

RANDSTAD DUTCH

Cor van Bree (University Leiden NL)

1. Introduction¹

What is *Randstad Dutch*? I use Dutch as a umbrella notion. Dutch includes Standard Dutch and the dialects, in the widest sense, that are spoken in the domain of this language and/or are closely related to it.² *Randstad* is the name given to a conurbation in the west of the Netherlands. This conurbation consists of cities and towns that have been growing together, so that they now form as it were a shape of a frame which encloses an agricultural region with some scattered towns and villages, the so called Green Heart. See map 1. Among these towns are Alphen aan den Rijn, not far from Leyde, and Zoetermeer, a satellite town of The Hague. The frame runs from Haarlem southwards via Leyde and The Hague to Rotterdam and from this city south-east to the so-called Drechtsteden (Dordrecht, Zwijndrecht, Sliedrecht etc.) and north-east to Utrecht. From Utrecht it runs north to Amsterdam and then westwards to Haarlem, our point of departure.

The Randstad including the Green Heart covers large areas of the provinces of South Holland and North Holland and the western part of the province of Utrecht. It excludes North Holland above the river *het IJ* and the so-called South Holland islands and *waarden* 'holms, bottoms' in the south. The Randstad does not extend beyond the city of Utrecht although we may doubt if we should not to include the city of Amersfoort, north-east of Utrecht. Outside its borders there are mainly agricultural regions in the north and the south and a region covered with forests in the east. In the west the Randstad borders on the North Sea.

In this contribution I shall leave the eastern branches, between Amsterdam and Utrecht and between Rotterdam and Utrecht, out of consideration, because these branches have their own dialectal backgrounds and need a separate treatment.

(For the sake of clarity: I do not use the term *Holland* for the entire Netherlands but only for the western provinces *North and South Holland*. *Holland* became also the name for the whole country because it was its the most important part. *Utrecht* is the name of a city as well a province of which this city is the capital.)

2. The old Holland dialect

¹ I thank Guy Tops (Wilrijk, Belgium) for the correction of my English.

² The Frisian dialects in the northern part of the Netherlands do not belong to Dutch because they are (more) closely related to Standard Frisian although they are spoken in a region in which Standard Dutch is used too. However, the Flemish dialects in the north-west corner of France belong to Dutch: although they are spoken in the domain of Standard French, they are closely related tot Standard Dutch.

Originally Holland dialects were spoken in the region described above. Relicts are present especially in two seaside resorts, Scheveningen (now a borough of the Hague) and Katwijk aan Zee (not far from Leyde). Both are well-known old fisher villages. I give a few examples from the dialect of Katwijk: the bilabial *w*, a palatal pronunciation of the *a* (both can be heard in the word for 'water': [wʏ:tʀ], and the consonant cluster *sk*- instead of *sch*- [sx-]: *skool*, Standard Dutch *school* 'school'. In the coastal regions in general we can find relicts of an old dialect spoken there about 800 and closely related to early stages of English and Frisian. The terms *Ingveonic*, *Coastal Germanic* or *North Sea Germanic* are used for this relative [betrekkelijke] language unity within the West-Germanic dialect continuum. *Bregge* for 'bridge' is an example. It contains an [ɛ] in the northern coastal regions, e.g. in Katwijk, and an [i] in the southern regions: *brigge*, e.g. in the province of Zeeland. The two variants contain unrounded vowels in comparison with Standard Dutch *brug* with [ʊ]. Frisian has a long [ɛ]: *brêge*, and English [i]: *bridge*. Compare also the toponyms *Terbregge* lit. 'near the bridge', the name of a village near Rotterdam, and *Brigdamme*, lit. 'bridge-dam', on the island of Walcheren in the province of Zeeland. The old Holland dialect has disappeared to a great extent. However, that does not mean that Standard Dutch is now spoken everywhere and by every groups and in all situations. To explain this we have to see how Standard Dutch came into being.

3. The rise of Standard Dutch

The rise of Standard Dutch started in the 16th century. In that century Antwerp was the most important city in the Netherlands. It looked as if a standard language would come into being on the basis of the Brabant dialect of this city. The year 1585 marks an important turn of fate in the history of the Netherlands. At the time the Netherlands were at war with Spain and Parma, the leader of the Spanish army, besieged and captured the city. This victory meant the definitive separation of the northern and the southern Netherlands.³ The northern Netherlands became a free republic, the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands, the origin of the present Kingdom of the Netherlands (*Nederland*). The southern provinces remained under Spanish rule and later on they fell to Austria and, at the end of the 18th century, to France; they became the historical basis of present-day Belgium (*België*). Many southern emigrants settled in the northern provinces for religious

³ I have to leave aside the history of Dutch, especially Standard Dutch, in the south. I only mention that the South has adopted the northern standard language since the second half of the 19th century.

reasons: they were protestants and would not live in the catholic south. Among them there were rich merchants who brought prosperity into the northern Netherlands. The political, economic and cultural centre shifted from the south to the north; in terms of cities: from Antwerp to Amsterdam. As a result Standard Dutch was formed on the basis of the Holland dialect, especially the dialect of the upper class in the big cities. Therefore Standard Dutch can be called *Regentenhollands* in origin, lit. 'the Holland dialect of the regents (i.e. the governing aristocrats)' (Van Haeringen 1936, 308). The poet Joost van den Vondel, in his *Aenleidinge ter Nederduitsche Dichtkunste* 'Introduction to Dutch Poetry' (1659), especially mentioned Amsterdam and the Hague in this connection. According to him Standard Dutch in statu nascendi was the language of the rich merchants of Amsterdam and the Court of the "stadthouder", the Prince of Orange, in the Hague. Of course the grammarians played an important role in establishing the norms of the standard language. They conformed to the language use of the higher classes, but these classes in their turn conformed to the norms established by the grammarians in their turn.

4. *Written and spoken standard language*

At first a written form of the standard language came into being that was strongly influenced by a written tradition of southern origin. Dutch was written for the first time about 1200, in Flanders (Bruges, Gand) and later on in the Brabant region (Antwerp, Malines, Brussels) too. This led to a written standard on a southern basis. The Holland authors conformed to this standard to a great extent, but gradually they used more and more Holland elements. An oral form of the standard needed more time to come into being; it was strongly influenced by the written standard. The form *breg(ge)* e.g. was not in the written language and therefore it was not allowed in the spoken standard ultimately. The form *brug* became the standard form in both written and oral Standard Dutch. In other cases the Holland form won out at least in the spoken language, e.g. *gooien* 'to throw' instead of southern *werpen*. Another example is the pronunciation of final *n* after schwa. This *n* is still written but mostly it is not pronounced (except in some dialect regions): *dage(n)* 'days', *regene(n)* 'to rain'. Sometimes the old Holland elements also won out in the written language; compare the diminutive endings containing *-(t)je* instead of southern *-ke*: e.g. *bakje*, diminutive of *bak* 'tray', instead of *bakske*. However, the newer Holland endings containing *-ie* were not allowed as in *bakkie*.

A complicated example is the development of the sound *ei* [ɛi]. Originally the different spellings <ij> and <ei> expressed different pronunciations, resp. [ɛi] and [ai] (older resp. [i.] and [ɛi]). Although the grammarians tried to prevent the merger of these sounds, they did not succeed; however,

they succeeded in maintaining the different spellings. Moreover, they succeeded in establishing the "civilised" pronunciation of the phoneme. The "correct" pronunciation is still [ɛi] and not [ai], the second being considered substandard. The grammarians rejected the pronunciation [ai] because neither the spelling <ei> nor the spelling <ij> suggested a pronunciation [a] (cf. Hellinga 1968, chapter 2). However, this was probably a rationalisation in hindsight: the secret reason was that [ɛi] was the pronunciation of the higher classes and [ai] that of the lower ones.

5. Grammatical argumentations

In general, the grammarians chose the forms of the higher classes, but defended them with different kinds of argumentation (cf. Van der Wal 1996). Authority was an important motivation: elements from the (more authoritative) written language were preferred (compare *brug*) and pronunciations were chosen in conformity with (the visible and therefore influential) spelling (compare the preference for [ɛi]). In the opinion of the grammarians, especially the language of famous authors (Joost van den Vondel, Pieter Corneliszoon Hooft) deserved imitation. Another important motivation was melliflence, whether the sound was "beautiful" or "pleasant": -(t)je sounded better than -ke (cf. Van der Wal & Van Bree 1994, 211-12) and [ɛi] better than [ai] (cf. Hellinga 1968, chapter 2). Of course, melliflence is a very strange motivation, because phonemes are not beautiful or ugly as linguists know. But here we have an interesting paradox: just because they are neutral in se, they are very suitable to be connected with value judgments.

The most important motivation was avoidance of ambiguity. Ambiguity is one of the greatest concerns of standardising grammarians. Compare again the maintenance of the difference in spelling between <ei> and <ij> (cf. Hellinga again). A famous lexical example is the distinction between *liggen* 'to lie' en *leggen* 'to lay' and the distinction between *kennen* 'to know' and *kunnen* 'to be able to'. In the Holland dialect these distinctions are not present anymore: there are two verbs, *legge* 'to lie' and 'to lay', and *kenne* 'to know' and 'to be able to'.⁴ A morphological example is the distinction between the personal and the possessive pronoun: whereas the standard language has different forms, e.g. *mij/me* 'me' and *mijn/m'n* 'my' (before the slash the strong, behind it the weak forms containig a schwa), the Holland dialect has only one form: *mijn/me* (*mijn* pronounced as [main] or [mɛ:n]). The translators of the *Statenvertaling*, the famous Bible translation of 1637, noted in the Latin registration of their decisions: *numquam mijn, ut*

⁴ The principal parts in the Holland dialect are: *legge* - *lag* - *gelege*; *kenne* - *kon* - *gekend*, those in Standard Dutch: *liggen* - *lag* - *gelegen*, *leggen* - *legde* - *gelegd*; *kennen* - *kende* - *gekend*, *kunnen* - *kon* - *gekund*.

vulgus hic loquitur 'never [use] *mijn* [instead of *mij*] as common people here say' (Van der Wal 1995, 35). They clearly dissociated themselves from the "vulgus".

Distinguishing oneself from the lower classes played an important role is also proved by the following case. In Middle Dutch the same form was used for the personal and the reflexive pronoun, namely *hem* or *haer*: *hi wast hem/si wast haer* 'he washes him/himself, she washes her/herself'. In the Holland dialect this ambiguity was solved by a new form for the reflexive, namely *zijn eige* (pronunciation: z★n eige) or *haar eige* (pronunciation: d★r eige). The grammarians chose another solution, namely a form of High German origin: *zich*, which had penetrated into the written language via Bible translations under German influence (cf. Van der Wal & Van Bree 1994, 214-15). The grammarians solved the ambiguity but they disqualified the form of the vernacular at the same time. An interesting example of interplay of a linguistic and a sociolinguistic factor.

6. Standard syntax

So far I have given examples from four different levels: phonology, orthography, lexicon and morphology. Are there also syntactic examples? There are syntactic phenomena that are accepted in spoken but not in written Standard Dutch, e.g. the so called left dislocation as in *die man DIE zei tegen me dat ik weg moest gaan* lit. 'this man HE said to me that I had to go'. That this construction is not accepted in written language may be due to the fact that it is experienced as redundant. There are also phenomena that are rejected both in spoken and in written Standard Dutch, e.g. the use of a double negation as in *ik heb NOOIT GEEN brief van hem gekregen*, lit. 'I have NEVER NO letter from him received' = 'I never received a letter from him'. The double negation is rejected because it is felt to be illogical, because mathematically $- x - = +!$ ⁵ Moreover, there might be influence from classical Latin involved. Both constructions occur on a large scale in the Dutch linguistic area.

There are not many syntactic phenomena that are characteristic of the Holland dialect or parts of it. An example is conditional *al* in e.g. *AL is het morgen mooi weer, dan ga ik naar het strand* lit. 'IF it is beautiful weather, I shall go to the beach' (cf. Van Bree & Van der Hee 2002-3 and 2002). In Standard Dutch the conjunction *al* can only be used as a concessive conjunction. A speaker of Standard Dutch would be inclined to interpret the sentence in question as 'although it is etc.' which would be a strange

⁵ In many languages, e.g. the Slavonic languages, double (or triple etc.) negations are acceptable in the standard variety. If the negation is repeated an odd number of times (compare Czech *nikdy nikde nikomu nic nekupuje* lit. 'I never nowhere for no one nothing not-buy' = I never buy anything for anyone anywhere"), the argumentation that the outcome is illogical does not apply, because it is negative.

communication.

Although many phenomena known from the Holland dialect (and from many other dialects) are not accepted in Standard Dutch, at least in written Standard Dutch, the standard syntax has nevertheless a Holland origin. Perhaps southern phenomena spread to the north during the Middle Ages, e.g. the use of partitive (referring) *er* as in *heb je schone overhemden? ja, ik heb ER een paar* lit. 'do you have clean shirts? yes, I have (OF THEM) a couple'. However, when standardisation started, these phenomena had become indigenous Holland dialect. Later southern developments did not reach the Holland region anymore, e.g. the use of *er* referring to a singular: *heb je koffie? ja, ik heb ER nog* lit. 'do you have coffee? yes, I have still (OF IT)'. On the other hand, the south did not participate in later northern developments such as the replacement of the causal auxiliary *doen* by *laten*. Causal *doen* is still in use in the south but in the north it is restricted to rather formal written language: *ik DEED hem vertrekken* instead of *ik LIET hem vertrekken* 'I had leave him'. (Cf. for syntax Van Bree 2007.)

7. Selection and acceptance

The American sociolinguist Einar Haugen (cf. Haugen 1966) distinguishes four stages (we can also speak of aspects) of standardisation: selection, codification, elaboration of function, and acceptance. In this context we are interested in selection and acceptance. As regards election, it is useful to distinguish macroselection and microselection. Macroselection concerns the question which dialect was chosen to be the standard language. Microselection concerns the question which concrete forms were chosen and which rejected. We have seen that the elements selected mostly have a Holland origin but among them there are also southern (and High German) elements.

As I remarked, acceptance of the written language was in the lead. In an 1825 story, an Amsterdam grandmother of a rather high social level tells her grandchildren a fairy tale, in which she still uses a language that contains many features of the old Holland dialect (Van der Wal & Van Bree 1994, 285-86). An explanation may be that in the higher classes French functioned as standard language (Burke 2005, 20). But gradually Standard Dutch became the daily spoken language of the higher social classes in the big cities and spread from the higher to the lower classes. Later on the same happened in the countryside. There arose a contrast between the classes: more standard language at the higher social levels than at the lower ones. In addition, a similar contrast arose between the cities and the countryside. Such contrasts had not exist to such an extent before.

8. The new Holland dialect

In many respects the lower classes preserved the old Holland dialect forms. All examples given above can still be heard. This also holds for the phonological ones: the [ai]-pronunciation of <ei>/<ij> is still very frequent just like the ou [ɔ̃u] in *nou* 'now' and *douwe* 'to push' instead of Standard Dutch *nu* and *duwen* (both with [y]). However, at the phonological level new developments took place. The lower classes introduced new pronunciations, different from the old Holland dialect as well as from the standard language. This development should be considered in connection with the radical social changes of the era of industrialisation. The old hierarchy of *standen* (social positions) developed into a new hierarchy of socio-economic classes. In the old hierarchy everyone had her or his own position authorised by God. The members of the different groups respected each other, shared the same norms and, to a great extent, the same language, i.e. the same dialect. In the new hierarchy a social gap existed between employees and employers. On the other hand, there was a growing unity, caused by improved instruction, increase of real and social mobility and cooperation on the shop floor. Contrast and unity were reflected in the language, the unity at the phonological and the contrast at the phonetic level. Both classes shared the same phonemes but did not pronounce them in the same way. Compare Commandeur 1988-9 and cf. also Van der Wal & Van Bree 1994, chapter 12.

Let me illustrate this with an example. The old Holland form *veul* 'much, many' (with eu [ɛ̃]) disappeared (it was still used in the countryside for a long time) and was replaced by *veel* (with ee [e]), a form of southern (more precisely: south-western) origin and already present in written standard language. The [e] seems to be a rather unstable sound: it easily moves to a higher position (>[i]) or is diphthongised (>[eɪ]). Cf. Labov 1994, 116 and Van Bree 1996, 98. The second development took place in western Dutch: ee is pronounced slightly diphthongised (whereas the eastern ee is a pure monophthong like in German). In the vernacular of the Randstad the result is a clear diphthong, approaching ei [ɛ̃i]. The same holds for the two other mid high long vowels, the rounded front vowel eu and the back vowel oo. These vowels are approaching ui [ɛ̃i] and ou [ɔ̃u] respectively. The diphthongisation began in the cities. An old attestation (perhaps the oldest one) is from Leyde and dates from 1841, In *Studenten-typen*, a sketch by Klikspaan (pseudonym of Johannes Kneppelhout): *Heirejei* instead of *Herejee* lit. 'Lord Je(sus)' (a disguised oath) and *laiven* (containing an remarkably extreme diphthong!) instead of *leven* 'life'. The diphthongisation was so successful in this city that it also took place before r (before which, in general, diphthongisation is excluded in Standard Dutch): compare *Heir(ejei)*. From the cities the Randstad diphthongisation expanded to the more agricultural regions. I have the impression that it is stronger in the north, especially around Amsterdam, than in the south. However, the first

attestation is from the middle region (Leyde) as we have seen.

Summarizing, we have to take into account three variants: the old Holland variant, now disappearing: *veul* [⓪.], the standard variant: *veel* [e.Ⓣ], and the new Holland variant, approaching *veil* [Ⓣi].

9. The Superstandard

However, the picture is still more complicated. We have to take into account a fourth variant, a superstandard variant. The highest classes, old nobility and also intellectuals, dissociate themselves from the lower classes (and perhaps also from the middle classes) in a hypercorrect way. This way of speaking is called *geaffecteerd* lit. 'affected' or *bekakt* 'snooty'. It is comparable with *posh English* in England.⁶ People who speak this kind of Dutch are so afraid of speaking diphthongised *ee*, *eu* and *oo* that they avoid the slightest trace of it. Therefore, they pronounce *veel*, *neus* and *groot* with pure monophthongs: [e.], [⓪.] and [o.]. (Such tendencies to distinction are a well-known phenomenon and were already discussed in Van Haeringen 1962.)⁷ Substandard Holland Dutch is considered not to be appropriate for formal situations. If we carry out a Labovian research in which we try to elicit different speech styles (casual style and more formal styles), we see that speakers of the new Holland dialect try to avoid their socially stigmatised features in more formal style. In a formal style the speaker is more aware of how he/she has to express him/herself. Because affected Dutch is spoken by very elitist people, we expect its use to increase in more formal styles. This expectation did not prove to be correct in research carried out at Leyde University: in a more formal style *bekakt*-speakers produced fewer superstandard features than in a more informal style. They try to speak more "normally", probably because they are aware of the fact that, since democratisation started about 1970, their way of speaking is not very much appreciated anymore. Of course, it is characterised by *culturedness*, but it lacks *generalness*, and according to Smakman (2006, 277-278) there seems to be the need in the Netherlands not to stand out. In a more informal style

⁶ Kloeke (1951) suggests that superstandard Dutch can be traced back to the *Regentenhollands* (i.e. of the 17th and 18th centuries; cf. section 3) and that neutral Standard Dutch is in origin the language of people who abandoned their dialect and switched to the standard language in later periods. In his opinion influence from French on the superstandard pronunciation is possible, because there was a lot of bilingualism (i.e. in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries).

⁷ The Superstandard is also characterised by a number of lexical preferences and sometimes by the use of substandard elements in combination with a posh accent, as if its speakers wanted to express this way that they are so distinguished by birth that they think to be allowed to use these elements. Perhaps the language of the very highest class (nobility, especially in the countryside) was in origin fairly substandard. There is a well-known case of a former governor of the province of Zeeland (Jonkheer 'Esquire' De Casembrot) who pronounced clearly diphthongised *ee*, *eu* and *oo*.

bekakt-speakers speak as if they were "among us".⁸ Cf. Van Bree & Van Dunné 2004.

Affected Dutch is often named *Haags* or *Leids*. Perhaps The Hague (where many members of the old nobility lived) and Leyde (a rather elitist university city) are the places of origin. However, the names are confusing because affected Dutch can now be heard in the whole country.

10. *The Randstad continuum*

The developments described above have led to a continuum, in which there are no clear boundaries between the "varieties". In the more peripheral parts of the Dutch linguistic area (in Flanders as well as in the northern, eastern and southern regions of the Netherlands) the situation is different: there is still a discontinuum with a clear difference between dialect (or regiolect) on the one hand and standard language (or a regional variety of the standard language) on the other hand. Because the old Holland dialect was the most important source of Standard Dutch, there existed a continuum in the west from the beginning.

The Randstad continuum reaches from extreme Substandard on the one hand to extreme Superstandard on the other hand. People living in the Randstad are aware of only one language (Dutch) although they may also be aware of striking differences. Persons who mostly speak substandard Holland Dutch do not think the queen (who speaks Superstandard) to speak a different language, and neither does the queen. Above I treated a number of tendencies, tendencies to diphthongise ee, eu and oo (in Substandard), to monophthongise them (in Superstandard) or to diphthongise them within certain limits (in neutral standard language), etc. The intensity of these tendencies depends on style, gender and social position (the last-mentioned now more a question of education than of income and housing). However, we should not interpret this causal relation too simply: on the one hand people's way of speaking is determined by situation and class or group, but on the other hand speakers can use their way of speaking to indicate how they interpret the situation and to which class or group they want to appear to belong.

In any case, the linguistic situation of the Randstad is a dynamic one, more precisely: a *stable* dynamic situation. The "varieties" that are involved show remarkable stability. Especially remarkable is the stability of the Substandard: although those who speak it are aware of the fact that their

⁸ That the social value of the Superstandard has decreased also becomes clear when pre-war films or radio programmes are compared with post-war ones. Whereas the Dutch of the former sounds very affected, the Dutch of the latter contains quite a few substandard features (for a study of these differences cf. Van de Velde 1996). What happened to the well-known author Adriaan van Dis is revealing in this respect: he was not admitted as a television news presentator because of his posh accent (Hagen 1990).

way of speaking is not appreciated very much by higher classes, they nevertheless stick to it, because it expresses their identity and their mutual loyalty (Labov: covert prestige). The superstandard seems to be stable too although its "market value" has decreased (cf. section 12).

This stable dynamics, however, does not exclude the possibility of some elements undergoing changes. Even the standard language is not a fortress that cannot be captured. Let us take as an example the substandard pronunciation of *ei* <ei, ij>: [ai]. This pronunciation (and other substandard pronunciations) can be heard ever more in the speech of young educated people, but we have to wait and see if this will become the new norm (cf. Stroop 1997)⁹ It is also possible that, as a result of the modern processes of democratisation and informalisation, the norm will allow more variation than formerly: the norm has become more diverse or more variants are being tolerated although they do not belong to the norm proper.

In any case, the Substandard can be an important source of innovations in Standard Dutch. A morphological example is the past tense of *raden* 'to guess, to advise': the old strong form *ried* has become very old-fashioned whereas the new weak form *raadde* is now the norm. Another important source of innovation is slang: a word such as *lullig* 'shitty' (a derivation from *lul* 'prick') is more and more acceptable.¹⁰

11. Review of the vowels

Below I shall give a review first of the short and then of the long vowels including the diphthongs.¹¹ For each group of vowels there is a diagram with comments. I shall give fixed values of the (neutral) standard phonemes, but, of course, these can show some variation and tendencies to change (cf. section 10). These fixed values represent the norms and serve as a frame of reference. The arrows symbolise tendencies: they are directed at the (covert) norms of Substandard and Superstandard. They can also be read in the opposite direction, symbolising tendencies which manifest themselves in a more formal style. Together the values and arrows symbolise the dynamics of the Randstad situation.¹²

⁹ Cf. e.g. Stroop 1997.

¹⁰ For Standard Dutch a great variety of terms is used. A well-known term is *General Civilised Dutch* (*Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands*, ABN): 'Dutch spoken by civilised people and accepted as the general norm (at least for formal situations) even by people who do not speak it in a proper way'. In Dutch linguistics there has been a lively but also confusing debate about the suitability of the terms and the precise nature of their referents. Cf. Van Haeringen 1960, 53-55.

¹¹ I leave aside the schwa, which can have an [I]-like pronunciation in some Holland dialects as well as in the Holland substandard. Cf. Van Bree 1975.

¹² I leave aside reductions and assimilations e.g. in [plisi] for *politie* 'police' (Standard Dutch [politsi]) and [kʷ→s] for *kans* (Standard Dutch [kʷns]), further "svarabhakti" vowels as in [kʷr★k], which vowels can be

For the Substandard cf. Commandeur 1988-9 and, also for the old Holland sounds, Van Bree 2004, for the Superstandard Van Bree & Van Dunné 2004 and for Standard Dutch Smakman 2006 (and the literature mentioned in these publications).

11.1. *The short vowels*

There seems to be a general and natural tendency for short vowels to become more open (lower) (Labov 1994, 116). However, in substandard Holland Dutch there is the opposite tendency, and the (more natural) tendency of fronting, both conditioned by following consonants. In Amsterdam and surroundings a [ɛ] and o [ɔ] are palatalised before tensed n, t, d and st: *pan* > [pa⁷n] 'pan', *kat* > [ka⁷t] 'cat', (we) *hadde(n)* > [ha⁷d[★]] 'we had', *kast* > [ka⁷st]; *bon* > [bo⁷n] 'voucher', *pot* > [po⁷t] 'pot', *vodde(n)* > [fo⁷d[★]] 'rags', *post* > [po⁷st] 'post'. Cf. map 2 for the spread of this phenomenon south of Amsterdam. Something similar holds for e [ɛ], which approaches [i], and maybe for u [u] [ɯ], especially before the same consonants. More to the south, in Rotterdam and surroundings, the a [a] becomes more velar (> [ɶ]) before labial or velar. *Rotterdam* is more or less pronounced as *Rotterdom*; *zag je dat?* 'did you see that?' sounds as *zoggie dot?* [zɶ⁷*i dɶt?]. In the same region u [u] and o [ɔ] can be pronounced higher and *dinke* [i] instead of *denke(n)* 'to think' can be heard, with [i] instead of [ɛ] before n plus consonant. The superstandard reaction is to pronounce the vowels in question more open. Especially the more open pronunciation of e [ɛ], u [u] [ɯ] and o [ɔ] is very striking. A well-known sentence mocking The Hague pronunciation is: *in Den Hèèg gèèt men tannissen met kannissen* instead of neutral Standard Dutch *in Den Haag gaat men tennissen met kennissen* 'in the Hague people go playing tennis with acquaintances' (for the èè in *The Hèèg* and gèèt see next section).

11.2. *The long vowels and diphthongs*

Properly speaking, the three diphthongs do not fit in the diagram phonetically. For the sake of convenience they have been placed in the centre of the diagram. About the high vowels nothing important can be noticed: they are very stable and do not show much variation. An exception is substandard ou in *nou* and *douwe* instead of *nu* and *duwen* (see section 8). The mid high vowels were discussed in section 8. In addition I mention palatalisation of oo before r in Superstandard: *voor* 'for, before' [vo:r] sounds as *veur* [v⁷:r], and the superstandard pronunciation of e.g. *militair*

heard more clearly in Substandard than in Standard Dutch.

'military' with [I:] instead of [ɛ:] for <ai>.

The diphthongs show two ways of substandard pronunciation. In the first place there is the old Holland way of pronouncing them as rather extreme diphthongs, with great phonetic distances between their first and second parts: ei <ij, ei> > [ai], ui [ɥi] > [ɥi], ou <ou, au> > [au]. In the second place there is the (probably more recent) way of pronouncing them as so-called secondary monophthongs: ei > [ɛ:], ui > [ɥ:], ou > [ɔ:]. Secondary monophthongisation is characteristic of the cities of Amsterdam (which has [a:] besides [ɛ:]), Harlem, Leyde, The Hague, Delft and Dordrecht. However, only the Hague shows monophthongisation of ou. Maybe the secondary monophthongs were originally (unsuccessful) attempts to pronounce neutral standard ei, ui and ou. An old attestation (perhaps the oldest) is from the south-east quarter of old Amsterdam, from 1874: *vaaf*, with [a:], instead of *vijf*, with [ɛi]. From the same year is the attestation of the Hague [ɥ:] and [ɛ:] in *(wat) reuist (die) zzèè*, instead of *(wat) ruist (die) zij!* lit. 'how rustles this silk!'. (Cf. Winkler 1874, p. 90 and 130 respectively.) The countryside mostly has the old Holland pronunciation. It is remarkable that this is also the pronunciation of the big city of Rotterdam. This may be due to the fact that many immigrants from the surroundings came to this city in the second half of the 19th century. There are, however, indications (cf. De Reus 1991) that the extreme diphthongs are again finding their way into the other big cities. The superstandard reaction is to pronounce ei, ui and ou as little diphthongised as possible, in the direction of ee, eu and oo. Of course, the directions [ɛ:], [ɥ:] and [ɔ:] are excluded because these would entail pronunciations approaching the results of the stigmatised secondary monophthongisation.

A rather unstable vowel is the low and medial a^o. In South Holland the substandard pronunciation is [a.] like in the standard language, the so-called clear a^o (not too velar and not too palatal); in the North Holland part of the Randstad, especially Amsterdam, the pronunciation is [ɔ.], a so-called dark, rather velar a^o. Sometimes, a nasalised [a.] can be heard, especially in the speech of women (cf. for Amsterdam Schatz 1986). This [a→.] sounds not very standard. Maybe the nasalisation makes it easier to keep the a^o central where it properly belongs and to avoid deviations to the palatal or the velar side. The superstandard pronunciation is slightly palatal: [ɔ.], e.g. in *Hèègs* (cf. section 11.1). It is difficult to explain this. It might be a reaction to the dark a^o, but the palatal pronunciation is not restricted to the northern part of the Randstad region. Still more peculiar is the fact that especially the Hague is known for the palatal a^o whereas the old dialect of Scheveningen (now part of the Hague) has a

similar a^o! Perhaps a dark a^o, [ɔ̃.] or [ɔ̃.], is considered to be rustic (Dutch: boers), because it is the pronunciation of many Dutch agricultural regions. The palatal a^o of the Scheveningen fishermen is (was) not open to objection, perhaps because they are or were a rather closed community with few outside contacts. Moreover, their "a^o" has not quite the same pronunciation as the superstandard a^o: [e.] and [ɛ̃.] respectively.

11.3. The consonants

As regards the consonants I restrict myself to a few remarks.

1. The r has many different pronunciations in Standard Dutch. At least three should be mentioned: the alveolar, the uvular and the so called *Gooise* r. The third r is called so because people think that it has been spread via radio and television programmes which are broadcasted from studios in *het Gooi*, a region southeast of Amsterdam. Its precise nature is not yet clear: perhaps it is a retroflex r. It is restricted to the codas of syllables. It is a very striking sound, which is especially heard in the speech of younger, well educated people. Recent research (cf. Smakman 2006, 235-243) shows that both the alveolar and the uvular r are accepted in Standard Dutch. The acceptance of the *Gooise* r, in any case a clear *Gooise* r, is dubious, because there is a preference for a non-prominent r in the coda.

In substandard Dutch there is also a lot of variation. The dialect of the Hague is characterised by an uvular r approaching [X]. The difference with [X] <g, ch> is maintained by pronouncing the latter extra fortis (Van Gaalen & Van den Mosselaar 1998). The dialects of Leyde and Rotterdam have an r that is related to the *Gooise* r, except that it can also be heard at the beginning of a word. In Superstandard there is a preference for a moderate uvular r.

For the pronunciation of the r cf. Bezooijen 2006, for especially the *Gooise* r for instance Bezooijen 2004.

2. The l has a rather velar ("thick"), [u]-like pronunciation in substandard Holland Dutch, especially in the coda. This pronunciation is more striking in the north than in the south. The result is e.g. that it may be difficult to hear whether *vernield* 'destroyed' or *vernieuwd* 'renovated' is meant. The superstandard reaction is to pronounce a "thin" l like in German, with quite a lot of tension.

3. The v and z (voiced or lax fricatives in Standard Dutch) are pronounced voiceless or tense in substandard Holland Dutch. The g, a more uvular than velar fricative, is often tense in Standard Dutch too and can be rasped in both varieties. However, too much rasp sounds "ugly". The voiceless or tense

pronunciation is more striking in the north than in the south. The north may be the region from which it spread; in any case, Winkler (1874, I, 78) already speaks of an expectorating g, for which he especially blames the inhabitants of Harlem. In research done with students, Harlem had 41.7% devoicing, Rotterdam 39,9% and Vlaardingen, west of Rotterdam, 26%. In other research Uithoorn (just north of the boundary between North and South Holland) had 53% devoicing in opposition to Ter Aar and Nieuw-Vennep (just south of it) with only 14%. On average, the g is more voiceless or tense than v and this fricative, more than z (Smakman 2006, 250). As regards place of articulation, especially Amsterdam is known for a rather palatal s: [s̟]. It is possible that this s originates from the Dutch as it was spoken by Jewish people (Den Besten & Hinskens 2005, 293). The superstandard reaction can be the *slis-r* 'lisped r' almost like [ʃ] (the english hard th-sound). The so called soft g (voiced and lax) is characteristic of Flanders and the southern regions of the Netherlands. Recent research shows that is not felt problematic in Standard Dutch (Smakman 2006, 227).¹³

12. Conclusion

The picture I sketched above, has been based partly on research and partly on impressions. The impressions are the author's, who was born in the Randstad (in Vlaardingen, west of Rotterdam) and has always lived there (in Oegstgeest, near Leiden, from his 19th year). He usually speaks neutral Standard Dutch but, in a sense, Substandard Holland Dutch and Superstandard Dutch belong to his registers. The research was carried out by him and by his students (University Leiden), all speakers of Standard Dutch from the Randstad, by carefully listening to informants. An additional phonetic analysis might be interesting, but that I have to leave to the phoneticians. (Cf. for Standard Dutch Smakman 2006).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartsch 1987: Renate Bartsch, *Norms of language*, London & New York.
 Den Besten & Hinskens 2005: Hans den Besten & Frans Hinskens, 'Diversificatie van het Nederlands door taalcontact', in: *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 10, 283-309.
 Bezooijen 2004: Renée van Bezooijen, 'De Gooise r: wie ziet er wat in en waarom?', in: *Taal en Tongval. Themanummer 17 Taalvariatie en*

¹³ I have the impression that the voiced plosives b and d too are pronounced with more tension in Substandard than in Standard Dutch. They are approaching p and t. Maybe the distinction between b and d on the one hand and p and t on the other hand is maintained by pronouncing the latter with still more [nog meer] tension. (There is no voiced velar plosive in Dutch except in cases of assimilation, e.g. in *zakdoek* [zʁgduk])

groepsidentiteit onder red. van Arjan van Leuvensteijn, Roeland van Hout & Henk Aertsen), 2004, 86-108.

Bezooijen 2006: Renée van Bezooijen, *Het raadsel van de ratelaar. Rondom de r in het Leewarders en het Fries*, Ljouwert/Leeuwarden.

Van Bree 1975: C[or] van Bree, 'Regionale varianten van de Sjwa', in: M.J.M. de Haan & B. van Selm, *Studies voor Zaalberg* enz, Leiden, 53-72.

Van Bree 1996: Cor van Bree, *Historische Taalkunde*, 2d impression, Leuven & Amersfoort (also to consult digitally: www.dbnl.nl).

Van Bree 2004: Cor van Bree, *Zuid-Hollands*, The Hague.

Van Bree 2007: Cor van Bree, 'Syntactische configuraties in het nederlandse taalgebied', forthcoming in: *Neerlandica Wratislaviensia*.

Van Bree & Van Dunné 2004: Cor van Bree & Essemie van Dunné, 'Variatie in geaffecteerd Nederlands', in: Johan de Caluwé etc. (eds.), *Taeldeman, man van de taal, schatbewaarder van de taal*, Gand.

Van Bree & Van der Hee 2002-3 and 2003: Cor van Bree & Jeroen van der Hee, 'Conditioneel al', in: *Taal en Tongval* themanummer 15-16, 158-183 and 55, 124-137.

Burke 2005: Peter Burke, *Towards a Social History of Early Modern Dutch*, Amsterdam.

Commandeur 1988-9: P.N.M. Commandeur, 'Het ontstaan van het modern Amsterdams. Over het verband tussen maatschappelijke ontwikkeling en taalontwikkeling', in: *Taal en Tongval* 41, 159-171 and 42, 1-21.

Van Haeringen 1936: C.B. van Haeringen, 'Hollands', in: *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 30, 302-309.

Van Gaalen & Van den Mosselaar, "Kèk mè nâh"...". *Plat & bekakt Haags*, Den Haag.

Van Haeringen 1960: C.B. van Haeringen, *Netherlandic Language Research*, Leiden,

Van Haeringen 1962: C.B. van Haeringen, 'Gedistingeerdheid in taal', in: C.B. van Haeringen, *Gramarie*, 1962, 24-37, first published in: *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 42, x-x.

Hagen 1990: A.M. Hagen, 'Groepsportret van het Nederlands', in: *Onze Taal* 2/3, 14-44.

Haugen 1966: Einar Haugen, 'Dialect, language, nation', in: *American Anthropologist* 68, 922-935.

Hellinga 1968: W. Hellinga, *De opbouw van de Algemeen Beschaafde Uitspraak van het Nederlands*, in: W. Hellinga, *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de nederlandse taalcultuur*, Arnhem 1968; originally thesis Gemeentelijke Universiteit Amsterdam 1938.

Labov 1994: William Labov, *Principles of Linguistic Change*, Vol. 1: *Internal Factors*, Oxford UK & Cambridge USA.

De Reus 1991: Annelies de Reus, 'Diftongen in het Delfts dialect', in: *Taal en Tongval* 43, 137-158.

'handkerchief'.)

Schatz 1986: H.F. Schatz, *Plat Amsterdams in its social context. A sociolinguistic study of the dialect of Amsterdam*, Amsterdam.

Smakman 2006: Dick Smakman, *Standard Dutch in the Netherlands. A Sociolinguistic and Phonetic Description*, thesis Radboud University Nijmegen.

Stroop 1998: Jan Stroop, *Poldernederlands - waardoor het ABN verdwijnt*, Amsterdam.

Van der Velde 1996: Hans van de Velde, *Variatie en verandering in het gesproken Standaard-Nederlands (1935-1993)*, thesis Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen.

Van der Wal 1995: M[arijke] J. van der Wal, *De moedertaal centraal. Standaardisatie-aspecten in de Nederlanden omstreeks 1650*, The Hague.

Van der Wal 1996: Marijke van der Wal, 'De grammaticus en de schoolmeester: externe taalnormen en taalverandering', in: Cor van Bree & Ariane van Santen (eds.), *Leidse mores. Aspecten van taalnormering*. Leiden, 13-29.

Van der Wal & Van Bree 1994: Marijke [J.] van der Wal & Cor van Bree, *Geschiedenis van het Nederlands*, 2d impression, Aula, Utrecht.

Winkler 1874: Johan Winkler, *Algemeen Nederduitsch en Friesch Dialecticon*, The Hague.