152).

(e) *X* in Auslaut was sometimes apocopated by analogy with inflected forms e.g. *dij* (thigh), *schoen* (shoe, MNL *scoe* + plural *n*, Germ. *Schuh*), *vlo* (flea – Germ. *Floh*); also *door* (through – Germ. *durch*).

In West Germanic the combination *g + t*, common in Auslaut, shifted to *cht*; compare the following couplets:

- *buigen* (to bend) – *bocht* (bend, curve)
- *dragen* (to wear) – *klederdracht* (costume)
- *plegen* (to care) – *plicht* (duty)
- *wegen* (to weigh) – *gewicht* (weight)
- *mogen* (to be allowed) – *mocht* (past tense – might)
- *brengen* (to bring) – *bracht* (brought)
- *denken* (to think) – *dacht* (thought)
- *zoeken* (to seek) – *zocht* (sought)

(2) The above *-cht < g + t* falls together in Dutch (but not in Frisian, English or German) with *-cht < f + t* e.g. *gracht* (canal) < *graven* (to dig) – compare Germ. *Grüf*/*graben*, *achter* (after), *schaft* (shaft), *zacht* (soft), *lucht* (air – Germ. *Luft*); also the past tense *kocht* < *kopen* (to buy).37

This shift began in the tenth century in the Low and Middle Franconian areas. It did not occur in Frisian and thus *Hollands* with its Frisian substrate, did not undergo the shift until quite late; *-ft* still occurred there in the seventeenth century. Middle Dutch texts, mostly of southern origin, show the shift as complete. Words such as *bruiloft* (wedding) and *deftig* (distinguished) are relicts. Sometimes *-ft* has been restored by analogy e.g. *helft* (< *half*), *vijftig* (< *vijf*), *wichtig* still occurs in Middle Dutch. *Heeft* and *hoofd* are contractions of *hevet* and *hoved* which have occurred since the shift of *-ft* > *-cht*.

**Grapheme h**

Germanic *h* (*X*) developed from Indo-European *k* via the First Germanic Sound Shift (see p. 121); in Anlaut before vowels it is now found as *h*, in other positions as *ch* (see p. 153) or not at all. The words *hond* (dog – Lat. *canis*), *hoofd* (head – Lat. *caput*), *huis* (house – Lat. *casa*) all contrast with cognates beginning with *c* in Latin based languages, for example.

The combination *hw* (pron. *Xv* or *Xw*) in Germanic usually dropped the *h* in favour of the *w* e.g. *waar* (where, Goth. *hwar*), *welk* (which, Goth *hwileiks*) but in the case of *hoe* (how, *< Gmc. *hwɔ*), the reverse occurred – compare the pronunciation of Eng. *what*, *where*, *who*.

In Flanders, Zeeland and parts of Brabant *h* is not a phoneme and is thus often

37. Eng. *f* and Dutch *X* alternate sometimes outside the combination *ft/cht* e.g. *enough/ge-noeg*, *laugh/lachen*; this is an Ingwaenic feature of English.
dropped, as in Cockney English. In these dialects, the space left by the dropping of h in the phonemic system is filled by g, which is pronounced as h i.e. een gele hoed (a yellow hat) – pron. een hele oed.

Confusion with regard to h in Anlaut is already evident in the eleventh century West Flemish sentence mentioned on p. 127 i.e. hic = ic. Throughout the Middle Dutch period texts of southern origin show such misspellings – huut (< uut = uit), us (< huus = huis).

The pronoun het (it – Germ. es) also has no h historically, as the English and German cognate forms indicate; it has been added by analogy with other pronominal forms with h e.g. hij (he), hem (him), haar (her). Similarly the neuter definite article het, which, like the pronoun het is usually pronounced [at], is by analogy spelt in the same way (see p. 163).

For the frequent occurrence of h in Inlaut and Auslaut in German, which is not found in Dutch, see p. 154 i.e. sehen, gehen, Schuh, Floh etc.

**Grapheme d**

Dutch d also has a complicated prehistory involving the First German Sound Shift (see p. 121). The two sounds which are found in Germanic as d (< IE. dh) and p/ð (< IE. t), occur as d in Dutch (see p. 126 for the development of p/ð > d).

In High German, Germanic d > t and thus the following words contrast: Tag – dag/day, Tal – dal/dale, Tat – daad/deed, trinken – drinken/drink etc. Where both German and Dutch have d, this d is derived from p, as the English cognates indicate e.g. das/dat – that, denken – think, dünn/dun – thin etc.

Final d in Dutch is pronounced voiceless, as in German (see p. 150).

**Vocalisation and syncope of d:**

Depending on the preceding vowel, d in the combination vowel + d + e has been a) vocalised to i/j or w or b) syncopated (probably via j).

(a) ooievaar (stork < MNL. õdevâre), rooien (to dig up, MNL. rôden); beneden (beneath, pron. beneje), goede (good, pron. goeje), poeder (powder, pron. poeier or poejer), snijden (to cut, pron. snijen). The long vowels or diphthongs which precede d in such words require a j-type glide between the two syllables to facilitate pronunciation. This vocalisation of d is heard much more than it is written, as the above spellings indicate. In a similar way, d after ou before e is often vocalised to w e.g. houden (to hold, pron. houwen), koude (cold, pron. kouwe), oude (old, pron. ouwe); it is written as w in very few words, however e.g. gouwe (a flower, < *goude), vouwen (to fold, < MNL. vouden < *volden < * Gmc. faldan).

(b) kou (cold, < koude), lui (people, < luide), sla (salad, < salade), slee (sleight, < slede), zou (should, < zoudie < *zolde); blaren (leaves, < bladeren), een boel (a lot, < boedel), broer (brother, < broeder), kwaliik (angry, < kwadelijk), leeg (empty, < ledig), lelijk (ugly, < ledelijk), weer (weather, < weder).

When a long vowel + d + e occurred at the end of a word, the syncope of d led to apocope of the final syllable, as the first examples above illustrate. The other

38. The term semi-vowel for j or w is particularly apt in this context.
39. The first person singular of the present indicative and the interrogative of the second person singular of such verbs show apocope of d in both the spoken and the written word e.g. ik snij, snij je; ik hou, hou je.
examples show the loss of a syllable in the middle of a word due to syncope of d. Occasionally in formal or older texts words of both types are written out fully e.g. leder (leather, > leer), mede (with, > mee), weide (meadow, > wet). Sometimes the syncopated and unsyncopated forms coexist with a differentiation in meaning e.g. boel/boedel (a lot/possessions), broer/broeder (brother/brother in an order), moer/moeder (nut/mother), Nederland/neerlandicus (Netherlands/graduate in Dutch), vergaren/vergaderen (to gather/meet).

Vocalisation of d, whether to j or nothing, is very widespread in Modern Dutch, but is found somewhat less frequently in Middle Dutch texts. It is not limited to Dutch but is also heard in Plattdeutsch and Danish. In French too, intervocalic d was syncopated (e.g. oun < Lat. audire). The origin of the phenomenon in Low Franconian could thus have been in West Flanders (see p. 21). It certainly started in the south anyway and became common in Amsterdam only after 1585 with the arrival of the southern immigrants (see p. 101). This is also consistent with the occurrence of j < d after ij, a sound the Brabanders are believed to have introduced into the north.

An interesting example of the effect vocalisation of d can have on a word is the variety of spellings of the name Bredero, a famous seventeenth century writer: Brederode, Bredero, Breero (with a double syncope).

As the cause of this vocalisation of d is to be found in lazy articulation (it is even more common in plat), there is still a feeling that it is not always beschadigd to apply it. This has led to a stylistic distinction sometimes being made e.g. broer (the relative), broeder (the cleric), goeie but Goede Vrijdag (Good Friday), tevree or tevrede but tevredenheid (satisfaction), mee (but) medeklinker (consonant), neer (down) but nederlaag (defeat). This had led to hypercorrect forms with d where etymologically d never existed e.g. bevrijden (to liberate – Germ. befreien), geschieden (to happen – Germ. geschehen), wijden (to dedicate – Germ. weihen). A well-known Dutch politician who represents the farmers of Holland talks of the politieke partijen (= partijen) in his regular television broadcasts.

For the occurrence of d in words such as kelder (cellar), donder (thunder) and puurder (purer) see r.

Grapheme t
Dutch t is also a product of the First German Sound Shift (p. 121). German words with ss/tz where Dutch has t have undergone the Second German Sound Shift e.g. essen – eten (to eat), zetten – zetten (to put). Dutch t is pronounced unaspirated unlike in English and German.

In Middle Dutch texts one often finds t in Auslaut where Modern Dutch has d e.g. hant – hand (hand), vant – vond (found); nowadays the 'rule of uniformity' has been applied to the spelling i.e. hand because of handen and vond because of vonden.

Final t after fricatives (i.e. ch, f, st) is apocopated in Limburg and the big cities along the rivers: Utrechenaars in particular are noted for this and are thus humorously known as theedieven (tea-thieves) e.g. Utrech < Utrecht. The same phenomenon is found consistently throughout Afrikaans, inherited from plat Hollands.

For the history of -tje < -ke as a diminutive ending, see p. 157.

For rendering foreign words which contain the Eng. ch sound, the Dutch alphabet uses tj (adopted by Indonesian originally) – compare sj for Eng. sh.
Grapheme \( p \)
Dutch \( p \), also a product of the First German Sound Shift (see p. 121), has remained unchanged since Old Germanic times. It is pronounced unaspirated however, unlike in English and German. In addition \( p \), along with \( t \) and \( k \), was one of the sounds affected by the Second or High German Sound Shift and thus Dutch words with \( p \) contrast with German words with \( ff/pf \) e.g. dorp/Dorf (thorpe), heup/Hüpf (hip), peper/Pfeffer (pepper), pond/Pfund (pound).

Grapheme \( k \)
Dutch \( k \) is also a product of the First German Sound Shift. In Middle Dutch texts it often occurs as \( c \) or \( ck \) e.g. ick \( = ik \). It only occurs in the combination \( ks \) in foreign words e.g. boksen (to box), tekst (text) – (see p. 151).

Like the other unvoiced stops \( t \) and \( p \), it is unaspirated in Dutch but aspirated in English and German.

Also like the stops \( t \) and \( p \) this sound underwent the Second Sound Shift in High German\(^{40}\) and consequently Dutch words with \( k \) contrast with German words with \( ch \) e.g. boek/Buch (book), ick/ich (I), maken/machen (to make), steken/stechen (to sting). In Limburg \( k > ch \), depending on the position in a word, and is found over a large area (see the Uerdinger Line on map 5).

The Middle Dutch diminutive ending -kijn, still found in southern dialects as -ke(n), is found in northern speech as -tie, the most frequent diminutive ending, depending on the preceding sound. This \( tj \) is believed to be a Hollands (therefore coastal, Ingwaeonic) palatalisation of \( k \) such as one finds in other positions too in English and Frisian e.g. cheese/kaas, church/kerk, bench/bank. \( K \) was not otherwise palatalised in Low Franconian, however.

Grapheme \( j \)
The grapheme \( j \) fulfills in Dutch the function of \( y \) in English, but as it is a very palatal sound and many Germanic \( g's > y \) in English, it is not nearly as common as that letter in English e.g. gelukkig – lucky (from Gmc. \( g \)), laag – lay; but ye – fij, year – jaar, yoke – juk (all from Gmc. \( j \)). There are but a few examples of such palatalisation of initial \( g \) in Dutch and these can be regarded as Ingwaeonisms – jenever (Dutch gin, sometimes still written genever), jegens (towards – Germ. gegen). Where Dutch has \( g \) instead of etymologically correct \( j \) (gene, gij, ginder), the cause may be hypercorrection of the above.

Grapheme \( l \)
Dutch \( l \) is a thicker, more velar sound than \( l \) in German or English, where it is also pronounced differently according to its phonetic environment and position in a word – thus the vocalisation of \( al \) and \( ol + i/d > ou \) in OWLF (see p. 126). The \( l \) in such words was still written in the north for a long time. Sometimes \( l \) has been restored by analogy e.g. gedenk/gold/gegolden (to be valid), smelten/smolt/gezmolten (to smelt). Otherwise the combinations \( old/olt \) and \( ald/alt \) are only found in words of foreign origin e.g. altaar (altar) – but autaar also exists, bushalte

\(^{40}\) Standard High German, which is based on Middle German (i.e. of central Germany), does not show a shifted \( k \) in Anlaut; this is only found in the dialects of the far south, particularly in Switzerland.
(bus stop), jolten (to torture, from Germ.), gehalte (quality), soldaat (soldier). In the Saxon areas of the north and east l has not been vocalised e.g. Patersholde and Oldenzaal.

In Germanic hl (pron. Xi) was common in Auslaut, as were hr and hw, but these h's had dropped off by the time of Middle Dutch e.g. lid (eyelid, <*hlid), Lodewijk (Louis, < Hlodowik).

Although r is the sound that most frequently underwent metathesis in Dutch, metathesis of l in the combination p + l also occurs e.g. naald (needle – Germ. Nadel).

Grapheme m

M has changed little since Old Germanic times. The combination mb (compare Eng. comb, lamb) is found in Middle Dutch as mp in Auslaut (see p. 150) and as mm (i.e. by assimilation) in Inlaut e.g. lamp – lammeren (lamb – lambs); nowadays, however, the singular or uninflected forms also show m by analogy with forms with mm in Inlaut e.g. kam – kammen (comb – combs), dom – domme (dumb – infl. form).

Historically one also finds m in Auslaut which has been weakened to n nowadays e.g. Middle Dutch ic bem – Modern Dutch ik ben (I am), Middle Dutch hem/hum – Modern Dutch hen/hun (them). The masculine and neuter dative m, so evident in German, also weakened to -n in Dutch e.g. tenslotte (at the end, finally) < te den (= n. dat. sing.) slot. However, several words beginning with b preserve m in Auslaut, where English also keeps m but German shows n e.g. bezem (broom – Germ. Besen), bodem (bottom – Germ. Boden), boezem (bosom – Germ. Busen).

Grapheme n

The tendency for final n after a to be apocopated (e.g. lopen – to walk, pannen – pans) in most Dutch dialects, except those based on Saxon, was already present in Middle Dutch. However, even in areas where it is usually dropped (also in ABN), it is often retained to avoid hiatus e.g. eten en drinken (eating and drinking); it is also commonly heard in such positions where there is no n in the written language e.g. wat zien ik (> wat zie ik – plat), toen hoorde-n-ie (< toen hoorde hij). Although infinitives have always ended in -en, -en has not always been as widespread as a plural ending (see p. 166).

For the development of n in Auslaut from m, see m.
For the combination ng (pron. η), see g.

Historically n has been syncopated and caused lengthening of the preceding short vowel in some words i.e. compensatory lengthening in the combination short vowel + n + X/f/p/s (i.e. fricatives) e.g. bracht (brought, < brengen), vijf (five – Goth. fimf), muiden (river mouth in place names, Goth. mufis). In part of South Holland and North Brabant the combination short vowel + n + s causes nasalisation and lengthening of the vowel e.g. mens (compare the pronunciation in Afrikaans).

Grapheme r

Dutch r has a double origin – either Germanic r or Germanic z. The latter origin explains why Dutch has z in verliezen (to lose) and vriezen (to freeze), for example,
while German has *verlieren* and *frieren* (compare also Eng. to lose – forlorn). As a result of Verner’s Law (see p. 122), *s* and *z* alternated in certain words in Germanic; *z* in Inlaut could change by a process known as rhotacism to *r*. This process, often aided by analogy, produced the following cognate forms with *r* and *s/z* alternating e.g. *kiezen* (to choose) – *voorkuier* (preference), *meer* (more) – Goth. *máiza, oor* (ear) – Goth. *ausó, verliezen* (to lose) – *verloren* (lost)\(^{41}\). The process is common in English and German too, as the examples illustrate.

The alternation of dental and velar *r*, depending on the area, is discussed on p. 54, the original Dutch *r* was a dental one, however.

Many monosyllabic Dutch words show metathesis of *r* i.e. *r* + short vowel + dental > short vowel + *r* + dental e.g. *borst* (breast), *kerstmis* (Christmas), *pers* (press), *vers* (fresh). This did not occur, however, in Anlaut or in combination with *nt/nd* e.g. *rust* (rest), *branden* (to burn). Many more instances of metathesis are found in Middle Dutch texts, even in polysyllabic words, than exist in *ABN* today.

Where (originally sonant) *r* immediately followed *l, n* or *r*, a medial *d* often developed in Dutch e.g. *daalder* (dollar – Germ. *Taler*), *donder* (thunder – Germ. *Donner*), *kelder* (cellar – Germ. *Keller*); *beenderen* (bones, *<* *been*, bone), *boerderij* (farm, *<* *boer*, farmer). It is common in the comparative of adjectives that end in *r* e.g. *duurder* (dear, *<* *duur*), *puurder* (purer, *<* *puur*).

*R* has often had various effects on preceding vowels depending on the phonetic environment: for example, it often caused lengthening of the vowel (*baard* – beard, *woord* – word). Such changes have been dealt with under the respective vowels.

**Grapheme *w***

North of the rivers *w* is now a labio-dental sound and thus also in *ABN*; in the Middle Ages, and even nowadays south of the rivers, *w* was and is a bilabial sound as in English.

Germanic *hw* in Anlaut (i.e. *hw* *<* *1E. kw* via the First German Sound Shift) has been simplified to *w* e.g. *waar* (where), *wat* (what, *<* *hwat* – compare Lat. *quod*), *welk* (which) etc.; thus *hw* and *w* in Anlaut fell together, as in German.

The combination *vow* in Anlaut was retained in Dutch but was simplified to *r* in German e.g. *wreken* (to revenge – Germ. *rächen*), *wrijven* (to rub – Germ. *reiben*), *wringen* (to wring\(^{42}\) – Germ. *ringen*). In this position *wr* is pronounced as Dutch *vr*, however.

For the effect of Germanic *w* after vowels where diphthongs and double vowels were created see p. 148.

Words like *schaduw* (shadow), *zenuw* (nerve – sinew), *zwaluw* – (swallow) have preserved *w* in Auslaut where it historically followed a consonant; the German

\(^{41}\) Germ. *verlieren* – *verlor*/*verloren* – *verloren* and Dutch *verliezen* – *verloor*/*verloren* – *verloren* contrast with Middle Dutch *verliesen* – *verloos*/*verloren* – *verloren* where Middle Dutch shows *r* only where historically *z* occurred; the Dutch and German paradigms show a partial and complete analogy respectively.

\(^{42}\) Compare also Eng. ‘to write’ where the *w* is preserved in the spelling but not pronounced; similarly with *hw* in ‘what’, ‘where’, ‘who’ etc.
cognates either show no trace of \( w \) or it appears as \( b \) e.g. \emph{Schatten}, \emph{Sehne}, \emph{Schwalbe} – also \( gelb \) (yellow – Dutch \emph{geel}).

In some instances \( w \) in Auslaut after \( r \) became \( v \) which was devoiced to \( f \) e.g. \emph{nerf} (woodgrain – Germ. \emph{Narbe}), \emph{verf} (paint – Germ. \emph{Farbe}).
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Case

Case was originally reflected in the endings of nouns and adjectives, articles and pronouns. Nowadays, with the exception of certain standard expressions, only the pronouns preserve distinctions based on whether they are the subject or object of the sentence. The remnants of the cases will be dealt with under the relevant categories.

Gender

Gender in Dutch was originally determined by the stem declension\(^1\) to which nouns belonged. There were three genders: masculine, feminine and neuter. Gender was determined purely according to the form of the word, a result of its declension, and had little to do with any sexual distinction; thus there are forms today such as *het wijf* (the woman – pej.), *het meisje* (the girl).

In Middle Dutch the distinction in declensional endings between masculine and feminine nouns had already begun to break down. Feminine nouns commonly ended in *e*, as they still do in German, and thus masculine and neuter nouns ending in *e* could be confused with feminine ones; a change of gender could then take place. Further confusion resulted, for example, from the fact that historically feminine nouns often employed the genitive *s*, an ending which was originally reserved for masculine and neuter nouns of a particular declension; thus we have today (and already in Middle Dutch) a form such as *s nachts* (< *de nacht*, a feminine noun) by analogy with *s morgens* etc. (< *de morgen*, a masculine noun.)

Neuter nouns still exist as a separate category in Dutch, but common gender nouns, the name given to the combined category of formerly masculine and feminine nouns, only betray a distinction when they are substituted by pronouns, but even here *hij/hem* is generally used for all nouns with the exception of those that designate a feminine being or nouns that end in historically feminine endings such as *-heid, -ing, -iek* etc.

Definite articles *de/het*

The Dutchman knows intuitively whether a given noun is of common gender or neuter and virtually never makes an error. The foreign student is dependent on learning the definite article with each new noun, the article usually being the only reliable indicator of the gender of a noun. *De/het* are the result of a long history of simplification in Dutch.

The definite articles in all Germanic languages are derived from the demonstratives, as nouns originally had no article at all (whether definite or indefinite) in

---

1. Broadly speaking *a*-stem nouns were all masc. or neuter, *o*-stem nouns were all feminine and *i- and u*-stems contained words of all genders but were chiefly masc. and fem.; *n*-stems, or weak nouns, were of all three genders.
Indo-European languages – compare Gothic, Latin and Russian. The following paradigm for the definite article/demonstrative existed in Middle Dutch, but even there it was no longer rigidly applied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>die (de)²</td>
<td>die (de)</td>
<td>dat ('t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>dien (den)</td>
<td>die (de)</td>
<td>dat ('t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>des ('s)</td>
<td>der</td>
<td>des ('s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>dien (den)</td>
<td>dien (den)</td>
<td>dien (den)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unstressed forms de and 't of the nominative have become the definite article in ABN, while the stressed forms of the nominative are nowadays used as the demonstratives – plat still knows die/dat as definite articles and Afrikaans also uses die with this meaning. The simplification that English underwent was in favour of 'the' (Dutch de) for the definite article and 'that' (Dutch dat) for the demonstrative; German has preserved a paradigm similar to the above one for Middle Dutch, but there the masculine and neuter dative forms still retain the longer sound m, whereas Middle Dutch had weakened it to n. In German the definite article is also commonly used as the demonstrative.

Middle Dutch het has developed from unemphatic dat: 't was originally a proclitic form of the article and still 't or [st] is the normal pronunciation of het today. The spelling with h is by analogy with the pronoun het (it- see p. 172) with which it fell together in pronunciation. The pronunciation [het] is thus a spelling pronunciation and not historically correct.

In Middle Dutch die (and thus later de as the unstressed form) is also used for the masculine sing. acc. and dat., breaking down further the formal distinction between masculine and feminine nouns, an issue which was causing great confusion by the sixteenth century. This led in the seventeenth century to artificial attempts by writers to keep the distinction between masc. and fem. alive. For details on the compulsory writing of den for masculine nouns in the acc. and dat. right up to 1947 see p. 41. The very artificiality of den caused unnecessary problems and was inevitably destined to extinction. Den is still found in standard expressions e.g. op den duur (in the long run) and in the places names Den Haag/Den Bosch where it is a locative dative i.e. at the park/forest.

Other case forms of the definite article, which are often difficult or impossible to separate from those of the demonstrative, also occur in standard expressions or higher style e.g. de heer des huizes (the man of the house), deskundig (expert, lit. 'of it knowing'), dientengevolge (as a result of that, < *dien te den gevolg), ten slotte (finally, < *te den slot – lit. at the end), ter zake (to the matter in hand, < *te der zaak). These examples also illustrate that prepositions always governed the dative case in Dutch.

2. Even today southern dialects distinguish three genders where den, de and het are used as the definite article for masculine, feminine and neuter respectively. As the paradigm here illustrates, the use of den in this way is unhistorical.
Nouns

Nouns were classified according to stem i.e. whether the stem ending contained an a, o, i, u or n. A noun was declined according to the stem declension to which it belonged. Because the stem endings were unstressed in Dutch, the distinguishing vowels of the endings were all weakened to a, written e, by the Middle Dutch period. Therefore only comparison with Gothic or Old English or Old High German (because of the lack of OWLF texts) can determine for sure which declension any particular noun belonged to; the distinction is an historical one and in Dutch it borders on the artificial, even in Middle Dutch. The vowel stem nouns are known as strong nouns, and the consonant stem nouns (mainly n) are known as weak nouns, a terminology borrowed from J. Grimm and one which is also used, although with different connotations, to describe verbs.

a-stems

The following comparison of the paradigms of Gothic dags and Middle Dutch dach (day) illustrate the degree to which Gothic preserves the original stem vowels and Dutch has weakened them to e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>pl.</th>
<th></th>
<th>sing.</th>
<th>pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>dags</td>
<td>dagós</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dach</td>
<td>daghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>dag</td>
<td>dagans</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>dach</td>
<td>daghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>dagis</td>
<td>dagè</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>daghes</td>
<td>daghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>daga</td>
<td>dagam</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>daghe</td>
<td>daghen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paradigm of dag in Middle Dutch illustrates several interesting facets of the historical development of Dutch: the alternation of voiced and unvoiced fricative in the plural and singular respectively – the ‘rule of uniformity’ (see p. 150) in spelling was not yet applied. Wherever case endings are added, the root syllable is open and consequently the vowel has been lengthened (see p. 127) – compare NNL dag/dagen (day/days), vandaag (today, < van daghe dat.), daags tevoren (the day before, < daghes gen.).

In the above paradigm, the plural ending -e in all cases but the dative is the result of analogy. The current plural ending -en⁴ for the originally masculine and neuter a-stems, as for other strong nouns, is derived in all probability from an analogy with weak nouns (see p. 167); it is already common before the end of the Middle Dutch period. The fact that the dat. pl. already ended in -en must also have helped the process.

The a-stem nouns schoen (shoe – Germ. Schuh) and teen (toe – Germ. Zehe), as

---

3. Because IE. ō > GMC. ą and IE. ā > GMC. ā, what are called a- and a-stems here are sometimes referred to as o- and a-stems, but then this is from the point of view of IE. philology.

4. The fact that large areas of Holland and Belgium do not pronounce the final n of the plural may be the result of this n having come by later analogy in the written language only, but it is more likely to be due to a later apocope of the n after it had been applied by analogy; after all, all words in -en, whether nouns, verbs or adjectives, drop the final n in speech.
their English and German cognates illustrate, did not originally end in -n; this is a plural n which ceased to be felt as a plural ending. The current plural forms schoenen/tenen are in fact a doubling up of the plural ending.

The oscillation that often exists in Dutch between plurals in -en and -s is ultimately to be traced back to an alternative means of forming the plural of a-stems. The s plural is an Ingwaeric form and thus its ubiquitous presence in English and total absence in German words. Even the much quoted West Flemish sentence from the OWLF period has both vogala (> vogelen) and nestas (> nests) where NNL happens to now have the reverse, vogels and nesten. Plurals in -s were, and still are in the dialects, more common along the coast from West Flanders to North Holland. It is difficult to formulate rules for the use of -s or -en in Modern Dutch, but the origin at least of the alternative in -s is most probably that described here (see p. 59).

Neuter a-stems in GMC and MNL were identical to masc. a-stems except in the nominative and accusative plural where many had no ending and were thus identical to the singular. Remnants of this situation are still to be found e.g. op de been (on one’s feet), vijf jaar (5 years), drie pond (3 pounds) – compare also English ‘sheep’, ‘deer’, ‘three pound’.

Quite a large, but nevertheless finite group of common neuter nouns, not all necessarily a-stems by origin however, take a plural in -eren (in Middle Dutch and various dialects also -er or -ers) e.g. ei/eieren (eggs), kalf/kalveren (calves), kind/kinderen (children), lam/lammeren (lambs). This plural formation has but one solitary representative in English, ‘children’, but is much more widely found in German than in Dutch although both languages have extended the use of the ending beyond its origin. In German too it is chiefly a neuter ending, but several masculine nouns have adopted it as well – compare Dörfer/dorpen, Häuser/huizen, Länder/landen; in the above mentioned cases German also has Eier, Kälber, Kinder, Lämmer.5 The ending -en on Dutch words such as land, huis etc. is by analogy with the other large number of nouns ending in -en in the plural. Note the forms kleren (clothes, < klederen) and bladeren (leaves, pron. blaren); occasionally the -eren ending is used beside -en with a distinction in meaning e.g. been (leg, bone) – benen (legs)/beenderen (bones), blad (page, leaf) – bladen (pages)/bladeren (leaves).

wa- and ja-stems

If the a-stem ending was preceded by a w or a j in Germanic, the masculine or neuter noun in question was said to be a wa- or ja-stem respectively. From the point of view of Modern Dutch this is only of importance in as far as some words that end in w have retained the w of the wa-stem ending e.g. schaduw (shadow), sneeuw (snow) and the ja-stem nouns, which contained an Umlauts faktor, have been unaluated in Dutch e.g. heer (army – Goth. harjis), kunne (gender – kin, Goth. kuni); also the e ending of kunne, which is found in other originally neuter stems in Middle Dutch.

5. Strictly speaking, the ultimate origin of the ending is to be found in a small group of words one can best call iz/oz stems (the former with Umlauts faktor) because the combination -er (with r < z by rohoticism) is also found in the singular of such nouns – compare eierdop (egg-shell), rundelaap (cut of beef); Latin gens/generis (nom./gen. sing.) illustrates the same phenomenon.
and nowadays still in certain dialects too (e.g. bed – bedde, net – nette) is to be traced back to the final *i* of the nominative case of *ja*-stems.

**o-stems**

:o-stems: nouns were all feminine. The following two paradigms of *o*-stem nouns (*daad* – deed, *ziel* – soul) show the degree to which the declensional endings had already been watered down in Middle Dutch when compared to an *o*-stem noun in Gothic (*giba* – gift):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N daet</td>
<td>dâde</td>
<td>siele</td>
<td>siele(n)</td>
<td>giba</td>
<td>gibôs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A daet</td>
<td>dâde</td>
<td>siele</td>
<td>siele(n)</td>
<td>giba</td>
<td>gibôs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G daet, dâde</td>
<td>dâde</td>
<td>siele(n)</td>
<td>siele(n)</td>
<td>gibôs</td>
<td>gibo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D daet, dâde</td>
<td>dâden</td>
<td>siele(n)</td>
<td>siele(n)</td>
<td>gibai</td>
<td>gibôm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *ziel* paradigm shows particularly clearly the degree to which analogy was applied to the nominal endings after the weakening to *e*. It is believed that the now ubiquitous plural ending -en in Dutch, originally the plural ending for weak nouns of all genders, probably first made its way into the realm of strong nouns (i.e. vowel stems) via the feminine *o*-stems, which usually ended in -e in both the singular and the plural (but -en in gen. and dat. pl.). Weak nouns also ended in -e in the nom. sing.; the application of *n* to the gen. and dat. sing. of *ziel* in the above paradigm is also in imitation of weak nouns (see p. 167). The ending -en was undoubtedly regarded as a clearer indication of the plural than simply an -e. In English, precisely the reverse occurred and -en is thus found in very few nouns (*oxen, children*) and the -s (< *as*) ending of the masc. *a*-stems was applied across the board. German still retains a diversity of plural formation similar to the original situation in Germanic.

Because both *o*-stems, which were all feminine, and fem. *n*-stems ended in *e*, *e* became generally recognised as a feminine ending, as it still is in German for the same reason. In Dutch, however, the -e was usually apocopated in the post Middle Dutch period but there are still several originally fem. words that end in -e e.g. *beschermvrouwe* (patron), *gave* (gift), *hulde* (homage), *koude* (cold), *schande* (shame), *geen sprake van* (no mention of).

Final *e* could have other origins, however (either a *ja*-stem, *i*-stem or *n*-stem) and this formal resemblance often led to a change of gender i.e. to feminine gender e.g. *ellende* (misery), *kudde* (flock), *kunne* (gender), *oorlog* (war < MNL *oorloghe*). These were all originally neuter nouns and are now of common gender. Although *hart* (heart) and *oor* (ear) are still neuter nouns, for example, in the expressions *van ganzer harte* (with all one’s heart) and *ter ore komen* (to reach one’s ear) show them being treated as feminine nouns. Such confusion about inflection and gender was already common in Middle Dutch and was the beginning of the simplified grammar of Dutch. The loss of case and gender in English must have followed a similar path.

7. *Dâde* in the gen. was already due to an early analogy with the dative, but in the Middle Dutch period *daet*, originally only the nom. and acc. form, was being applied by analogy in all cases.
jo-stems
Just as there were ja-stems beside the a-stems, so there were originally also jo-stems beside the o-stems; this is only relevant from a modern point of view in as far as it explains the umlauted and sometimes geminated forms (better preserved in German) of some feminine words e.g. hel (hell, < helle – Germ. Hölle), brug (bridge, < brugghe – Germ Brücke).

i- and u-stems
Nouns of these two declensions were nearly all masculine or feminine. The u-stem declension was never large and even in Primitive West Germanic they began to join the i-stems. As final i and final u both became e in Middle Dutch anyway, the falling together of these declensions was helped even more. Some Middle Dutch nouns that end in e are thus historically i- or u-stems e.g. sone (son, NNL zoon), beke (brook, NNL beek); also stede (town, NNL stad) where the e < i acted as an Umlautsfaktor. Stede is still found as an ending in place names. The German plural formation in -e is also to be traced back to i-stems.

By the i and u endings weakening to -e, and thus falling together in form with feminine o-stems, the stage was set for firstly the feminine u- and i-stems to follow the fem. o-stems, and then for the masc. u- and i-stems, which didn’t differ formally from the feminines, to follow suit. As the fem. o-stems were meanwhile assimilating with the weak nouns of all genders, particularly as far as the adoption of the -en plural ending is concerned, the masc. and fem. u- and i-stems also followed suit in this regard. The history of the spread of the -en plural ending in Dutch is a classic example of the far-reaching effects analogy can have on the grammar of a language.

The n-stems or weak nouns
Although strictly speaking the term weak nouns is applied to all consonant stems (i.e. also dr- and nd/nt-stems), the number of non n-stem consonant stems is so small that the term is usually understood to denote n-stems only and the two terms have thus become synonymous.

Weak nouns were chiefly masculine and feminine but a few very common neuter nouns were also weak, namely hart (heart), oog (eye) and oor (ear). Compare the following paradigms of a masc. and fem. weak noun in Middle Dutch and Gothic:

\[\begin{array}{llll}
\text{MNL:} & \text{sing.} & \text{pl.} & \text{GOTHIC:} & \text{sing.} & \text{pl.} \\
\text{N hân} & \text{hânen} & \text{hana} & \text{hanans} \\
\text{A hân} & \text{hânen} & \text{hanan} & \text{hanans} \\
\text{G hânen} & \text{hânen} & \text{hanins} & \text{hananê} \\
\text{D hân} & \text{hânen} & \text{hanin} & \text{hanam} \\
\end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{lll}
\text{MNL:} & \text{tonge(n)} & \text{tongen} & \text{tuggô}^* & \text{tuggôns} \\
\text{A tonge(n)} & \text{tongen} & \text{tuggôn} & \text{tuggôns} \\
\text{G tongen} & \text{tongen} & \text{tuggônô} & \text{tuggôm} \\
\text{D tongen} & \text{tongen} & \text{tuggôn} & \text{tuggôm} \\
\end{array}\]

8. Under the influence of Greek orthography Goth. writes ng as gg whereas in Dutch ng >η.
The above Middle Dutch paradigms already show analogy in the singular where the usual ending is -e; in German, masc. weak nouns still have -en in the acc., gen. and dat. singular. Interesting relicts of n inflection in the singular in Dutch are the place names 's-Gravenhage (= at the park of the count) and 's-Hertogenbosch (= the forest of the duke) from the nouns graaf (MNL grave) and hertog (MNL hertoghe).

Comparison of the above paradigm of MNL tonge with that of MNL siele (p. 166) shows little formal difference between the two, and in fact they fell together completely at that early date. Separate paradigms for the two, as given here, only have an historic validity even for MNL.

A few masc. words that end in -e in NNL owe this -e to the fact that they were originally weak nouns that did not lose the ending by apocope e.g. getuige (witness), postbode (postman); jongen (boy, < jonghe – Germ. Junge) has adopted an n in the nom. by analogy with the other cases; other nouns that formerly had -en in the acc., gen. and dat. singular now behave like all other nouns but can be compared with their German cognates that still add -en in those cases e.g. graaf/Graf (count), heer/Herr (gentleman), hertog/Herzog (duke), mens/Mensch (person), vorst/Fürst (prince).

The spread of the -en plural ending from weak nouns to all other classes has been dealt with under strong nouns (see p. 167).

Adjectives

Adjectival inflection, of which the meagre remnants in NNL are the presence or lack of a final e, has a long complicated prehistory in Germanic and Indo-European. Suffice it to say that the weak and strong declensions of the adjective, which are still alive and well in German today, were still in existence in Middle Dutch, although the two had begun to fall together and simplify even then.

Historically the weak declensional ending had been used in definite contexts i.e. after de/’t, die/dat, deze/dit and possessives, whereas the strong endings had been used in indefinite contexts i.e. after een/geen, elk/ieder etc. – compare Germ. der gute Mann, ein guter Mann. Because of the confusion between the two originally separate declensions of the adjective – partially due to the adjectival ending often being borrowed from the preceding article (e.g. terzelfdertijd – at the same time) – it is not possible to give complete weak and strong paradigms even for Middle Dutch as one can for NHG. The use of strong and weak endings in Middle Dutch, and thus also in the many standard expressions still used today that contain archaic adjectival endings, was already not entirely in accordance with the historical distinction. The following paradigm represents the situation in Middle Dutch:
Where alternative forms are given for the masc. and neuter, the distinction is due to the weak form existing side by side the strong form (marked *); in the feminine nom. and acc. both weak and strong declensions originally had -e, but in the strong declension it was apocopated. The -en endings can be of either strong or weak origin.

The rules for adjectival inflection in NNL (see p. 60) are based on a very much simplified version of the above paradigm i.e. the absence of any ending on the adjective before a sing. neut. noun in an indefinite context (e.g. *een goed huis) is ultimately to be traced back to the strong declension of the adjective, whereas the presence of an -e ending (e.g. *het goede huis) is based on the weak declension. Otherwise the endings of the above paradigm are found in countless expressions e.g. goedendavond (good evening, masc. acc.), blootschofs (with a bare head, neut. gen.), tegelijkertijd (at the same time, fem. dat.), ter elfder ure (at the eleventh hour, fem. dat.). As previously mentioned under nouns, final e was usually apocopated in Dutch, but the distinction between the e ending and no ending, which actually serves no practical function, has remained; this is probably because of the former occurrence of -en (pron. a) as an adjectival ending i.e. a < en possibly helped preserve a < e.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries men of letters attempted to artificially keep such case endings alive. The last vestige of such attempts was the recommended -en ending on adjectives (and articles) for sing. masc. nouns in the acc. and dat. (e.g. van den goed man), which was not abolished from the written language until 1947 (see p. 41).

The frequent omission of the e ending, particularly before masculine agents (e.g. een goed man), has nothing to do with strong/weak endings; it is purely stylistically (and occasionally semantically) determined. Afrikaans also now inflects chiefly according to sound and number of syllables, not according to grammar.

In the case of adjectival inflection, we thus see Dutch very much occupying a medial position between German on the one hand, where two completely separate paradigms for weak and strong inflection exist, and English on the other hand, where all endings have been dispensed with – compare, however, ‘the olden days’.

**Comparative and superlative of the adjective:**

The comparative in -er and superlative in -st have, as in German and English, not changed substantially since the earliest records. (For the inclusion of d after r in comparatives, see p. 159)

**Numerals**

Originally in Germanic the numerals 1-12 were inflected with endings similar to
those for the adjective (see p. 169), according to gender and case. The only numeral for which there is still a full paradigm of endings in Middle Dutch is *een, which, in its unstressed form (*an or *'n), had developed into the indefinite article, as in the other Germanic languages. Remnants of the earlier inflection of *een, and less frequently of the other numerals, are still found in the literary language and standard expressions e.g. *het leed *en *moeder (the sorrow of a mother, fem. gen.), *tweeë*erlei (of two kinds, gen. pl.), *met *z'n *tweë*en (two of them, dat. pl., *<* tween plus analogy with the nominal plural ending -en).

Sometimes the form of the cardinal numeral now used is by origin one of the inflected forms e.g. twee (neut.) but twintig, drie (fem.).

The word *geen (no, not a/any- Germ. kein) is found in Middle Dutch as negheen (<* nih + aina not one) and is inflected like *een.

For the phonology of *vijf (five) see p. 146, for *zes (six) p. 151 and *acht (eight) p. 153. In *negen (nine – Germ. neun, Goth. niun, Lat. novem) we see the change of w>g – compare *zag/saw, Eng. *drag/draw. *Tien (ten – Germ. zehn, Goth. taihun, Lat. decem) shows, at least in Gothic, *h<k via the First German Sound Shift plus later contraction in Dutch, English and German.

The numerals elf/twaalf (eleven/twelve – Goth. ainnif/twalfif) were compound words, as comparison with the Gothic shows, where the meaning was something like ‘(ten and) one left’ etc.

Dutch drie/dertien/dertig show the same metathesis of r that occurs in English three/thirteen/thirty – compare Germ. drei/dreizehn/dreißig.

For the alternation of veertien/veertig with vier see p. 138.

In Middle Dutch the forms vijftien/vijftich also occur with a shortening of the long vowel in vijf as in English five/fifteen/fifty; these alternative forms also often show the regular Low Franconian shift of fi>chi in Middle Dutch e.g. vichtien/vichtich (see p. 154).

The ending -tig (Goth. tigus) for numerals 20-90 contrasts with palatalised g in Eng. twenty etc. In West Germanic the word hund (ten) was used as a prefix for 70, 80 and 90 – it is still found as hund in Old English texts and as ant in Old Saxon; thus the Middle Dutch forms tsevenich, tachtich, tnegentich and, by analogy, also tsestich. Today the former presence of the prefix is still evidenced in tachtig, where the initial vowel facilitated retention, and in the voiceless pronunciation of the initial consonant in zestig and zeventig and, by analogy, also in veertig and vijftig; eastern dialects also still know the form tnegentig. The original division between the two forms -tig and hund- being at 70 reflected an older counting system based on a ‘greater hundred’ (120).

**Personal Pronouns**

The paradigms for the personal pronouns in Middle Dutch are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>2nd person</th>
<th>3rd person (masc.)</th>
<th>3rd person (fem.)</th>
<th>3rd person (neut.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>N ic</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>het</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A mi</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>hem</td>
<td>haer</td>
<td>het</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G mijn</td>
<td>dijns</td>
<td>zijns</td>
<td>haer</td>
<td>(sijns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | D mi | di | hem | | }
Comparison with the forms of the pronouns in Modern Dutch on p. 61 will show considerable differences between the situation in Middle Dutch and that in ABN today. The greatest change has been in the forms of the second person singular and plural, the forms of direct address. The changes that have occurred in Dutch since the Middle Ages are similar to those which have taken place in English over the same period; the following early Modern English forms can thus be useful for comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N thou</td>
<td>ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A thee</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G thine</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D thee</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plural form ghi was at the same time the polite form of address, both sing. and plural. Du and its related case forms ceased to be used in the sixteenth century and were replaced by the plural forms gij/u. North of the rivers along the coast, however, the alternative palatal forms jij/jou existed. This situation is still reflected in the use of gij and jij in the Low Countries today; in the south, gij is the usual form of address (both sing. and plural), whereas in the north, gij is felt to be an antiquated form with biblical connotations because of its use in the seventeenth century State Translation of the Bible (see p. 108). But as jij stood beside gij in the post Middle Dutch period as both a singular and plural form, both polite and familiar, a need was felt for a new plural form and a new polite form; thus the appearance of jullie (<je + lie[den] = you people) as the familiar plural form and u as a polite form in both the singular and plural. U as a subject pronoun is ultimately derived from a seventeenth century form of address, Une Edelheit (Your Honour), which was abbreviated in writing to Une Ed, U(w)e Ed., U Ed. or U.E., which abbreviation was pronounced uvé and was finally shortened, by a shift of stress to the first syllable, to u. The existence of u as an original object form of gij must have assisted the final shift to u, which was already current in the seventeenth century. U still betrays its third person origins by its ability to be accompanied by a third

9. The unemphatic forms given on p. 61 were also existence in Middle Dutch – see p. 176.
10. Still found in certain dialects, however.
11. Compare the connotations of 'thou' in English.
12. Compare the popular form 'youse' in Eng. which is apparently also the result of a need to distinguish between the singular and the plural. The dialects also know the forms wullie, gulkie, hulie (Afr. hule) and zulie.
13. Such influence is not without precedent – compare the Eng. subject pron. you (dat/acc. of ye) and the frequent use of hun (instead of zij) as a subject pronoun in colloquial Dutch today; in Swedish too de (nom.) has been replaced by dat. dom in the spoken language.
person form of the verb (e.g. *u is/heeft*) and the reflexive pronoun *zich*; the second person forms *u bent/heeft* and reflexive pronoun *u* are also current, however.

In the above Middle Dutch paradigm it will be noticed that the acc. and dat. form of all persons are identical, as they are in English too, but unlike German – compare *mich/mir, dich/dir* etc. The lack of final *r* (< Gmc. *s/z* via rhotacism) in the pronouns is an Ingwaeonic phenomenon – compare *he/hij* – Germ. *er, me/mij* – Germ. *mir*. Historically one would thus expect *mik/mi, dik/di* in Middle Dutch but the dative forms have been adopted in the accusative for all persons – a simplification of the paradigm in other words.

The presence of so many pronouns with initial *h* is also an Ingwaeonic trait – compare *he/hij* – Germ. *er, hun/hem* – Germ. *ihnen/ihn, her/haar* – Germ. *ihr*. Comparison of Dutch *het* with Eng. *it* and Germ. *es* shows that the initial *h* in this case is not etymological; it has been added by analogy with the other personal pronouns in *h* (see *het* meaning ‘the’ on p. 163).

The object forms of the plural have changed somewhat since the above situation in Middle Dutch. The forms in *-m* are clearly originally dative forms which have since been weakened to *hen*; but beside *hen* we now also have *hun*, which is historically purely a regional phonetic variant of *hen*, with rounding of the vowel. The current distinction made between *hen* (acc. or direct object) and *hun* (dat. or indirect object) in the written language, where the spoken language only knows *hun*, has been artificially imposed by grammarians (see p. 108).

The gen. forms (originally ‘of me’, ‘of you’ etc.) in the above paradigm are the forerunners of the current possessive pronouns. The forms *ons* (our) and *uw* (your) have been shortened and a possessive form *jouw* has developed beside *ijj/jou*. The use of *haar* for both ‘her’ and ‘their’ (compare Germ. *ihr-her, ihr-their*) has since been replaced in the plural by *hun*, the dative pronoun, but in very formal written style *haar* is still used for the (frequently feminine) plural e.g. *de prinsessen en haar echtgenoten* (the princesses and their spouses). The unemphatic form of possessive *hun, d’r*, is a remnant of the situation as it was in former times, however.

The unemphatic forms of the pronoun (see p. 61) have also existed since the earliest times and are commonly found as enclitic and proclitic forms in Middle Dutch e.g. *hoordi* < *hoorde gi* or < *hoorde giij*; *hi nam et* (he took it) > *hi namet* > *hi naemt*, where the proclitic pronoun places the short vowel of the verb in an open syllable and causes lengthening. English too knows unemphatic pronouns but does not write them e.g. *ya* (< *you*), *ee* (< *he*).

The third person sing. and plural reflexive pronoun *zich* is of German origin, as the final guttural fricative indicates. Dutch formerly (and even now in dialects and Afrikaans) used the object form of the third person pronouns as reflexives, as we still do in English e.g. he washes himself/she washes herself/they wash themselves – compare Afr. *hy was hom/sy was haar/hulle was hulle*. *Zich* did not become common in Holland until the sixteenth century, under the influence of Reforma
tion literature from Germany. Its incorporation into the State Translation of the Bible in the seventeenth century assured it of a place in *ABN*. However, in *plat* one still very commonly hears the following forms, an indication that *zich* is not an indigenous word: *z’n eigen* (lit. his own)/*d’r eigen* (lit. her own, their own).
Demonstrative and relative pronouns

As the definite article developed from the unstressed forms of the demonstrative pronoun, the original paradigm for the demonstratives is on p. 163. Certain adverbs and conjunctions (actually also adverbal phrases) still retain case forms of *die* as they appear in that paradigm e.g. *sindsdien* (since, adv. < since that), *indien* (if, conj. < in that [case]); also *met dien verstande* (on the understanding that). The genitive form *diens* also still alternates with *zijn* as a possessive pronoun in certain contexts e.g. *de gouverneur en diens echtgenote* (the governor and his wife).

Originally in Germanic there was no particular relative pronoun, as is still often the case in English and the Scandinavian languages e.g. The man (whom, that) I saw yesterday. Dutch, like German, also gave the function of relative pronoun to the demonstrative pronoun (*die*, *dat*) but unlike German uses the interrogative pronoun (*wie*) when a preposition is involved. The common use of *waar* as a relative instead of *wie* in combination with prepositions and the rather *plat* (also Afrikaans) use of *wat* as a general relative regardless of antecedent, also show the utilisation of originally interrogative forms; the variety of possibilities of relative pronouns, also well illustrated in English (*who*[m], that, which, what, -), is a result of the absence of specifically relative forms in Old Germanic. The use of *welk* as a relative pronoun is probably in imitation of Latin and it is a form which is still only found in formal written style.

The initial *w* of interrogative forms (e.g. *wat*-what, *waar*-where, *wanneer*-when, *welk*-which, *wie*-who) is derived from Germanic forms in *hw* (< IE. *kw* via the First German Sound Shift). They are common to all Germanic languages. Middle Dutch knows a paradigm for *wie*, both as an interrogative and a relative pronoun, which is similar to that for *die* (p. 163) by which it had been greatly influenced. This accounts for the rather formal genitive forms *wiens* (masc.) and *wier* (fem. and pl very formal) which are occasionally used in the written language but are more commonly replaced by the periphrastic forms *wie z’/d’r* or *van wie* in speech e.g. *Wiens jas is dat?* (Whose coat is that? – interr.), *De man wiens jas ...* (The man whose coat ... ) – compare German *Wessen Mantel ist das? Der Mann, dessen Mantel ... .

The loss of case in Dutch has led to the more frequent occurrence of analytical forms such as *waarvan* (whose), *aan wie* (to whom < former dat. *wien*). The use of *van* in the genitive is particularly striking in Dutch when compared with English and above all German: *het huis van de man* (the man’s house – Germ. *das Haus des Mannes*). Constructions like the English are not unknown in Dutch (e.g. *mijn vaders auto* – my father’s car) but they are not nearly as common (see p. 58).

Verbs

Regular and irregular verbs are known as weak and strong verbs respectively in Germanic languages, terms (invented by J. Grimm) which are also applied to nouns and adjectives, but where the concepts which they indicate are of course quite different. There is no distinction between weak and strong verbs in the present tense; only in the imperfect and in the formation of the past participle is the
difference between the two evident. The dental suffix of the imperfect and past participle of weak verbs is characteristic of all Germanic languages.

Originally in Germanic there were but two tenses – the present tense, which was also used to express the future, and the preterite (now called imperfect), which expressed all actions in the past. However new compound tenses, the perfect and the pluperfect, which are formed from the verbs ‘to be’ and ‘to have’ plus the past participle (previously used only adjectively and substantively) had already begun to develop simultaneously in both Romance and Germanic languages in the old period i.e. prior to 1100.

By the Middle Dutch period, Dutch thus had the following tenses: present tense, imperfect tense, perfect tense, pluperfect tense and a future tense formed with the auxiliary zullen (Eng. shall) plus the infinitive. There were also three moods – the indicative, the imperative and the subjunctive (both past and present) The subjunctive in Dutch has undergone a similar fate to that in English since the Middle Ages and is now only found in standard expressions and occasionally in literary style. The development of the verbal system in Dutch and English has been parallel; only in use of the tenses (see p. 65) have the two languages diverged to any great extent. German, on the other hand, has preserved both the present and past subjunctive.

Present tense
In the present tense, where there was and is no distinction between a weak and a strong verb, a verb was conjugated in Middle Dutch as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{woenen}^{14} & \text{(to live)} \\
1 & \text{ic woene} \\
2 & \text{du woens} (< \text{woenes}) \\
3 & \text{hi woent} (< \text{woenet}) \\
1 & \text{wi woenen} \\
2 & \text{ghi woent} (< \text{woenet}) \\
3 & \text{si woenen} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{nemen} & \text{(to take)} \\
1 & \text{ic neme} \\
2 & \text{du neems} (< \text{nemes}) \\
3 & \text{hi neemt} (< \text{nemet}) \\
1 & \text{wi nemen} \\
2 & \text{ghi neemt} (< \text{nemet}) \\
3 & \text{si nemen} \\
\end{array}
\]

The present subjunctive differed from the above only in the third person singular, which was identical to the first person singular.\(^{15}\)

Comparison of the above conjugation, which stays close to the situation as preserved in Gothic, with that on page 63 reveals the following changes since Middle Dutch times:
1. The -e ending of the first person singular has been apocopated, chiefly a post Middle Dutch development; it still occurs occasionally in standard expressions e.g. Verzoekte ... (I kindly request that ... ) Verblijve ... (I remain ... )
2. The second person singular, like the third person singular and second person plural, usually showed apocope of the vowel in the final syllable in Middle Dutch, but the older longer form is still found in many Middle Dutch texts. The ending of

---

14. This spelling was common in Middle Dutch for long o.
15. This third person present subjunctive ending is still found in formal imperatives e.g. lang leve de koningin (long live the queen); meu neme één ei (take one egg, in recipes).
the second person singular is now identical to the third person but there has been a change of pronoun since the above situation existed (see p. 171); since the substitution of *du with *jij (<gij), the ending -t, a second person plural ending, is now used in the singular. In Middle Dutch the ending -st often accompanies *du, as in German, the origin of this ending being the inverted form of the verb and subject i.e. nemes – *du > nemesu > nemes – *du > *du nemes. Inversion of *jij with the verb ending in *t led to assimilation of the *t in early Modern Dutch e.g. *jij neemt but neem je?

3 The long vowel in all persons of a verb like nemen above is the result of it having originally been followed by a second syllable which opened the preceding syllable to cause lengthening. Even once the vowel of some endings was syncopated, the analogy with other persons preserved a long vowel throughout – compare German ich nehme (long), *du nimmt (short, with Umlaut of e < OHG nimis, OWLF *nemis).

4 Although jullie has nowadays replaced gij as the second person plural in ABN and can also take a -t ending, it is more usual for it to take -en by analogy with the first and second persons plural.

We see here a unitary plural form where the ending of the first and third persons, which fell together in pre-history, is applied to the second person. In the Saxon based dialects of the east of Holland and northern Germany, however, it is the dental ending of the second person which has been applied analogously to the other two persons. This is also the case in Old English and Old Frisian.

5 Due to its origin, u (see p. 171), which did not exist in Middle Dutch, can take either a second or a third person singular ending, but as both these persons now end in -t, this duality is not usually obvious; the verbs hebben (to have) and zijn (to be) are the only ones where the second and third persons differ (see p. 182).

The imperfect and the past participle of weak verbs

The origin of the dental suffix of the preterite (now imperfect) in Germanic has been the subject of much debate among philologists; it would go beyond the aim of this book to delve into this problem. Suffice it to say here that there is considerable evidence (especially in Gothic) to suggest that the ending is derived from the verb ‘to do’.

The imperfect of a weak verb in Middle Dutch was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ic hoorde</td>
<td>(&lt; ede)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>du hoordes</td>
<td>(&lt; edes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hi hoorde</td>
<td>(&lt; ede)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>wi hoorden</td>
<td>(&lt; eden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ghi hoordet</td>
<td>(&lt; edet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>si hoorden</td>
<td>(&lt; eden)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. In Germanic there were originally four classes of weak verbs (as in Gothic) which were distinguished by the vowels in the endings. With the weakening of vowels in unstressed syllables, this distinction was doomed to extinction and eventually all four groups fell together. This was already the situation by the Middle Dutch period where the endings -de or -ede were applied willy-nilly to any weak verb, whereas historically -ede was the ending of the first class of weak verbs, the so-called jan-verbs.
The imperfect indicative and subjunctive of weak verbs had fallen together in Middle Dutch.

The current alternation of -te(n) and -de(n) endings employed in the formation of the past tense of weak verbs is the result of assimilation of the initial consonant of the ending (i.e. \(-de < -ede\)) to the final sound of the stem of the verb. Wherever the medial vowel was preserved in Middle Dutch, although forms without it are already more common by then, assimilation of \(d\) to \(t\) was prevented. Nevertheless, Middle Dutch spelling is still too erratic to show the regularity modern spelling does with regard to these endings (see p. 63).

In those areas where \(gij\) is still used, the ending is as in the above paradigm. Otherwise, as \(du\) and its verbal forms have died out and \(jullie\) has followed the other plural persons, there is now a complete falling together of the three persons of the singular to \(-de\) or \(-te\) and of the three persons of the plural to \(-den\) or \(-ten\). In practice, of course, all six endings are pronounced the same in that large area of the Low Countries where final \(n\) after \(a\) has been apocopated. We witness here a de facto simplification of verbal endings which is analogous to the situation in English – compare \(I/you/he/we/they\) worked.

The dental ending of the past participle of weak verbs:
Historically the \(t/d\) ending of the past participle is also derived from an original \(d\), but with the same distinction having been applied as for the imperfect. In this instance, however, as final \(d\) is always devoiced to \(t\) in Dutch, the distinction in spelling is not heard unless the past participle is inflected (i.e. when used adjectively or substantively) e.g. \(gekocht\) (bought) / \(geverfd\) (painted) – both pronounced \(t\), but \(het geverfde huis\) (the painted house), pronounced \(d\).

The prefix \(ge\)-
The unstressed prefix \(ge\)-, which in both Dutch and German precedes all past participles whether of weak or strong verbs17, was formerly known in English too, but English, along with Frisian, has dispensed with it18; it is still heard in some English dialects in palatalised form as \(ye\). It occurs in Gothic as \(ga\)- but is not yet associated with past participles there; it is by origin a prefix which designated completion (i.e. perfectiveness of an action in general and thus also some infinitives could and still do begin with \(ge\) e.g. \(geloven\) (to believe), \(gelukken\) (to succeed), \(geraken\) (to attain). As past participles by definition stress the perfectiveness of an action, the prefix became very much identified with them in West Germanic and was eventually applied to all – for some strong verbs it became a means of distinguishing between the infinitive and the past participle e.g. \(vallen\) (to fall) – \(gevallen\) (fallen). Nevertheless there were several verbs which were apparently already felt to be perfective in meaning whose past participles still did not take \(ge\)- in Middle Dutch e.g. \(bracht\) (brought), \(komen\) (come), \(vonden\) (found), \(worden\) (become). From the fifteenth century these verbs too began to adopt \(ge\)-, as did

17. Except when such verbs already begin with an unstressed prefix i.e. \(be\)-, \(her\)-, \(ont\)-, \(ver\)- etc. or are inseparable verbs.
18. Loss of the prefix is also found in several Dutch dialects, notably in West Friesland, the north and the east. Other areas know an \(a\) prefix.
verbs of foreign origin – compare Dutch *gereserveerd, gestudeerd* etc. and German *reserviert, studiert*.

The verbs *blijven* (to remain, < *belijven*), *blussen* (to extinguish, < *belussen* – compare Germ. *löschen*), and *vreten* (to eat, < *vereten*) contain a contracted unstressed prefix which is no longer felt to be such and thus can take *ge-* in the past participle i.e. *gebleven, geblust, gevreten*. Compare also Dutch *geloven* (to believe) – past participle *gehoord*, German *glauben* – past participle *geglaubt*.

Verbs which are often regarded as ‘irregular’ by the student of the language but which are in fact historically weak verbs are *brengen/bracht/gebracht* (to bring), *denken/dacht/gedacht* (to think) *dunken/docht/* – (to seem); *kopen/kocht/gekocht* (to buy), *plegen/placht/* – (to be used to), *zoeken/zocht/gezocht* (to seek). Comparison with the English past forms ‘brought/thought/sought’ illustrates that the concept is not foreign to English either. The group is also smaller in German than in Dutch. The past tense of the first three verbs shows the results of a prehistoric compensatory lengthening (i.e. loss of *n* plus lengthening of the preceding vowel) with a later shortening of the vowel before the cluster -cht; in English the vowel is still long, unlike Dutch. The shift from final *-kta > -chta*, which must have occurred before the loss of the nasal, is thus also prehistoric and common to all West Germanic languages (and Gothic). The latter three verbs have also undergone this shift and lost the final e, which is still present in German (brachte, dachte), by apocope19; it was apparently considered superfluous as there are other clear signs that these are past tense forms, which is not the case with other weak verbs. *Kopen* (kocht) shows the regular Low Franconian shift of *ft > cht* (see p. 153); *ft < pt* is comparable to the *cht < kt* in the other verbs in this group i.e. a shift from voiceless stop to voiceless spirant (Auslautverschärfung). *Brengen/bracht* shows alternation of vowels due to Ablaut but the vowel in *dacht* is the result of Rückumlaut i.e. the *e* in *denken* (< *tanktan*) goes back to an original *a* which has been retained in the past, where there was no Umlautsfaktor following.

The imperfect and past participle of strong verbs
The degree to which Dutch has preserved the seven Ablaut series known to all Germanic languages is an unusually conservative aspect of its morphology. But even English, in most respects even more morphologically progressive than Dutch, has preserved the original situation quite well. The Ablaut series as they are in Dutch today are on p. 64 and can be compared with the following situation as it was in Middle Dutch:

19. Apocope of final *e* is characteristic of many aspects of the historical morphology of Dutch and contrasts distinctly with German – see the 1st person sing. of the present tense of verbs (p. 174), loss of *-e* by feminine nouns (p. 166) and weak nouns (p. 167).
The only significant changes have been in series 3 where the singular of verbs in group a have adopted the vowel of the plural and past participle. In German the reverse has occurred in the preterite – compare band/banden/gebunden. In addition, those verbs in group b whose stem ends on l or r + consonant, have since adopted the vocalism of group 7 in the preterite e.g. helpen (to help) – help, sterven (to die) – stierf, werpen (to throw) – wierp; compare German helfen – helf, sterben – starb, werfen – warf.

The alternation of a short vowel and a long vowel in the singular and plural of verbs in series 4 and 5 is an example of the phonological conservatism of Dutch; this is the original Germanic situation whereas German shows analogy with the plural in these instances, as both the singular and the plural contain a long vowel – compare nahm/nahmen, gab/gaben.21

The seven Ablaut series show fewer deviations in Dutch than in German, where, for example, group 1 has divided into two sub-sections: German steigen/stieg/gestiegen, schneiden/schnitt/geschnitten and Dutch stijgen/steeg/gestegen, snijden/sneed/gesneden; group 2 in German has verbs with both long and short vowels depending on the consonant that follows: biegen/bog/gebogen21 (long), riechen/roch/gerochen21 (short) versus Dutch buigen/boog/gebogen, ruiken/rook/geroeken.22

Strong verbs were conjugated as follows in the past tense in Middle Dutch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>indicative</th>
<th>subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ic nam</td>
<td>nāme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>du names, &lt; naems</td>
<td>nāmes, &lt; naems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hi nam</td>
<td>nāme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>wi nāmen</td>
<td>nāmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ghi nāmet, &lt; naemt</td>
<td>nāmet, &lt; naemt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>si nāmen</td>
<td>nāmen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. These forms are those that differ from the situation as it is today.
21. German spelling does not reflect as regularly as Dutch spelling which vowels are long and which are short.
22. The Second German Sound Shift created in many cases a double consonant sound in German which locked the preceding vowel into a closed syllable and prevented lengthening, unlike in Dutch, where lengthening in open syllables could take place unimpeded.
The s ending of the second person sing., which is also found in Middle High German, is not historical – Gothic has namt – but is probably by analogy with the present tense and the subjunctive. Nowadays analogy has reduced the indicative to two forms nam/namen. In areas where gij is still used, its verb still ends in -t and takes the vowel of the plural i.e. in Ablaut series where the plural differs from the singular e.g. gij waart (you were) but gij was.

The imperfect indicative and the imperfect subjunctive of weak verbs had fallen together in Middle Dutch, as in MHG and ME. The imperfect subjunctive of strong verbs, which has now fallen together with the imperfect indicative in Dutch and English, still preserved different forms in the first and third persons singular in Middle Dutch, however – compare als het ware (as it were).

The falling together of the above paradigms which we see taking place here, did not occur in German where Umlaut distinguishes between the two e.g. ich nahm/ nähme, ich ab/äbe etc. Dutch and English, in as far there is any need to distinguish between the two forms, now use a periphrastic construction (see p. 67) i.e. a further analytical development that these two share that German doesn’t.

Strong verbs changing class or becoming weak i.e. mixed verbs

Although Dutch, German and English all still preserve certain patterns among their strong verbs which can be traced back directly to the seven Ablautseries inherited from Old Germanic, in all three languages a degree of interchange between the classes of the strong verb and between strong and weak verbs has occurred. The instances of a strong verb joining another strong class with which it shares one or other phonetic similarity are not as numerous or as obvious, from the point of view of the student, as those of strong verbs that have become (usually only partially) weak. Comparison of such words in related languages can reveal former situations which analogy has since disguised. The English verb ‘to laugh’, for example, is a weak verb, as it is in German (lachen/lachte/gelacht); only when one is confronted with Modern Dutch lachen/lachte/gelachen does one realise that Eng. ‘to laugh’ and German lachen were originally also strong. Lachen, as its past participle in Dutch indicates, was formerly a group 6 verb and it occurs in Middle Dutch as such i.e. lachen/loech – loeghen/ghelachen.

It is group 6 in particular that has shown a tendency to turn weak in the imperfect but the phenomenon is not exclusive to this group:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{bakken} & \text{(to bake)} & \text{bakte} & \text{gebakken} \\
\text{laden} & \text{(to load)} & \text{laadde} & \text{geladen} \\
\text{malen} & \text{(to grind)} & \text{maalde} & \text{gemalen} \\
\text{wrekken} & \text{(to avenge)} & \text{wreekte} & \text{gewroken} \\
\text{brouwen} & \text{(to brew)} & \text{brouwde} & \text{gebrouwen} \\
\text{weven} & \text{(to weave)} & \text{weefde} & \text{geweven}
\end{array}
\]

(23). The e ending of the imperfect subjunctive was originally an i (i.e. an Umlautsfaktor) and was weakened to e in unstressed syllables.

(24). For example: wegen (to weigh, group 5) joined group 2; steken (to sting, group 5) got a new past part., gestoken, by analogy with breken (to break) etc. in group 4. (see also p. 178).
The term often given to these verbs is mixed verbs. They are the product of various analogies such as we hear children and foreigners and even ourselves applying daily to English verbs e.g. snuck < to sneak, shat < to shit; striked < to strike.

What we now call group 7 is, from an Indo-European and Old Germanic point of view, a separate class altogether from groups 1-6. It contained the so-called reduplicating verbs which formed their past with or without Ablaut of the root vowel of the verb plus the addition of a reduplicating prefix. However, as such reduplicated forms are not recorded in any of the West Germanic languages\(^{25}\), not even in the oldest period, tradition has assigned them the status of group 7 in the Ablaut series as they now form their past tense by the application of Ablaut in the same way as other strong verbs. That they have at one time had a special status is possibly reflected in the fact that many of these group 7 verbs are now mixed verbs or have become totally weak:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>heten</th>
<th>(to be called)</th>
<th>heette</th>
<th>geheten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spannen</td>
<td>(to stretch)</td>
<td>spande</td>
<td>gespannen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoten</td>
<td>(to push)</td>
<td>stootte</td>
<td>gestoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vouwen</td>
<td>(to fold)</td>
<td>vouwde</td>
<td>gevouwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vloeken</td>
<td>(to swear)</td>
<td>vloekte</td>
<td>gevloekt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zaaien</td>
<td>(to sow)</td>
<td>zaaid</td>
<td>gezaaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waaien</td>
<td>(to blow)</td>
<td>waaid</td>
<td>gewaaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also woei (&lt; group 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modal verbs or preterite-presents**

The term modal verb, which all readers should be acquainted with, to denote the verbs *kunnen* (to be able), *mogen* (to be allowed to), *moeten* (to have to) and *zullen* (will), is of little validity or utility when one looks at the rather irregular conjugations of such verbs from an historical point of view. In terms of historical linguistics these verbs belong to the so-called preterite-presents, a class to which several other verbs also did or do belong. A preterite-present, a concept known to other Indo-European languages as well as to all other Germanic languages, is a verb which in form is a past tense (*kan, mag* – compare *nam*-took, *lag*-lay) but in meaning is a present (*ik kan*– I can, am able; *ik mag* – I may, am allowed to). The origin of such verbs lies in a time when there was but one form of the past tense, the preterite, which thus also rendered the perfect tense i.e. *ik kan* – lit. I have come to know (preterite) therefore I can (present).

The preterite-presents, like the imperfect of strong verbs (actually preterites), know only one form for all persons in the singular and one for the plural:

**present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kunnen</th>
<th>mogen</th>
<th>zullen</th>
<th>moeten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik kan</td>
<td>mag</td>
<td>zal</td>
<td>moet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jij/u kan/kunt(^{26})</td>
<td>mag</td>
<td>zal/zult(^{26})</td>
<td>moet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hij kan</td>
<td>mag</td>
<td>zal/zul</td>
<td>moet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij kunnen</td>
<td>mogen</td>
<td>zullen</td>
<td>moeten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jullie kunnen</td>
<td>mogen</td>
<td>zullen</td>
<td>moeten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zij kunnen</td>
<td>mogen</td>
<td>zullen</td>
<td>moeten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. The past tense of *doen* (to do) is a possible exception (see p. 182).
26. Younger analogical forms with the plural *gij* to which *jij* is related.
imperfect:
kon (< konde)/konden   mocht/mochten   zou (< zoude)/zouden   moest/moesten

past participle:
gekund   gemoogd, gemogen   gezuld   gemoeten

The infinitives have been formed by analogy with the plural forms of the present according to which Ablaut series the verb is derived from. Similarly, as the present tense forms are preterites in origin, new analogical imperfects had to be invented; they are all weak. The past participles are a good example of the options that were at the disposal of these verbs for forming their past tenses – *kunn(e)n* and *zullen* have formed past participles by analogy with weak verbs, *moeten* by analogy with strong verbs while *mogen* has exploited both possibilities; nowadays the strong form of *mogen* is the more common, however.

*Weten* (to know – compare ‘to wit/I wot’) is also a preterite-present by origin i.e. ‘I have seen’ thus ‘I know’ (compare Lat. *vidi* – I have seen). For this reason it also has irregular past forms: *wist*/geweten – compare German *wissen*/ich *weiß*/wußte/gewußt.

*Willen* (to want to):
This verb, although usually regarded as a modal verb, has a different origin from the other modals. It is not a preterite-present but, as comparison with Gothic clearly shows, a preterite subjunctive by origin where the meaning must have been something like ‘I would like’ therefore ‘I want’ – compare German ich *möchte*:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ik wil} & \quad \text{wij willen} \\
\text{jij wil/wilt} & \quad \text{jullie willen} \\
\text{hij wil} & \quad \text{zij willen}
\end{align*}
\]

imperfect: *wou* (< *woude* < *wolde*), *wilde/wilden*

past part: *gewild*

The imperfect forms *wilde(n)* and the past part. *gewild* are by analogy with weak verbs, as is *wou*, but here we see an Ablaut variant common in * Hollands* and competing with the Flemish form *wilde*; the plural *wouden* (pron. *wouwen*) is never written and is regarded as *plat Hollands*. In English too, forms with *i* and *o* alternate e.g. will, won’t, would.

It should be noted that Dutch retained the verb *zullen* (Eng. shall) as the auxiliary for forming the future tense, whereas English, after letting ‘shall’ and ‘will’ compete for some time, has finally opted for the latter to form the future tense.

---

27. The forms of the preterite-presents enable us to identify which Ablaut series they originally belonged to e.g. *weten* (1), *kunn(e)n* (3), *zullen* (4), *mogen* (5), *moeten* (6).

28. With apocope of the final *e* (see p. 177). The *i* of the past tense alternates with the *e* of the infinitive because short *i* lengthened to long *e* in open syllables – compare *schip* (ship)/*schepen* (ships).
The monosyllabic verbs
The six monosyllabic verbs known to Dutch are of various origins. *Doen*, *staan* and *gaan* are original root verbs. *Doen* (to do) with its past tense *deed/deden* is possibly the only surviving example of a reduplicating verb (see p. 180). *Staan* (to stand) and *gaan* (to go) contrast with German *stehen* and *gehen*, where the *h* is purely orthographical, and they too are usually pronounced as one syllable. West Germanic knew forms *gangan* and *standan*. The past tense of *staan*, *stond/stonden*, as well as the English infinitive, are clearly derived from this alternative form. The past tense of *gaan*, *ging/gingen*, is the result of an analogy between *gangen* and *hangen* (to hang) and *vangen* (to catch) which are class 7 verbs; in Middle Dutch (and Old English) they too occur as the younger contracted forms *haen* and *vaen* (*< vānen* <*vāXen*<*vanXen*). In *plat*, the analogical form *sting* (*= stond*) is heard as well as *gong* (i.e. *ging*).

The verbs *slaan* (to hit – Germ. *schlagen*) and *zien* (to see – Germ. *sehen*) are not root verbs by origin but later contractions of forms with medial [X] – compare Gothic *slahan*, *sathwan*.

Zijn
The final monosyllabic verb, ‘to be’, shows great irregularity of form as it has in fact inherited its constituent parts from various verbs – compare ‘I go/I went’. In simple terms there are forms derived from *b*-roots (Eng. *be*), *s*-roots (Lat. *essere*) and the verb *wezen* (Eng. *was/were*), a strong verb belonging to group 5. The present tense in Middle Dutch was as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ie} & \quad \text{bem/ben} & \quad \text{wi} & \quad \text{sijn} \\
\text{du} & \quad \text{best/bist} & \quad \text{ghi} & \quad \text{sijt} \\
\text{hi} & \quad \text{es/is} & \quad \text{si} & \quad \text{sijn}
\end{align*}
\]

In Modern Dutch, *du* and its form of the verb have died out, but *jij* has preserved the *b*-root in *jij bent* by analogy with the first person. *Jullie* has fallen into line with the other plural forms so that we now have only one form in the plural. In *plat*, the analogous form *benne* is sometimes heard throughout the plural.

The verb *wezen*, which also exists as an alternative infinitive to *zijn* in Modern Dutch, has provided *zijn* with its past tense *was/waren* (also the imperfect subjunctive form *ware*) and its weak past part. *geweest*. The strong past part. *gewezen*, which German uses, now exists in Dutch only as an adjective e.g. *de gewezen burgemeester* (the ex-lord mayor). Dutch *was/waren* and English *was/were* show the alternation of *s* and *r* (*< z*) as a result of grammatical change; in German *war/waren*, the consonant of the plural has been adopted by analogy into the singular. The alternative infinitive *wezen* also provides the imperative – *wees braaf* (be good) – but in Middle Dutch the *b*-root (*Eng. be*) and *s*-root (*Germ. sei*) forms also existed. The present subjunctive form *zij* is now only found in certain standard expressions e.g. *God zij dank* (God be thanked).

Hebben
The verb ‘to have’ is historically a weak verb but it now shows irregularities which are peculiar to it. To begin with, only *hebben*, along with *zijn*, has a different ending
in the present tense for the second and third person singular i.e. *jij hebt*, *hij heeft* and thus *u hebt* or *heeft* (see p. 171). Heeft occurs in Middle Dutch as *hevet*, where *v* could alternate regularly with *b* in intervocalic position, and the vowel of the ending is preserved, which thus lengthened the root vowel in an open syllable. The modern form is a contraction of the Middle Dutch form. *Jij* has preserved the second person plural ending indigenous to *gij*, which it has replaced. Dutch *hebben* contrasts with German *haben* (also *zeggen*/*sagen* – to say) as it joined the first class of weak verbs, which contained an Umlautsfaktor in the ending, in the pre-Middle Dutch period. In the past tense and past part. the original *a* has been preserved and the *b* has been assimilated i.e. *had* (older *hadde*)/*gehad* – compare Germ. *hatte* (also with assimilation)/*gebraht*. Such alternation of vowels between the present and past tense forms is found in many more verbs in German e.g. *kennen* (to know) – *kannte*/*gekannt*; *rennen* (to run) – *rannte*/*gerannt*30 – compare Dutch *kennen* – *kende* / *gekend*; *rennen* – *rende*/*gerend*.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

LOEY, A. van *Schönfeld’s historische grammatica van het Nederlands*. Thieme, Zutphen, 1959 (see p. 160).


---

29. *Plat Hollands* uses *heb* in the third person singular.

30. This is due to a phenomenon known as Rückumlaut (see p. 177).
Glossary

The following definitions, which could have been more detailed in some instances, relate to how the terms are used in this book.

**Ablaut:** (German term) regular system of alternation of vowels in the same consonantal environment; the alternation denotes a distinction in meaning e.g. sing/sang/sung/song.

**ABN:** abbreviation of *Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands* (General Cultivated Dutch) – see p. 17.

**affricate:** a stop (see stop) plus movement into the corresponding fricative (see fricative) position e.g. *ts, pf, kch.*

**allograph:** see grapheme.

**allophone:** see phoneme.

**analogue change:** the occasional and unpredictable tendency of a word or form to be pulled out of its natural orbit of development by the attraction of another word or form with which it has a real or fancied resemblance.

**Anlaut, Auslaut, Inlaut:** (German terms) at the beginning, at the end and in the middle of a word respectively.

**apocope:** the loss of a final vowel e.g. MNL *ic neme* > NNL *ik neem*.

**aspiration:** the addition of a perceptible breath, or h-sound, after a stop or plosive e.g. Eng. *phot, thop.*

**Auslaut:** see Anlaut.

**Auslaufsverschärfung:** (lit. final sharpening – a German term) the devoicing of voiced stops and fricatives at the end of a word, common to Dutch and German but foreign to English e.g. *leven-leef*.

**back vowel:** a vowel which is articulated in the back of the mouth – see chart on p. 132.

**beschaafd:** (lit. civilised, cultured) standard, non-low class.

**checked vowel:** see p. 46.

**closed syllable:** a syllable ending in a consonant e.g. *zet-ten* – see open syllable.

**cognate (form):** words in two or more languages from the same original source e.g. Eng. *beam/*Dutch *boom*, as distinct from a loan word e.g. Eng. *boom* (< Dutch *boom*).

**compensatory lengthening:** the lengthening of a short vowel to compensate for the loss of a following nasal in the combination short vowel + n + fricative e.g. Dutch *mond* – Eng. *mouth*.

**compound grapheme:** see grapheme.

**cultuurtaal:** (lit. language of culture) standard language, R.P.

**diphthong:** a sound made by gliding continuously from the position for one vowel to that for another.

**diphthongisation:** see p. 131.

**Ersatzdelegation:** (German term) – see compensatory lengthening.

**etymology:** that branch of linguistics which deals with the origin and history of words.
fricative: a consonant produced by friction caused by the air moving through a narrow passage somewhere in the mouth e.g. f, s, th, v, z.

front vowel: a vowel whose point of articulation is in the front of the mouth – see chart on p. 132.

fronting: bringing a sound, whether vowel or consonant, from the back to the front of the mouth.

gemination: doubling or prolonging of a sound, especially consonants, usually indicated by a double letter in writing.

grapheme: the smallest unit of writing that distinguishes one meaning from another; compound grapheme – a group of two or more letters representing a single sound; allograph – a positional or other variant of a written symbol or grapheme.

gutteral: see velar.

Ingwaeronism: see p. 128.

Inlaut: see Anlaut.

isogloss: a line on a map marking the boundaries within which a given linguistic phenomenon is to be found.

methathesis: a sporadic sound change whereby there is a transposition of the order of sounds within a word.

monophthong: a phoneme produced as a single sound.

monophthongisation: see p. 131.

morphology: the science and study of the smallest meaningful units of language and of their formation into words – includes inflection and derivation but not syntax.

oblique cases: a collective term for all declensional cases other than the nominative.

open syllable: a syllable ending in a vowel e.g. pra-ten – see closed syllable.

palatal sound: any sound formed by placing the front of the tongue against the hard palate as in front vowels for example.

phoneme: a minimal unit of distinctive sound; allophone – a positional variant of a phoneme which occurs in a specific environment and does not differentiate meaning e.g. the different k-sounds in cat and kit.

phonetics: the analysis and classification of speech sounds including how they are produced in the mouth – compare phonology.

phonology: a description of the sounds of a language and how they function in that language – compare phonetics.

plat: a non- or sub-standard form, often dialectical in origin.

plosive: see stop.

Randstad: (lit. rim city) the collective name given to the following cities in the west of the Netherlands which almost form a circle: Haarlem, Amsterdam, Utrecht, Rotterdam, Delft, The Hague, and Leiden. Together they play a dominant role in the economic, political, sociological and linguistic life of the Netherlands.

rhotacism: the shift from intervocalic voiced s (i.e. [z] to [r]) e.g. kiezen – keuren.

rounding, unrounding: pronouncing a sound with the lips rounded or unrounded respectively – compare choose (rounded) and cheese (unrounded).

schwa: (a Hebrew term) the colourless, indistinct, neutral vowel represented by the symbol [ə] e.g. father, enough.

stop: a consonant that momentarily halts the flow of breath e.g. p, t, k, b, d – also called a plosive.

svarabhakti: (a Sanscrit term) the insertion of a vowel to break up a troublesome consonant cluster e.g. film [filam].

syncope: the loss of a medial sound.

syntax: the study of word order.

Umlaut: (a German term) see p. 132.

Umlautsfaktor: (a German term) the i or j (often weakened to o or lost altogether)
which causes the back vowel in a previous syllable to mutate to a front vowel.

see rounding.

uvular:
a consonant, usually \( r \), produced by contact between the back of the tongue and the uvula.

velar:
a consonant formed by the back of the tongue against the soft palate – also called gutteral.

vocalisation:
the change of a consonant to a semi-vowel or vowel.

voiced:
sounds produced with simultaneous vibration of the vocal cords i.e. all vowels and the following consonants for example \( b, d, g, v, z \); the voiceless or devoiced counterparts of these consonants are \( p, t, k, f, s \).

*Note:* Several of the definitions in this glossary have been taken (almost) verbatim from M. Pei, ‘*Glossary of Linguistic Terminology*’, Anchor Books, New York, 1966.
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a:
- short, devt. of 133
- long, devt. of 136
aat:
- devt. of 149
abbreviations:
- list of XII
Ablaut: 139, 141, 185 (see also strong verbs)
ABN: see Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands
Activism: see Frontism
adjectives:
- modern 60, 79
- inflection 60
- comparative/superlative 60
- participle 62
- devt. of 168
- inflection 168
- comparative/superlative 169
adverbs: 60, 80
Afrikaans: 3, 33, 41n, 49n, 136, 140, 141, 157
158, 169, 172
Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands (ABN): 5, 13, 17
41, 49, 52, 55, 103, 106, 143, 146, 150, 185
American Revolution: 113
Amsterdam: 11, 97, 101ff., 146, 156, 186
AN: see Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands
analogy: 133, 164, 168, 175, 179, 185
ancien régime: 24
Anglo-Saxons: 20, 86
- missions 89
Antwerp: 23, 26, 95, 97, 101, 146
apocope:
- final e 128, 132
- final t 13, 156
articles: 58, 60
- devt. of 162ff.
assimilation: 55, 132
au:
- devt. of 148
Auslautverschärfung: 36, 150, 185
Australia: 3, 146n
Austrian Netherlands: 24
auw:
- devt. of 148
b:
- devt. of 150, 158
Barbarians: 85f.
Bargoens: 20
Batavians: 85, 87
Batavian Republic: 114f.
Bavai: 87
Beets, Nicholas: 115
Belgae: 20
Belgium: 16f., 20f.
Benrather Line: 16, 123
Beweging van Tachtig: 108
Bible:
- Van Liesveldt 99
- State translation (Statenvertaling) 99, 108,
  116, 171, 172
- Louvain 99
- Luther 99
- Gothic 125
Bilderdijk, Willem: 114
Boniface: 89f.
Boulogne: 87
Brabant:
- province 23
- Bible 99
- dialect and influence 11, 13f., 18, 23, 95, 101,
  103, 107f., 127, 138, 141, 143, 146, 154, 158
Bredero, G.A.: 106, 107
Bruges: 21n., 23, 95
Brussels: 23, 24, 26, 28f., 32, 34, 95
Burgundy: 23
c:
Calvinism: 99, 107, 108
Canninefates: 85
Canada: 3
Carolingians: 88f., 91
Cats., J.: 107
case: 59, 72
- devt. of 162
Catholic Church: 15, 30, 95, 99
Celts: 20, 87, 142

cultuurtaal: 24, 33, 185
d:
- devt. of 126, 155
- vocalisation of 50
- syncope of 155f.
Dagobert I: 89
Dekker, Eduard Douwes: 115
Deutsch: 4
Deventer: 97
deoiving: 13, 55
dialects: 9f.
Dictionarium: 103
Diets: 4f., 96
diminutive: 13, 15, 53, 59, 80, 157
diphthongs: 49f.
- diphthongisation 101, 128, 131, 142
- tendency of o and e in Hollands 13
- devt. of 142f.
- long: see double vowels
Drenthe: 11
Duits: 4
Dunkirk: 7, 87n.
Dutch Antilles: 3, 110
Dutch East Indies: 110, see also Indonesia
Dutch Guyane: see Surinam
Dutch Revolt: see Eighty Years' War
e:
- short, devt. of 134
- long, devt. of 137
East India Company: 110
E.E.C.: 17, 28, 31
eeuw:
- devt. of 149
ei:
- devt. of 146
Eighty Years' War: 24, 97, 99, 143
English loanwords in Dutch: 34, 48n., 76
er: 68
Erasmus of Rotterdam: 96
Ersatzdehnung: see compensatory lengthening
Etymologicum: 103
eu:
- devt. of 141
Eupen-Malmédy: 30
f:
- devt. of 150
First German Sound Shift: 119, 121, 126
- b 150
- g 152
- h 154
- d 155
- t 156
- p 157
- k 157
contracted forms: 132 (see also syncope/apo-
cope)
Coster, Lauren: 96

Canada: 3
Carolingians: 88f., 91
Cats., J.: 107
case: 59, 72
- devt. of 162
Catholic Church: 15, 30, 95, 99
Celts: 20, 87, 142

ch:
- devt. of 153f.
Chamavi: 85
Chambers of Rhetoric: 101
Charlemagne: 21, 88, 90
Charles V: 23
Charles the Hammer: see Charles Martel
Charles Martel: 89
Chatti (Hessians): 85, 90
Childeric: 88
Christianity:
- spread of and missions: 88f., 93
Clovis: 88f.
Cologne: 85
Comines - Mouscron: see Komen-Moeskroen
Common Market: see E.E.C.
compensatory lengthening: 128, 134, 145, 146,
156, 177, 185
Congo: 34
conjunctions: 68
Conscience, Hendrik: 25
Consonants:
- modern 51ff.
- stops (p, t, k, b, d) 51
- fricatives (g, ch, v, f, z, s) 51f.
- trills (r) 54
- laterals (l) 54f.
- devt. of 150ff.
- b 150
- v/f 150f.
- sch 151f.
- sj 152
- g 152f.
- ch 153f.
- h 154f.
- d 155f.
- t 156f.
- p 157
- k 157
- j 157
- l 157f.
- m 158
- n 158
- r 159
- w 159f.
contracted forms: 132 (see also syncope/apo-
cope)
Coster, Laurens: 96
Flanders: 20ff., 143
flamant: 27
Flemish: 5, 6, 11, 33f., 95, 103, 154, 181
Middle Dutch texts 127
Bible 108
East Flemish 17
West Flemish 9, 13, 17, 127, 143, 150, 154, 156
Flemish Movement: 25f.
Fourons: see Voerstreek
France: 3, 21
ancien régime 24
Revolution 113
French:
culturel 21ff.
in Belgium, see Chapter 3, 33f.
loanwords 33, 75, 78, 104, 106f., 112, 139
as international language 106, 114
Franconian dialects: 11
High 93
Low 91, 93, 118
Franks: 85ff.
Friesland: 89f.
Frisian:
people 85, 89f.
language and dialect influence 11, 13, 97, 103, 108, 128, 138, 140, 143, 150, 151, 152, 153, 176
Frontism and Activism: 26, 27
Gothic: 124f., 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 175
grammar (morphology): see Chapter 6, 58 ff.
historical 16ff.
grammatical change: 122f., 150
Great Migrations: see Chapter 9
Gregory of Tours: 88
Grimm, Jakob: 120
Grimm's Law: see First German Sound Shift
Groene Boekje: 42f.
Groningen: 11, 90, 115
Grootnederlands Gedacht: 26
Gutenberg, Johannes: 96
h:
devt. of 154f.
Haarlem: 96, 110
Habsburgs: 23, 24, 101
Hanseatic League: 109
Heloland: 91
hebben: 182
as an auxiliary verb 66
Hessians (Chatti): 85, 90
De Heuiter, Pontus: 103
High Franconian: 93
High German: 11, 16, 91
in Netherlands, see Limburg
High German Sound Shift: see Second German Sound Shift
Hildebrand: 115
Hochdeutsch: 4, 123
see also High German
Noordhollands (Westfries) 11, 89
Zuidhollands 136, 158
Holy Roman Empire: 21, 23
Hooft, P.C.: 107
Van Hoogstraten, David: 112
Huguenots: 107
Huns: 125
Huydecoper, Balthasar: 112f.
Haygens, Constantijn: 107
hw: 154
hypercorrection: 50m., 137, 156
i:
short, devt. of 135
ie: devt. of 128, 138f.
ij: 36, 38f.
devt. of 128, 145f.
ich line: see Uerdingen Line
imperfect in Germanic languages: 119, 175
Indo-European: 119
Indo-Germanic: see Indo-European
Indonesia: 3, 54n.
see also Dutch East Indies
Ingwaeronisms: 89, 128f., 137, 140, 146, 153, 157, 165, 172
- devt. of 173

\( f \):
- devt. of 153, 157
Jews: 52, 77, 101, 107

\( k \):
- devt. of 157
Ten Kate, Lambert: 112f., 146
-kijn (diminutive suffix): 157
Kiliaen: 103
Kluut, Adriaan: 113
Kollewijn, R.A.: 41
Komen-Moeskroen: 28
koninkskwestie: 28

\( l \):
- devt. of 126, 157f.
language laws:
- of 1932 27
- of 1962 28, 30
Latin: 4, 73, 90, 91, 93, 95f., 103, 112, 124, 127
- loanwords from Romans 88
Leeu van Vlaanderen, De: 25
Leuven: see Louvain
Leiden: 97
- University of 109, 114, 115
Lex Salica: 91
Liège: 23, 25
Van Liesveldt: 99
Limburg: 11, 15f., 89, 93f., 123f., 127, 152, 157
limes: 85f.
Ludger: 89f.
loanwords: 74ff.
- spelling of 42f.
- in Middle Dutch 96
- Latin 88, 124
- English 34, 48n., 76f.
- French 33, 75, 78, 104, 106, 112, 115
- German, 76, 104, 115, 124
- Malay 78
- Yiddish 77
- Dutch words in other languages 109f.
Louvain: 21n., 30, 96
Low German: 4, 16n., 99, 109, 123, 143
Luther, Martin: 99, 108

\( m \):
- devt. of 158
Maastricht: 87
maken/lachen line: see Benrather Line
Malay:
loanwords 78
- Dutch influence on 110
Marchant, H.P.: 41
Max Havelaar: 115
Mennonites: 99
Mercator: 97
Merovech: 88
Merovingians: 88f.
metathesis: 153, 158, 159, 186
Middle Dutch: 93ff.
Moer Dyke: 13
monophthongisation: 131, 137f., 140
Moonen, Arnold: 112
morphology:
- modern Dutch, see Chapter 6, 58ff.
  - articles 58
  - gender 58
  - nouns 58f.
  - case 59
  - possession 58, 62
  - dominatives 59
  - adjectives 60
  - adverbs 60
  - numerals 60f.
  - pronouns 61f.
  - verbs 62ff.
  - conjunctions 68
  - er 68f.
- historical, see Chapter 18, 161ff.
  - case 162
  - gender 162
  - articles 162f.
  - nouns 164ff.
  - adjectives 168f.
  - numerals 169f.
  - pronouns 170f.
  - verbs 173ff.
  - hebben 182f.
  - zijn 182
  - modals 180f.
Muiderkring: 107
Multatuli: 115
Münster, Treaty of: 24

\( n \):
- devt. of 158
Nantes, Edict of: 107
Napoleon: 25, 74, 115
NATO: 17, 28, 31
Nederlands: 5f.
Nederlandse Taalunie: 38
Negerhollands: 110
New York: 110
New Zealand: 3
ng: see g
North Sea Germanic: see Ingwaeronisms
nouns:
Index

- modern Dutch 58f., 79f.
  - plurals 59
  - diminutive 59
  - infinitive as noun 62
- historical devt. 164ff.
  - a-stems 164f.
  - wa-stems 165
  - ja-stems 165
  - e-stems 166
  - jo-stems 167
  - i-stems 167
  - u-stems 167
  - n-stems 167f.
  - weak, see a-stems

numerals: 60f
- historical devt. 169f.
- -tig 170

o:
  - short, devt. of 135
  - long, devt. of 139f

œ:
  - devt. of 127, 140f.

œl: 149
Old Dutch: 91 (see Old West Low Franconian)
Old East Low Franconian: 91
Old Saxon: 127
Old West Low Franconian: 91, 126f.

oœl:
  - devt. of 149
  - orthography: see spelling
  - Ostrogoths: 125
  - œl: 126f., 148, 155f.
  - œul 148

Overijssel: 11
Overmaas, Land van: 28

p:
  - devt. of 157
  - see also b., 150

Panninger Line: 14, 152
palatalisation: 127, 142, 143, 151, 153
personal pronouns: 61, 129
  - devt. of 170f.
Phillip II: 23
Plantin: 97
plæt: 16, 106, 186
Pliny: 85n., 128
possessive pronouns: 62
printing press: 96f.
Protestants: 15, 99f.
pronounal substitution: 34, 61f.
pronouns: 61f.
pronunciation: see Chapter 5, 45ff.
r:
  - devt. of 159
  - influence on environment 133, 134, 137f., 139, 142
  - pronunciation 54
  - metathesis 159
  - rhotacism 122, 157

Radboud: 89
Randsdall: 16, 52, 140, 142, 150, 186
Redbad: 89
rederijkerskamers: 101
Reformation: 100, 172
relative pronouns: 62, 173
Renaissance: 96, 99, 104
rhotacism: 122f., 159, 186
rhyme, as phonetic guide: 95
Romans: 85f.
- loanwords 88
Roorda, Taco: 116
Rotterdam: 11, 40
royal question: 28
Rücklehnwörter: 75
Russian: 109n.
s:
  - devt. of 151
Saint Amandus: 89
Saxon:
  - dialect 11f., 97, 138, 142, 158.
  - Heiland 127
  - tribes 85, 89, 90
sch:
  - devt. of 151f.
Scheldt River: 21
schoolstrijd: 28
schools struggle: 28
schwa: 161, 186
Second German Sound Shift: 74, 123f., 126, 137
Siegenbeek, Matthijs: 114f.

si: 53, 152
South Africa: 3, 109f. (see Afrikaans)
Spanse Brabander: 106
Spain: 23
Spanish Succession, War of: 24
Spelling: see Chapter 4, 36ff.
  - history of 40ff.
  - Spellingbesluit 42
  - Spellingwet 42
  - syllabification 39f.
  - voorkeur-vs. nieuwe 42f.
  - Middle Dutch 95, 103
  - Siegenbeek 114f.
Spieghel, H.L.: 103
Statenvertaling (Bible): 99, 108
Stevin, Simon: 104
stress: 56
  - Germanic 119, 122
Surinam: 3, 110
syllabification: 39f.
syncope: 132, 155, 186
syntax: see word order, 70ff.,

u:
  - devt. of 156f.
  - supplemented: 25
  - supplemented: 25
Tactists: 85n., 128
tangconstructies: 34, 72
tense:
  - use of 65f.
  - see also verbs
Thuringians: 85, 90
-tig (numeral suffix): 170
Tongeren: 87
Tubantes: 85

v:
  - short, devt. of 136
  - long, devt. of 142
Uerdinger Line: 14, 16, 124, 157

vi:
  - devt. of 128, 142ff.
  - unrounded: 128
U.S.A.: 3
  - American Revolution 113
Utrechters: 6, 11, 13, 18, 89, 73, 106, 115, 156, 157
  - Union of 107

v:
  - devt. of 150f.
  - devoicing 13, 187
Van Veldeke, Hendrik: 93

verbs:
  - modern Dutch 62ff.
    - infinitive 62
    - present tense 62f.
    - imperative 63
    - past tenses, use of 65f.
    - weak verbs: imperfect 63
      - past participle 63
    - strong verbs: imperfect 63f.
      - past participle 63f.
    - irregular verbs 64f.
    - monosyllabic verbs 62n., 64
      - zijn 64f., 66
      - hebben 66
      - modals 65
      - reflexive verbs 66f.
      - passive voice 67
      - subjunctive 67f., 179

- Ablaut, see strong verbs
- historical devt. 173ff.
- present tense 174f.
- subjunctive 174, 179
- weak verbs 175f.
- prefix ge- 176f.
- irregular verbs 177
- mixed verbs 179f.
- strong verbs 177f.
- reduplicating verbs 180
- modals 180f.
- monosyllabic verbs 182
- zijn 175, 182
- hebben 175, 182
Verlooy, J.B.C.: 25n.
Verner, Karl: 122
Verner's Law: 122, 159
Verdun, Treaty of: 21
Versailles, Treaty of: 30
Vienna, Congress of: 25
Vikings: 91
Virgin Islands: 110
Visigoths: 125
Vlaams: 5, 20
- see Flemish
Vlaams Cultureel Centrum: 33
Vlaamse Beweging: see Flemish Movement
vocabulary: see Flemish Movement
Voerstreek: 28
volksstaat: 16
Volksunie: 26, 27, 31
Van den Vondel, J.: 107
vowels:
  - modern Dutch 45ff.
    - checked 45ff.
    - unchecked 48f.
    - diphthongs 49f.
    - devt. of 133ff.
    - monophthongisation 131
    - diphthongisation 131
    - lengthening 127, 131
    - syncope/apocope 132
    - Umlaut 132f.
  - short vowels:
    - a 133f.
    - e 134f.
    - i 135f.
    - o 135f.
    - u 136
  - long vowels:
    - a 136f.
    - e 137f.
    - ie 138f.
    - eu 141f.
    - o 139f.
    - u 142
Index

-diphthongs:
  - ui 142f.
  - ij 142f., 145
  - ei 146f.
  - ou(w)/au(w) 148
-double vowels:
  - oai 149
  - ooi 149
  - oei 149
  - eeuw 149
De Vries, Matthijs: 40ff., 113, 115ff., 138, 140

w:
  - devt. of 159f.
Waalse Kerk: 107
Wachtendonk Psalms: 91, 127
Walloons: 3, 20ff.
Waterloo: 31n.
Weiland, Petrus: 114
West Friesland: 11, 13, 89
wezen: 65, 182
Widukind: 90
William I: 25f., 115
Willems, Jan Frans: 26
Willibrord: 89f.

Woordenlijst der Nederlandse Taal: 42
word formation: 78ff.
word order: 70ff.
  - in Belgium 34
World War I: 26, 27, 30
World War II: 27, 52, 74, 77
Wulfila: 125

x:
  Xanten: 85

y:
  Yiddish: 52, 118
  - loanwords 77

z:
  - devt. of 151
  - devoicing 13, 52, 55
Zeeland: 9, 11, 13, 40, 138, 143, 145
  - Frisians in 89
Zeeuws-Flanders: 9
zich: 66f., 172
zijn: 64, 182
  - as an auxiliary verb 66
Zuidnederlands: 5, 15, 18
Zwolle: 97
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Map 2 Dutch dialects (in detail) p. 8
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Map 5 The High German Sound Shift in Limburg p. 14
Map 6 The Netherlands in the Middle Ages p. 22
Map 7 The language border in Belgium p. 29
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Map 10 The ui isogloss p. 144
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