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1. Foreword

1.1. This book on Dutch Pronunciation deals with different native accents of the Dutch language, beginning with the two neutral pronunciations respectively used in the Netherlands and in Flanders (in northern Belgium) by ‘speech professionals’, primarily (good) actors and dubbers; then, we will describe the relevant mediatic pronunciations which nowadays tend to be more frequent among anchormen and journalists from non-local TV & radio stations, and are even considered by many to be as ‘standard’ as the actual neutral pronunciations.

Thirdly, a concise account about a number of culturally and geographically relevant regional accents will be provided, including the pronunciation of Afrikaans (a language closely-related to Dutch, from which it derives historically, one of South Africa’s official languages). The Dutch accents of Afrikaners is provided, too, in addition to those of the inhabitants of the Netherlands Antilles and of Surinam (including the phonosyntheses of the Surinamese creole and those of Old and Middle Dutch).

We insist on terming as ‘neutral’ instead of ‘standard’ an impeccably articulated pronunciation which gives no clue about the speaker’s geographical or social origin, because we are convinced that the term ‘standard’ stands more for something which is common and… ‘good enough’, rather than excellent and… recommendable.

1.2. However, the often capricious behaviour of purely native accents has led us to the ‘wise’ decision to primarily present an ‘international’ Dutch pronunciation to our readers, in a ‘native-like form’. This has the practical advantage of providing an easier access to the ‘spirit’ governing Dutch phonemics, precisely because the international phonetic realizations are more straightforwardly –yet realistically– connected to the phonemic level than most national or regional accents are.

As a matter of fact, this ‘international pronunciation’ has proven to be a good teaching and descriptive device, which is somehow intermediate between the two main national variants, with a slight prevalence of Belgian characteristics, for reason that will become self-apparent in the chapters on Flemish-Dutch accents.

1.3. Not surprisingly, the neutral and mediatic pronunciations of Belgium Dutch will immediately come after the full treatment of the international accent. The relevant counterparts of the Netherlands Dutch will logically follow.
A full set of examples will be repeated for each accent, both in phonetic transcription and graphemic form, in order to allow the researcher (and the student, as well) to practically visualize the—often subtle—differences and the fundamental similarities between international Dutch and its (four) most prestigious native accents.

When the vocalic, consonantal and intonational traits of these five accents are acquired, the reader will be fully capable of interpreting at first sight the sketchy information that are provided about regional varieties, with no need of lengthy explanations or to transcribe all examples over again.

The meaning of international Dutch

1.4. What has been said so far should clarify that by international we mean a model of pronunciation that is free from local peculiarities, and is good for anybody, especially foreign learners. Thus an International Pronunciation of Dutch must be different from any localizable and easily recognizable kind of accent, especially from the many stigmatized ones. Of course, it should also be more similar to the neutral accents of the Netherlands and Flanders than any other lesser-known accents.

1.5. In addition, it should adhere more to the current Dutch spelling, eg as far as r is concerned: it is a good thing that roker /rookǝr/ is precisely [ˈrookǝr], instead of, say, [ˈwoukǝr]; but it is also useful that certain minimal pairs such as chi jl [ˈχɛul] and gi jl [ˈxeul] remain distinct (also: chi jl, gi jl).

Arguably, we do not mean to favor spelling pronunciations at all. Although, when a word has more than one pronunciation allowed and recognized, the simpler one has to be preferred, which generally means the one that is less different both from spelling and from a more natural phonemic structure.

1.6. However, it is even more important to clearly say that our term ‘international’ does not stand—at all—for ‘multinational’ or ‘intercultural’—or (by combining them) multicultural.

An example taken from a certain school of thought of teaching English as a foreign language will come at hand: Of 13 of the book Gimson’s Pronunciation of English (2008)—ie Teaching and Learning the Pronunciation of English as an Additional Language—introduces some targets for teaching and learning the pronunciation of English for foreigners. Beside Native-Speaker Targets, the new ‘Amalgam English’ and an ‘International English’ are presented.

Unfortunately, the meaning of the latter—‘International English’—is the exact opposite to the kind of International English as presented in Canepari’s English PronunciationS. In fact, this last pronunciation scheme is international in a highly evaluative sense: it chooses the best of both native neutral American and British accents, reducing the single peculiarities of each of them.
1.7. Certainly, a serious international accent should be nothing ‘artificial’, and in fact Canepari’s proposal in *English Pronunciation* has been modeled upon the pronunciation that many singers and actors use, more or less coherently, but systematically, as many CNN newsreaders do – which is quite easy to verify.

On the contrary, Gimson’s International English as presented in that chapter is an extremely simplified kind of English, with its original phonic inventory ultimately cut by almost a half, which is meant to be used mostly by non-native speakers and produces what might still be an intelligible form of English, given that communication using it will be in contexts where the language used has a fair degree of predictability. Practically, the lowest possible ‘thing’ that, euphemistically, could still be called *English* (*pace* Kachru and Jenkins, too). Nor is any better the intermediate kind of English pronunciation, presented as ‘Amalgam English’, which only seeks for an ‘easy intelligibility by native speakers’ rather than trying to sound like a native speaker.

Our ‘international Dutch’ aims at avoiding unnecessary subtleties, but always in the framework of a pronunciation model that remains as close as possible to genuine native accents.

1.8. Thus, we do not want to kid ourselves about learning and teaching. Those who do not have a feel for the pronunciation of a language (ie for *Natural Phonetics*) will not get better results if they try to study the phonetics of that language, even in a simplified form. The world is full of people who –somehow– do communicate in foreign languages, even without studying any phonetics at all. But those who understand that it is important to pronounce a language well should aim at our kind of international Dutch pronunciation, either in its basic arrangement, as presented hereby, or in a more native-like form, by acquiring and properly also using some of the peculiarities described in the appropriate chapters (on neutral, mediatic and regional accents).

**Why doing phonetics?**

1.9. It is a common assumption that the pronunciation of a language and its official spelling are one and the same thing (in spite of some lamented incongruity). This impression derives from the fact that school –to be true– generally only worries about writing, and neglects pronunciation. The belief of the (almost) ‘natural’ correspondence between spelling and pronunciation is illusory. But, if spelling can be fairly homogeneous in every nation, this is not the case for pronunciation, which is generally more or less marked regionally.

1.10. Too often, people think that they cannot improve their pronunciation, or simply need not to. At first, it is not always easy, nor is it evident that each person has a different pronunciation from other people’s, not so much –or not only– because of individual peculiarities of voice, due to personal *timbres* (which are determined by the somatic and temperamental characteristics of each person); but,
most of all, because of the regional and social characteristics which every person ‘spontaneously’ has (unless one has freed oneself from them, by applying the phonetic method).

Such characteristics have been acquired together with the language, as a part of language itself.

1.11. What follows provides a fairly concise, but helpful, introduction to the natural method. Quite understandably, these introductory notes have been prepared primarily from the point of view of English native speakers, or of those who have a very good command of English pronunciation. That is why the various aspects of Dutch pronunciation will be systematically compared to the corresponding ones of English (whenever present).

However, those who have a different mother tongue are warmly advised to refer to the relevant descriptions (more or less extensively dealt with) provided in some of the canIPA works listed in the Bibliography. So the readers can make useful comparisons between the language —or languages— they know best and the one treated hereby.

1.12. Phonetics must not be ‘studied’ unwillingly or mnemonically. On the contrary, it has to be ‘discovered’, while enjoying playing with sounds (and with words, sentences, and texts).

Although we are hardly aware of it, phonetics is always with us: it is in us, as we naturally and inevitably resort to phonetics-related mechanisms whenever we speak and hear others speak. Those who learn to use the categories and principles of phonetics will succeed in recognizing the different sounds of their own language, including nuances.

Later on, one can also manage to recognize the sounds of other languages, dialects, and accents. And this will become easier if one is able to apply correctly what phonetics offers freely, with no need of expensive equipments: it is sufficient —but necessary—to start to really ‘listen’ to the sounds, not just simply ‘hear’ them.

A very effective help, with this way of analyzing sounds, is provided by the use of phonetic symbols, which allow us to ‘see’ the sounds and then to compare them, by reflecting on their similarities and differences.

Another way to ‘see’ the sounds is by using appropriate articulatory figures which, besides facilitating reciprocal comparisons, also activate your reflection of the movements that occur inside your mouth, when you just produce a given sound. Once started doing so, it is surprising to notice that certain sound nuances correspond to given movements (although small). And people really wonder why they did not realize such a simple and natural thing earlier.

1.13. Let us now see a simple type of transcription, which puts words (and sentences, as well) between slashes. We will refer to English, here, as it is assumed that all readers already know this language, while it is possible that some of them only have a theoretical knowledge of Dutch at this stage. Phonemic transcriptions show
phonemes (or functional sounds) in relation to spelling. It should be noted that a stressed syllable is clearly indicated by the sign // before it.

In a word such as concise, the two c’s have two different phonic values: /kən'saes/; whereas the c and s in the last syllable have exactly the same value.

Thus, it is obvious that a transcription (even a diaphonemic international one as the one used here for English) is definitely more precise and less ambiguous than traditional spelling, where c generally corresponds to /k/ when it is not followed by i, e, y, that is before a, o, u, or before a consonant; but s may be either /s/ or /z/ in different positions: seas /'siiz/, cease /'siiz/.

Let us also consider g, which can either correspond to /j/ or /ʤ/: get /'get/, gem /'gium/; porgy /'po:gy/, orgy /'o:gi/; while ‘gif’ can have either phoneme: /'gif, 'ʤif/.

Another difference, in comparison with current spelling, will be quite obvious when one considers the following examples, as well: to live /'liv/, a live /'laev/ concert, to tie a bow /'bø¨/, to bow /'boø/ and scrape, a minute /'minøt/, in minute /mae-'njuøt/ detail, of no import /'umpø:øt/, to import /'impø:øt/.

1.14. It is obvious that a monographic treatment of Dutch pronunciation requires to carefully select only what is really needed to analyze that language phonetically. That is why a number of well-mediated excerpt from Canepari’s Natural Phonetics & Tonetics –NPT– have been favored. In fact, that is the fully revised, amended, and updated edition of A Handbook of Phonetics –HPh– with additions and substitutions.

In addition, in the canipa website, still further updatings about vowels, consonants, and intonation (including ton[em]es) are to be found, freely downloadable.

This simply means natural phonetics—that is articulatory, auditory, and functional—with all necessary explanations through articulatory figures for consonants: orograms of all articulations (and some palatograms and linguograms); for vowels: vocograms (or vowel quadrilaterals) and labiograms (some of the last ones are useful for consonants as well).

In addition, auditory figures are used for intonation and tones: tonograms; when it is necessary or useful, some other kinds of figures are used, as will be seen below.

1.15. To put natural phonetics into practice, nothing is needed except one’s own personal abilities and interest for the sounds of the world’s languages: both languages and dialects, and both accents and variants, as well.

The only ‘external’—technological— instrument which is highly useful is a good sound recorder with good earphones, and with a quick, sharp pause button, that is a mechanical one (preferably – though recently also electronic pauses are sufficiently quick, as not to mutilate whole parts of phones, any longer).

This button allows one to interrupt the listening of a recording (and to start it again at once), being able—with practice—to segment each sound, even a short one, into two or three parts.

On the other hand, all of us have learned our own mother tongue perfectly, with no need of any sound recorder, since we were of the ideal age and had the neces-
sary motivations to build up a language, in order to be able to communicate with people around us.

Without a language to use, anyone would inevitably have terrible practical, social, behavioral, and conceptual limitations.

After babyhood, it is more complicated to learn another language, or more languages, also because the new structures never coincide with those of our first language, and every kind of interference is always in wait, even between similar languages.

**Typography & canIPA symbols**

1.16. Some readers may be interested in knowing how to succeed in dealing with so many symbols, and type them in continuous transcriptions with reasonable ease and speed. Given the typographical limitations of most fonts normally available on the market, we had to devise our own phonetic fonts according to the Mac OS Roman character encoding.

*Mac OS Roman* allows to encode 221 characters for each of the four members of a font family (generally known as roman, italic, bold and bold-italic), for a total number of 884 signs. It goes without saying, then, that an Apple computer—apart from being the most suitable and reliable tool for high-end word processing and editing— is indispensable to work with our *Mac OS Roman*-encoded fonts.

Furthermore, we also recommend using the last pre-OS X operating system, namely *Mac OS 9.2*, thanks to its straightforwardness and versatility. More importantly, OS 9.2 users have the special privilege to be able to use *Word 5.1* by many remembered as the most practical yet powerful release of *Microsoft’s* classical word processor ever developed for the *Mac*. Of course, a good desktop publishing software is then needed for professional page layouts.

At the time when our earliest fonts were created, *Apple* computers had an Italian qzerty keyboard layout, quite different from the sadly unified qwerty *Italy Pro* one of today (which nevertheless has little to do with the nearly universal uk and us-inspired qwerty proper).

Unlike its modern counterpart, ‘Old qzerty’ provides at least four symbols for each key. For instance, using our own SimonCanI fonts, one immediately obtains [a, ä] by simply typing a on the lower- or uppercase keys, with the addition of the option, option + shift, and option + caps keys). This is done without having to perform complex acrobatics to *insert symbols* with many clicks of the mouse and curses.

But non-Mac users will hardly be able to realize what this statement actually means, since it seems impossible—or even unimaginable—for those who are bound by the absurd limitations of common pc’s, with their more or less 100 signs directly from the keyboard. Nor is *Unicode* as simple and complete as our canIPA fonts are.

1.17. However, our readers will easily understand that the intrinsic potential of our phonetic-symbol inventory and the long-experimented method to deal with its typographical rendering—no doubt—pose a great challenge to transcribers.
Works like the present one—not to mention *Natural Phonetics & Tonetics*, with its 320 languages dealt with—are rather complex, both for the very many figures and for its transcriptions. We have done our best to avoid mistakes and misprints, but perfection is not of this world, and therefore we will very much welcome any corrections and suggestions from our readers.

1.18. In addition, it is important to remember that when we criticize pure phonologists or pure acoustic phoneticians, and their use of ‘symbols’ we do not mean that their work is of no use at all. Of course, they are free to do what they want (or what they can), but we would just like to point out that doing descriptive phonetics is not at all something out-of-date, useless, or unscientific.

On the contrary, it is very useful and helpful both to researchers and students, provided the correct approach is adopted. In fact, one should rebel against those who do descriptive phonetics in a very generic and worthless way, by using approximate and ambiguous terminology and symbols, as well.

However, those who only do phonology, or acoustic phonetics, limit themselves to simply thinking of sounds, or seeing them (as computer images or numerical data). By doing so, they prevent themselves from really listening to actual sounds. And, after all, sounds are sounds!

1.19. We particularly thank for their kind help Giacomo Ferrieri, Alexander Loengarov, Ester Maso, Maurizio Pugliese, Alberto Venturi, Daniele Vitali, Yvonne Weichsel, Barbara Williams, and many other friends.

The website (http://venus.unive.it/canipa, for canIPA) is dedicated to *Natural Phonetics & Tonetics*. Of course, by surfing the Web, one can simply search for canipa.

The site is also meant for updates, integrations, modifications, corrections, reflections, anticipations, and to spread the importance of articulatory, auditory, and functional phonetics, that is natural phonotonetics – the only one that allows people feel that they are actually doing something useful and worthwhile, not just mere ‘phonanism’.

\[ LC \& MC \]

Venice, 2013/8/15
University of Venice (Italy)
Phonetics and Phonology
2. Pronunciation & phonetics

2.1.1. One of the most important way human beings are different from animals is that they have developed an extremely elaborate system of communication, in order to exchange information with others of their kind. This system of communication is called articulated speech, in the sense that it has a double articulation. In effect, the signifier, which is constituted primarily by ‘sounds’ of the language is articulated at the first level into units carrying meaning (i.e. lexemes, or lexical elements, and grammemes, or grammatical elements, as for instance in: book-let-s /bok-lət-s/), which are the signified.

The second level of structure is constituted by units which have no intrinsic meaning, but which—in combination—form the meaningful units just now considered. These second level units are the phonemes: /b-ə-k-l-ə-t-s/, which are our main interest, together with their actual realizations (in the spoken language). This goes for both the study of the pronunciation of one or more foreign languages, as well as for the pronunciation of one’s own mother tongue.

Even though the first contact with a foreign language is more often via a visual code, that of writing (i.e words printed in a book, or seen on a display), the fundamental code of a language is, in reality, oral. The natural acquisition of language is perfectly reflected in the case of a child, who first learns to understand, reacting to the sounds of the language used by those close by, and afterwards learns to imitate these sounds and use them to communicate.

2.1.2. Thus, the first ability one learns is understanding the spoken language, then one goes on to use it: to speak it. Much later, if ever, one learns to read the written language, and finally to write it.

The first two stages are fundamental, whereas the last two are complementary—they constitute additions which are not strictly necessary. This point is demonstrated by the fact that many people do not know how to read or write, yet they use their own language or dialect perfectly.

What is more, the majority of the languages spoken in the world, aside from the languages of ‘culture’, do not (yet) have a written form. Even when there is a written language, the spoken language is generally used much more frequently by the average person.

The spoken language is, therefore, the fundamental form of communication among humans, while the written language is only a practical means for fixing in place the spoken language: indeed, it is well-known that scripta manent, verba volant (‘writing remains, words fly away’).
However, writing is not always (or is no longer) a clear and unequivocal method of representing the phonetic form of the language. For example, how are *applicable*, *kilometer* (-tre), or *Caribbean* pronounced? Or *alveolar* and *laryngeal*?

2.1.3. Phonetics—the scientific study of the spoken language—‘studies’ (ie analyzes and describes) the phonetic realizations of language, using various approaches.

Articulatory (or physiological) phonetics examines and describes the production of linguistic sounds by the phono-articulatory organs. In this task, it is aided by Auditory (or perceptive) phonetics, which helps to verify which sounds have been uttered, and functions as the fundamental tool for perceiving the sounds to be imitated.

Acoustic phonetics studies the physical structure of sounds by using sophisticated devices developed for this purpose, or also computer programs, by now.

Instrumental (or experimental) phonetics, uses many different instruments, ranging from very complex ones (such as the spectrograph), to simple ones (such as the artificial palate – today, both of these also have computerized versions).

Historical (or diachronic) phonetics is yet another branch of the subject; it studies the development of the sounds of a language in the course of time.

Finally, functional (or structural) phonetics, also referred to as phonemics, phonology, or phonomatics, addresses the value and function of a language’s sounds, and their interrelationships. In this way, phonemics links the phonic aspect of language to the psychological, cognitive, and social aspects of oral communication, and also to the meaning of words (linguistic signs), in order to arrive at the meaning of sentences.

The two absolutely necessary and indispensable branches of phonetics are, therefore, articulatory phonetics, together with auditory feedback, and functional phonetics, also called phonemics.

All of the other branches indicated above are inevitably complementary – things which are added successively, providing further details, but without being fundamental. They can be helpful for deepening the understanding of particular aspects of the subject, on levels which are definitely more academic than practical.

The transformation of languages and the formation of new languages can be explained through historical phonetics, while acoustic phonetics can help improve communication technology.

In phonemics, there has been a particular development along exclusively academic lines, which seeks to ‘perceive’ the deep internal structure of languages, hoping to arrive at universal conclusions, which could better be defined as glottosophic (abstract and philosophical, more concerned with theoretical speculations about language) than glottographic (concrete and practical, with descriptive and comparative applications, as well as use in teaching contexts).

2.1.4. Thus, a natural phonetics handbook leaves out almost everything which we cannot do by ourselves. Consequently, it mainly deals with articulatory and functional phonetics, starting from zero and working towards very high levels of knowledge and detail.
As a matter of fact, one should start any possible subsequent specialization—profitably—only after having really mastered the articulatory possibilities (and not just the rudiments) of a number of languages, with their phonemic systems presented glottographically, not glottophonetically.

Every phonic realization, besides carrying a conceptual, strictly linguistic message, also contains a collection of additional ‘extra-linguistic’ information. This information includes the age, gender, personality, state of mind, social group, and—sometimes—even the state of health of the speaker. Individuals also have their own physical characteristics, which make it possible to recognize people by listening to their voices while not seeing them, and even when not hearing clearly what they are saying.

Thanks to the radio, television, movies, telephones, computers, CD’s, and cassette recorders, not to mention ease in (and often, the necessity of) moving from one country to another, it has been recognized that the phonic aspect is much more important in the study of languages than the written aspect (which is quite secondary and dependent upon the spoken aspect).

Unfortunately, for a long time (and many continue in this manner even now), the study of languages was focused upon morphosyntactic structure, ‘idiomatic expressions’, and a language’s literature, using only books and without much (or any) concern for the phonic structure—the pronunciation of that language.

But if one wishes to understand a speaker of a given language, if one wishes to be understood, for reasons of work or merely for tourism, it is indispensable to learn pronunciation. The distinctive elements, or phonemes, should be used appropriately, thus resulting in a sufficient level of phonemic competence.

2.1.5. It is still commonly believed that the only way to acquire a good pronunciation of a foreign language is to live for a long time in the country where that language is spoken. Certainly, this method can lead to a certain fluency in the language.

However, practice has shown that (except for unusually talented people, who are rather rare) the method is of almost no use for acquiring a good pronunciation. Everyone knows some people who have lived for decades in a country they were not born in, and who nevertheless continue to speak with a broad ‘foreign accent’.

The accent of most English-speaking people who use a foreign language is notoriously bad, even though they can frequently understand others and make themselves understood in that language, at least to some extent.

Languages do not differ only in their grammar, their vocabulary, and their idioms. They also differ a great deal in the sounds of which they are composed, in the way these sounds are combined to form words and sentences, in the quality of stresses and their distribution, as well as in the way voice pitch rises and falls (ie intonation).

Inevitably, when people study a foreign language (unless they have a special talent or special training), they transfer into the new language the phonic habits of their mother tongue. Contrary to what some continue to think, the desired ‘new habits’ do not arise spontaneously, but require a bit of work, as with any other activity.

Language teaching has improved noticeably ever since it was realized that pronunciation, like any other aspect of linguistic study, can be dealt with scientificaly. It was realized, in other words, that the true nature of any sound used in any language can be described precisely.
Phonetics works effectively side by side with the imitative abilities of the learner, guiding and indispensably complementing the entire endeavor. Phonetics makes available simple and complete scientific descriptions, thereby making it possible to abolish definitively reprehensible statements like ‘this sound cannot be described’, or ‘this sound must be learned directly by imitating your teacher’.

The phonetic method

2.2.1. The true difficulties in studying a spoken language are rarely well-understood. However, when they are clearly explained in detail, it becomes much easier to overcome them. Indeed, depending upon the particular phonemic system of one’s own language, phonic interference can be of four types:

1) certain phonemes are not distinguished (‘hypodifferentiation’), 2) more phonemes are distinguished than actually exist (‘hyperdifferentiation’), 3) phonemes are distinguished in a different way than in the language in question (‘reinterpretation’), 4) certain phones are confused with others (‘substitution’).

The phonetic method consists in understanding completely the articulatory possibilities of the phono-articulatory apparatus and in working to recognize and produce freely a large number of sounds which have been systematically analyzed. The teacher explains how certain sounds are produced, and then pronounces them repeatedly for the students, who try to imitate them. Specially prepared diagrams are used in the explanations (§ 1.14): orograms (from Latin ὀσος, ὀρις ‘mouth’, not from Greek ὄρος– ‘mountain’), which are articulatory sections, usually sagittal (but also occasionally frontal, therefore, a sort of linguogram), and palatograms. These diagrams show the position of the various organs involved in the articulation of different consonant sounds.

For the vowel sounds, the vocogram (or vowel quadrilateral) is used. The vocogram employed here is one with modernized shape and internal subdivisions; the result is a decisive improvement on the ‘official’ shape. This last diagram has the defect of sacrificing precision on the altar of tradition; in fact, it stems from ideas which were partially erroneous from the outset.

If the teacher is reasonably competent (both in perceiving and [re]producing the various sounds), it will be possible to help students when their efforts fail to reach desired levels of performance. Useful techniques include repeating the correct sound multiple times while alternating it with the incorrect one, giving further advice, suggesting additional exercises, and obviously referring back to the articulatory diagrams (and showing accurate symbols). An early and detailed treatment of intonation is more than appropriate, even though it is usually relegated to the later sections of textbooks, and often treated hurriedly (if not completely ignored). In fact, every tonogram should be analyzed in its smallest details (just like any other articulatory figure), in order to ‘discover’ all of its characteristics and thereby acquire full familiarity with the concepts treated.

2.2.2. The first difficulty that must be overcome concerns the ability to perceive the sounds of the language sufficiently well. Individuals differ quite a bit in this