



UDC 811.112.5

Liubov Ulianitckaia

St. Petersburg State Electrotechnical University

**THE FLEMISH VARIANT OF THE DUTCH LANGUAGE:
BELGIAN DUTCH OR “TUSSENTAAL”**

For citation: Ulianitckaia L. The Flemish variant of the Dutch language: Belgian Dutch or “Tussentaal”. *Scandinavian Philology*, 2019, vol. 17, issue 2, pp. 247–263. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2019.204>

This article is devoted to the study of the modern language situation in Belgium, where three languages — Dutch, French and German — are recognized as the state languages (with the predominant use of Dutch and French). This situation is complicated by the fact that along with the literary norms of these languages there are numerous dialects, as well as options such as Belgian Dutch and Belgian French. Due to the linguistic neighborhood with France, Germany and the Netherlands, as well as the increasing importance of the English language in Belgium, it is difficult to talk about a common language norm that would be used by all residents of the country, in particular for their everyday communication. The Belgian Dutch is in contact not only with the Belgian French, but also with the Dutch and French literary norms, not to mention the Flemish dialects. All this leads to a very complicated language situation. Particular attention is paid to the Flemish variant of the Dutch language, which has notable differences from the Dutch norm. A comparison between the North Dutch norm (Dutch Dutch) and the South Dutch norm (Belgian Dutch) is also presented in the article. The study describes the features of the intermediate language — “tussentaal”, which is chosen by people of different levels of education in almost all situations, except perhaps the most formal ones. The article concludes that the Flemish version of the Dutch language is a striking example of the contact of Flemish dialects with the Dutch and French languages and is a “suspension” of Belgian Dutch with “tussentaal”, in conjunction with Belgian French, Dutch Dutch, French French, English and German languages.

Keywords: Flemish variant, Dutch language, Tussental, language situation, Belgium.

The current linguistic situation in Belgium is the result of an almost two-hundred-year history of social changes and linguistic impact of both neighboring states and countries that have influenced

Belgium politically. Today, we continue to observe constant changes in language policy, and in the linguistic diversity represented in different parts of Belgium. The language situation in Belgium, where three languages — Dutch, French and German are recognized as state languages (with the predominant use of Dutch and French), is complicated by the fact that along with the literary norms of these languages there are numerous dialects, as well as options such as Belgian Dutch and Belgian French.

As far as the Dutch language is concerned, the basis of its general literary norm is formed by two of the most formal variants — Dutch Dutch and Belgian Dutch. Dialects of the Dutch language belong to the informal category. Intermediate languages can be recognized as the middle category. The intermediate language is closer to Dutch Dutch (and to the common norm) in the Netherlands, and to dialects in Belgium. The intermediate language of Belgium (“tussentaal”) has been known in the field of linguistics since the late 80s of the 20th century. It is believed that this term arose among the Ghent linguists [Goossens, 2000] and indeed, J. Taeldeman [Taeldeman, 2008], like many others, tries to introduce it everywhere. The term itself, however, has a well-known background and is associated with the problem of familiarization with a foreign language. When someone tries to speak a foreign language, but does not keep it away from the interference effect of their native language at the phonetic, lexical and morphosyntactic levels, an intermediate language arises. An intermediate language is considered as a transitional process, an almost inevitable part of an effort to master a foreign language. In this analogy, one can speak of “tussentaal” in Belgium as the result of language standardization in the second half of the 20th century. Most Flemish then spoke a particular dialect, and the goal of the state language policy was to “teach” them a new “foreign” language — the northern Dutch norm — with the help of educational institutions and the media.

Referring to the Dutch language, a special situation develops in Belgium at the beginning of the 21st century. The gap between the formal and the informal types is wide, and many Flemings tend to master the formal type (the general Dutch norm). However, the Belgian Dutch is different from the general Dutch norm, as, for example, Austrian German is different from the general German norm. Therefore, the transition to a formal level is inevitably associated with the Belgian Dutch

acquisition. Perhaps this particular language should be considered to be the Flemish version of the Dutch language and its features should be described. But from our point of view, it is necessary to take into account other realities.

The process of the language standardization began in the 16th century and proceeded in the Netherlands, and practically stopped in Flanders — the national language of the South was subjugated by French. Formally, on gaining its independence (1830), Belgium obtained the freedom of language choice, but in fact, French was the only state language. The majority spoke Flemish dialects; however it was not possible to defend the right of their widespread use. In the period between 1834 and 1840, the Flemish movement highlighted the need to give the Dutch language the status of the state language, but the first language law which allowed Flanders court proceedings in Dutch was adopted only in 1873. In 1898, the Law of Equality was adopted — all laws and royal decrees were to be published in two languages. Until the end of the 21st century, Flanders was officially bilingual, and from the 30s of 20th century people began to speak the Dutch language, but did not stop using geographically separate dialects. There was no single language that at all social levels could compete with prestigious French.

The need for a linguistic norm was urgent, and the Flemish movement asked itself what the Dutch language of Belgium should be. Within the movement began a discussion between the so-called integrationists and particularists. The first ones insisted on the North Dutch norm, as they wanted to promote South-North integration. The second ones called for the development of a special Flemish language. Ultimately, the idea of integration was accepted, and there were two reasons for that — the new language had to embrace all of Dutch history and literature in order to become a formidable rival to French, and to serve as a language option with which it was possible to distance oneself from dialects. The North Dutch language met these requirements. It was introduced into the education system in 1914, and in 1946 received additional support under the Cultural Agreement between Belgium and the Netherlands. However, the spread of this norm was slow, its functioning became noticeable only in the 50–60s of the 20th century, and reached its maximum in the 80s.

Thus, the Belgian Dutch is in contact not only with the Belgian French, but also with the Dutch and French literary norms, not to men-

tion the Flemish dialects. All this leads to a very difficult linguistic situation.

The tradition of language regulation is strong in Flanders, and as a result almost every citizen understands the general Dutch and, especially, the South Dutch norm. However, these standards are used purely in formal communication. Due to the fact that the Flemings were asked to adopt a “foreign language”, and the national color is not enough expressed in the Belgian Dutch, neither of these norms can claim to be an informal, spoken language. Thus, the general Dutch norm is used mainly as a “dress suit”, which is not always convenient [De Caluwe, Geeraerts, Kroon, 2002; Geeraerts, 1999].

Flemish dialects also cede to literary norm, but their position is stronger than in the Netherlands — almost everyone in Belgium speaks a dialect [Clerck, 1981]. The linguistic situation in Flanders is more complicated than in the Netherlands. This is due to the fact that from the throw-down of Antwerp to the short coexistence of the Northern and Southern Netherlands during the reign of Willem I (from 1815 to 1830), there was no contact with the North Dutch literary norm. In the Southern Netherlands, the Flemish linguist R. Willemyns distinguishes between five language variants flowing into each other — dialect, transliterated dialect, regional language (regiolect), intermediate language (“tussentaal”), and the South Dutch norm (Belgian Dutch) [Willemyns, 2005]. The existence of an intermediate language, sometimes called “Vlederlands” (“Flederland” — our translation) or “Schoon Vlaams” / “Verkavelingsvlaams” (“Beautiful Flemish” / “Provincial Flemish” — translation by A. A. Yakovleva [Yakovleva, 2015]), is quite often disputed. The intermediate language is a special language that develops “in the neighborhood” with the South Dutch norm, and is clearly different from it. Of course, in southern (Belgian) Dutch, there is also a strong influence of dialects, gallicisms, purisms and archaisms, but since for many Flemings the gap between the dialect and the South Dutch norm is too large, an “intermediate language” (“tussentaal”), closer to the dialects, is used. Some Flemish linguists and writers are opposed to this language, because they no longer understand it in the Northern Netherlands, and if the intermediate language becomes the norm in Belgium, this will mean the end of the linguistic unity existing between Flanders and the Netherlands and enshrined in law. Many Flemings believe that the literary norm for the Netherlands and Belgium should be

the same. But regional differences still exist [Willy, Willy, 2009]. Some of these differences are related to vocabulary, for example: *ajuin* ‘onion’, *hesp* ‘ham’, *nonkel* ‘uncle’. The influence of the Flemish persisted during the period when the North Dutch became the norm. To this day, Flemish vocabulary extends to the north. So, *betoging* ‘rally’, *gezapig* ‘sedately’, *monkelen* ‘smirking’, *op voorhand* ‘in advance’, *stilaan* ‘quietly’, *uitbater* ‘manager’, *zinderen* ‘sparkle’ were of southern origin. In recent decades, especially in the field of cycling, Flanders has become an important “supplier” of new words and phrases. For example, *afgetekende overwinning* — *duidelijke overwinning waaraan niet te twifelen valt* ‘undoubted victory’, *afzien* — *lijden* ‘torment’, *iemand op afstand zetten* — *een duidelijke voorsprong nemen op iemand* ‘to have an obvious advantage over someone’, *klassieker* or *koers* — *wielerwedstrijd* ‘cycling competitions’, *recupereren* — *op krachten komen* ‘to regain strength’ — also came from the south. Originally Flemish football terms, for example, *heenedwstrijd* / *terugwedstrijd* — *eerste* / *tweede dwstrijd die een voetbalploeg tegen een andere ploeg moet spelen* ‘the first / second competition in which one football team plays against another’ are increasingly frequent in the Netherlands; *gekwetst* — *geblesseerd* ‘injured’ is also found in Dutch sports reviews.

When it is required to establish the lexical features of the intermediate language (“tussentaal”), the matter boils down mainly to the identification and description of “Belgicisms” (as is done for Belgian Dutch) and dialectic words.

However, some linguists believe that the identification of Belgicisms should be carried out only in relation to the literary norm of the Belgian Dutch. These differences make it difficult to classify a particular token as a specific language variant.

Establishing a difference in the grammatical inventory of the languages in contact is not so difficult. Words and phrases are sorted by syntactic rules, with little dependence on the will of the speaker or writer. The word order, in its basic principles, is common to all carriers.

The South Dutch literary norm, as well as the “tussentaal”, is characterized by noticeable syntactic deviations from the (north) Dutch literary norm. The intermediate language, however, rejects its syntax even more, but this will be discussed below.

Between the Belgian and Dutch norms, differences are found in the organization of verb groups in simple and complex sentences. For exam-

ple, the Belgian construction *dat ik het zou gedaan hebben* ‘what would I do’ in the Dutch norm in most cases looks like *dat ik het gedaan zou hebben* or *dat ik het zou hebben gedaan*, i. e. participle II (or the infinitive) does not occupy a central position. The preposition (verb extension) in Belgian simple sentences also occupies a central position in the verb group, for example, *we zullen er wat moeten aan doen* ‘something needs to be done with this’. In the Dutch norm, this sentence will look like *we zullen er wat aan moeten doen*. Another example *ze zullen morgen kunnen op reis gaan* ‘they can leave tomorrow’ — *ze zullen morgen op reis kunnen gaan*.

Differences are also found in the organization of conditional sentences. This way, the Belgian *moest ik rijk zijn, ik kocht het* ‘if I were rich, I would buy it’ in the Dutch norm looks like *mocht ik rijk zijn, dan kocht ik het* or *als ik rijk was, kocht ik het*. In Belgian Dutch, such a construction is also possible, but *als* is very often replaced by *eens*. Conjunctions *zodra* and *wanneer* are also replaced by *eens*, *eenmaal* or *van zodra*. The North Dutch *toen* is replaced in the Belgian Dutch by *als*. Thus, the allied elements in the southern and northern Dutch are different.

After the verb *komen* in the southern norm, the participle II is usually used, for example *een auto kwam aangereden* ‘a car drove up’, and in the northern one, the infinitive *een auto kwam aanrijden*.

When translating the Belgian sentence *aan de overkant staan er mooiere bomen dan aan deze kant* into the Dutch norm, the *er* should be excluded.

In the Dutch norm, after the verbs *durven*, *beginnen* and *proberen* the particle *te* is obligatory, for example, *ik durf het niet te vragen* ‘I dare not ask this’; in Belgian Dutch, such a sentence as, for example, *hij moet beginnen werken* ‘it should start working’ is correct. However, this particle can also be omitted in the infinitive with *om*, for example, *het is mooi om zien* ‘it’s nice to see’. In the Dutch norm, only *het is mooi om te zien* is possible. In these phenomena, we see the interference effect from the corresponding French constructions, in which infinitive particles are not used. Another French influence is the use of verbs with return particles in the southern norm, for example, *zich aan iets verwachten* ‘expect something’, unlike the northern *iets verwachten*, as well as *geweest / geworden* in perfect passive.

In the compound modal verb predicates, built on the perfection of the modal verb, the Belgian Dutch chooses an auxiliary verb depending

on the fixed semifinitive. The Dutch norm almost always uses “hebben” (“have”). For example, the Belgian sentence “Hij is niet kunnen komen” (“He could not come”) in the Dutch norm looks like “Hij heeft niet kunnen komen”. It is interesting that in either norm the choice of the auxiliary verb also depends on the modifying semifinitive, for example, “Ik ben wezen werken” (“I worked”).

The prepositional groups are somewhat different — in the North Dutch norm *voor 50 euro kopen* ‘buy for 50 Euro’, in the southern *aan 50 euro kopen*. Other examples in the same sequence of languages: *kwart over tien* ‘quarter past ten’ — *kwart na tien*, in *Amsterdam wonen* — *te Amsterdam wonen*, *door het jaar heen* ‘all year’ — *het jaar doorheen*.

In southern Dutch, more often than in northern, there are deviations in the matching of the adjective and noun, for example, in the phrase *dat mooi huis* ‘this beautiful house’ instead of *dat mooie huis*.

There are various forms of politeness in Belgium and the Netherlands. In the northern norm, *jij* ‘you’ is used more often than *U* ‘you’, and in the southern norm — vice versa. Sometimes in Belgian Dutch you can hear the form *gij/ge* ‘You’ (common for “tussentaal” and Flemish dialects). In the Netherlands, almost everyone knows the Dutch standard. In Belgium, perhaps, there is not a single lay person who could perfectly master it [De Caluwe, 2012]. Integration ideology in the media is declining, and the language of television and radio broadcasting increasingly reflects the characteristics of Belgian Dutch. The previously used North Dutch norm is becoming more and more virtual, since it is not used in everyday speech [Grondelaers, 2011] and is perceived by the Flemings as an exogenous version [Lebbe, 1997].

Along with changes in the Dutch language, the “tussentaal” is on the rise in the Flemish media. The loss of dialects and growing Belgian identity lead to the need to form a special endogenous language [Lybaert, 2011], located between the norm and the dialect. This language does not represent ultimate unity; it is more likely represented by a group of intermediate variants, combining, in an averaged form, dialectical features with the features of the Belgian Dutch, as well as showing its own. Moreover, the features of Belgian Dutch appear in “tussentaal” more often than in Belgian Dutch itself [Geeraerts, 1999]. Grondelaers and Van Houth see the distribution of “tussentaal” as an autonomous process of language standardization [Grondelaers, 2011],

[Van Hoof, 2013]. This option is the mother tongue for the younger generation and is increasingly used by Flemings with higher education.

This autonomous, spontaneous process was inevitable. When the Flemings, who had previously spoken dialects, began to master the Dutch standard, the result was a multiplicity of intermediate languages. In the 1930s, school and university teachers experienced this, and after twenty to thirty years, the rest of the population, influenced by language campaigns aiming to supplant the dialects in which children were brought up and trained, speak the (North) Dutch norm. Due to a lack of confidence in this norm and, as a consequence, insufficient knowledge of it, the Flemings began to speak more in intermediate languages than in the introduced version. At that time there was nothing like the modern “tussentaal”.

For the younger generation, their native language is the average version of many intermediate languages — “tussentaal”. For modern children, even Belgian Dutch, not to mention the general Dutch norm, is a specific option, very suitable for the role of a written language (for example, when performing school tasks), but completely unsuitable for oral, informal communication.

Perhaps all this will soon make the ideology of standardization inconclusive, despite the fact that, as we have already noted, some Belgians are inclined to master and improve the general Dutch norm.

This ideology was aimed at borrowing from the Netherlands a linguistic foundation; the Flemings were offered only this way of switching from native dialects to a unified version. Now, in almost all situations, except perhaps the most formal, people of different levels of education prefer the intermediate language “tussentaal”.

This causes discontent among the supporters of standardization and “purity” of Belgian Dutch, and even attacks from academics against the development of “tussentaal” in Belgium. Works of this kind are described in detail in the reviews of Jaspers [Jaspers, 2011] and De Caluwe [De Caluwe, 2012].

Since the beginning of the 21st century, through the efforts of these scientists, the “tussentaal” phenomenon has been considered with great reverence. Intermediate language is increasingly considered the result of objective sociolinguistic processes, the essence of which is that people strive not only for mutual understanding, but also for maintaining

authenticity in conditions of increasing mobility and a noticeable deformation of colloquial forms, including in the media.

Nowadays, we see the gradual institutionalization of “tussentaal” research and teaching. The University of Ghent (which in 1930 was the first to completely switch from French to Dutch) has taught Dutch with many language options for many years, but since 2005, linguistics students have been offered a separate course (for one semester) dedicated to “tussentaal”. In 2008, the first dissertation on the features of the distribution of morphosyntactic characters of the “tussentaal” in various regions of Belgium appeared [Plevoets, 2008]. In 2012, Sarah Van Hof (University of Antwerp) presented a sociolinguistic work that examined the language change in the radio programs Vlaamse openbare omroep (Flemish open broadcasting) from 1977 to 2012 [Van Hoof, 2013]. The conclusions of the work are impressive: in earlier broadcasts, you can equally hear both the dialect and the norm (not used simultaneously); “tussentaal” dominates today, even in cases where one should switch to a dialect or norm.

The process of formation of Belgian Dutch can be considered steadily current within the framework of one well-visible option; the process of formation “tussentaal” is in its initial, unstable stage and proceeds within the framework of several options artificially reduced to one by the efforts of Belgian linguists.

For informal communication in Flanders, a special option is chosen — “tussentaal”. The reason for its appearance is understandable: “If people no longer want or cannot speak dia- / regiolect, an intermediate form arises, a language that mixes endogenous dia / regiolect and exogenous standard language” [De Caluwe, Geeraerts, Kroon, 2002]. According to J. Taeldeman [Taeldeman, 2008], the following two factors play the main role in the genesis of the intermediate language: on the one hand, “negative attitude to the dialect,” on the other hand, “insufficient knowledge of the (Belgian version) of the Dutch language and therefore also negative attitude towards it”. The process of losing dialects also affects the emergence and spread of an intermediate language [Van de Craen, 1985]. This process started in Flanders quite late and manifests in two ways: “on the one hand, more and more people refuse the dialect in more and more cases, on the other hand, the dialect must be replaced with some other option” [Willemys, 2005]. The norm is not chosen as a substitute, since the dialect is used in an informal setting, and the norm

in a formal one. There is a place for “another informal option, a kind of Umgangssprache” [Willemys, 2005]. Other factors play a role in the development of the intermediate language: “an increase in the number of interregional informal contacts associated with increasing mobility” [Ferguson, 1959], language changes in the Flemish media, parents talking to their children in “tussentaal” and, of course, children themselves, who in their circle use only this option.

Despite the fact that “tussentaal” has been developing for quite some time, the term itself, as mentioned above, and the first works devoted to it, appeared only in the late 80s of the 20th century. Apparently, before scientists considered this phenomenon as interference of the Flemish dialects, and not as a kind of intermediate phase. However, “tussentaal” is a new option: it is a way to distance oneself from dialects, which facilitates inter-regional contact, as well as from the (general) norm, which allows you to maintain an authentic, still recognizable Flemish. Thus, for many, “tussentaal” is still very imperfect, but still a true Flemish version of the Dutch language.

Like any autonomously standardized language, “tussentaal” implicitly strives for a certain center. This center is located in the Brabant dialect region, which is explained by the peculiarities of the process of the loss of dialects in different regions. In Brabant, this process began early, and the population of other regions, where dialects were lost later, needed a language that replaced them, and this language, among other things, became the Brabant version [Willemys, 2005]. In fact, one could speak of Brabant expansion, of “the tendency of all Flanders to adopt the dialect version of the Brabant Antwerp for general use” [Goossens, 2000]. In addition, the influence of Brabant on the Flemish version could be felt long before the term “tussentaal” appeared [Willemys, 2005]. During the time of Burgundy, the duchy of Brabant already possessed prestige and fame, and the features of the Brabant dialect spread to neighboring regions [Demedts, 1971].

A precise description of “tussentaal” has not yet been found in the field of modern German studies. Basically, research is devoted to the sociolinguistic legitimacy of this option, and not its linguistic features. According to J. Taeldeman [Taeldeman, 2008], “tussentaal” combines the following features: “(a) features of a language norm (by which it is clearly recognized as a non-dialect), (b) dia- and regiolectic features (which provide a fair amount of structural distance from the (Belgian

version) of the language norm and (c) new elements typical of “tussentaal”.

It seems to us that the consideration of “tussentaal” should be conducted in the same way as the Belgian Dutch, that is, in comparison with the general Dutch literary norm, from which, in fact, both of these Flemish versions of the Dutch language try to “get away”. Of course, when detecting dialect or regiolect traits, as well as unexpected innovations, we will not ignore them.

In “tussentaal” we observe a strong lexical influence from the dialects and a lot of gallicisms, purisms and archaisms. Since the 1990s, autonomous standardization has been noticeable in this version, focusing, however, on the Brabant dialect. This is not surprising, since Brabant is still a kind of “language center” in Belgium, from which many words (such as the already mentioned *hesp* ‘ham’) are distributed throughout the country. Of course, the urban dialect of Antwerp should be taken into account when describing the “tussentaal” vocabulary, but for the most part one should be guided by the colloquial forms of the Belgian Dutch, which in modern dictionaries of the Dutch language, as well as its Flemish version, are marked with special signs. In comparison with Belgian Dutch, the assignment of certain lexical units to “tussentaal” is even more difficult. Grammatical features are established taking into account the phenomena characteristic of both the South Dutch variant and the Flemish dialects.

In the Dutch norm, *de* is used as the definite article in the singular for masculine and feminine nouns, and in the plural for nouns of all three genders; in the singular for middle nouns — *het*. For the indefinite article in the singular for nouns of all three genders *een* is used; and in the plural, the zero article.

In “tussentaal”, as the indefinite article in the singular for masculine nouns beginning with the vowel or consonant *h, d, t* or *b*, *nen* is used, for example, *nen aap* ‘monkey’ or *nen bakker* ‘baker’, and for those which start with other consonants, *ne*, for example, *ne stoel* ‘chair’; for feminine nouns, *een* is used, for example, *een vrouw* ‘woman’; for middle nouns beginning with a vowel or consonant, *h* is also *een*, and for those which start with other consonants, *e* is, for example, *e kind* ‘child’. As the definite article in the singular for masculine nouns, in full analogy with the indefinite article is used *den* or *de*, for example, *den aap* or *de stoel*.

In the Dutch norm, in the singular with an indefinite noun of the middle gender, an adjective without an ending is used, in all other cases the ending *-e* is added to the adjective. In “tussentaal”, regardless of certainty / uncertainty, in the singular with a masculine noun beginning with the vowel or consonant *h, d, t* or *b*, an adjective with the ending *-en*, for example, *die groten aap*, and with a beginning with other consonants — without ending; with a feminine noun, the adjective is also used without an ending, unless it ends in *-d* (then *-d* is replaced by *-i*) or *p, t* or *k* (then the Dutch norm applies), for example: *die schoon tafel, die goei vrouw*; with a neuter noun, the adjective is used without an ending, and in the adjective *goed* the ending *-d* is often lost; in the plural, the adjective behaves the same as in the singular with a feminine noun.

In the Dutch norm, the possessive pronoun *ons* is used in the singular with a middle noun, in all other cases — *onze*. Other defining pronouns do not change. In “tussentaal” in the singular with a masculine noun beginning with the vowel or consonant *h, d, t* or *b*, a pronoun with the ending *-en* is used, and with a beginning with other consonants with the ending *-e*, for example, *dienen hond, mijne man*. In all other cases, deviations from the Dutch norm are not observed. However, *ons* is again an exception, used in the singular with a feminine noun, for example, *ons ma*.

Quite often, a specific article is used with masculine proper names, for example, *de Peter*, which is “tussentaal’s” own “innovation”. As in the Belgian Dutch, the gender of nouns can be defined with deviations from the Dutch norm.

The tussentaal uses the diminutive suffix *-ke* (*-eke, -ske*), as, for example, *meiske* ‘girl’, *huizeke* ‘house’ or *dooske* ‘box’, which it is characteristic, as was shown above, for Flemish dialects, and is also found in the Belgian Dutch.

In contrast to the Dutch norm, after *iets, veel* and *niets*, the *-s* ending is not added to the adjective, for example, *niets mooi* ‘nothing beautiful’.

In the second person singular, the pronoun *ge* or *gij* ‘you’ is used, for example, *ge komt* ‘you go’. This can be explained by the influence of both dialects and the archaic South Dutch language.

A special verb conjugation is also manifested in the singular of the first person, when the verb ending in a vowel in the Dutch form is supplemented with the ending *-n*, for example, *ik gaan* ‘I go’ — *ik ga*; In the imperative mood, the ending *-t* (sometimes pronounced *-d*) is added to

the verb, for example, *Kalmeerd!* ‘Calm down!’ — *Kalmeer!*). Sometimes the ending -t is not pronounced in the second and third person, for example, *ze ga* ‘she goes’ — *ze gaat*.

In “tussentaal”, as in most dialects, the pronoun subject is modified, for example, *ge moe (t) gij da (t) vergeten zijn* ‘you need to forget this’ — *Je moet dat vergeten* or *Da ‘weet ekik wel* ‘I know this’ — *Dat weet ik wel*. An interesting construction is ‘*k heb ekik* ‘I have’, where the subject, as it were, is modified twice. The subjective pronoun *hij* ‘he’ is sometimes replaced by the object *em* (in the Dutch norm this happens with the subjective pronoun *ze* ‘they’, replaced by the object *hun*; in Afrikaans, the replacement of the subjective pronoun *we* by the *ons* object form led to its complete loss).

To the union element, as in all dialects, a *dat* particle is added, the syntactic status of which, as shown above, can be associated with antecedence. So, for example, in “tussentaal” you can find the sentence *we weten hoe dat ge u voelt* ‘we know how you feel’ — *we weten hoe je je voelt*. Allied elements, “tracking” the antecedent, manifest themselves in dialects very specifically (which relates mainly to the modification of the pronoun subject); in the Belgian Dutch, such phenomena are not observed. Therefore, we are inclined to consider the *dat* particle added in dependent sentences to the union element as an innovation of “tussentaal”, but to perceive in this innovation the interfering influence of the French language at the level of syntax of antecedent constructions formed depending on the informativeness of question and union elements.

It is interesting to note that, unlike the Dutch norm, “tussentaal” does not always comply with the coordination of antecedent and an allied element by gender, for example, *da is nu ne keer nen auto da weinig geld kost en toch goe bolt* ‘here is a car that doesn’t cost much, but drives well’ — *dat is wel een auto, die weinig kost en toch goed rijdt*. The union elements *zodat*, *opdat*, *doordat* are often replaced with the simple form *dat*.

Double negation is not used in all dialects, but is regularly found in tussentaal, in various manifestations. So, an archaic particle *en* can be used, for example: “*k En (h) e (b) n (h) em nieverst gevonden* ‘I have not found it anywhere’ — *Ik heb hem nergens gevonden*. The phrases *nooit nie (t)* or *niets nietmeer* are also used, which are sometimes accompanied by an *en* particle, for example, *Ik en (h) e (b) da (t) nooit nie (t) gedaan* ‘I never did this’ — *Ik heb dat nooit gedaan*.

In the Dutch phrase “om te + infinitive”, the preposition *om* may be obligatory or optional. In cases where it is mandatory, “tussentaal”, like dialects, uses the preposition *voor*, and when optional, the preposition *van*, for example, *wij doen dat niet voor de mensen te pesten* ‘we do not do this to pester people’ — *we doen dat niet om de mensen te pesten* and *de neiging van te zeggen* ‘to show addiction’ — *de neiging (om) te zeggen*.

Instead of the Dutch verb *zullen*, the verb *gaan* is used in “tussentaal”, which is also a characteristic of dialects and is found, sometimes, in the Belgian Dutch. Generally speaking, verb groups in “tussentaal” are organized in almost the same way as in the Belgian and Dutch dialects. This applies to verb extensions, the *niet* particle, the *als* conjunction (which can be used instead of the *toen* conjunction), etc.

The presence of original lexical units and grammatical constructions in “tussentaal” contributes to the increasing number of adherents of the idea of the independent nature of this “intermediate” language. However, it is impossible to ignore the presence of interference elements in it. For example, the modification of the subject, characteristic of the French language, is widespread in Flemish dialects and in “tussentaal” and is expressed in the joint use of full and short forms of personal pronouns in sentences of various types. It was also established that the antecedent phenomena characteristic of the French language are widespread in Flemish dialects and in “tussentaal” and are expressed in the use of an excess relative pronoun. These phenomena are not found in the Belgian Dutch language, which is grammatically close to the general Dutch norm, but differs from it lexically.

In 80 % of cases, Flemish families speak tussentaal, which is a kind of compromise between the academic Dutch language (ABN) studied at school and the dialect. According to a survey conducted by Standard, Radio 1 and Nederlandse Taalunie, 60 % of Flemings use tussentaal at work, for business and business contacts. The widespread use of this language variant contributes to its development, and the increasing number of speakers leads to the fact that the role of “tussentaal” in the Belgian language situation is becoming increasingly important [Le flamand pour les initiés, 2017].

The Flemish version of the Dutch language is a striking example of the contact of the Flemish dialects with the Dutch and French languages and, in our opinion, is a “suspension” of Belgian Dutch with “tussentaal”,

in conjunction with Belgian French, Dutch Dutch, French French, English and German.

REFERENCES

- De Caluwe J. Dutch in Belgium. Facing multilingualism in a context of regional monolingualism and Standard Language Ideology. *Standard Languages and Multilingualism in European History*. Amsterdam. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publ., 2012. P. 259–282.
- De Caluwe J., Geeraerts D., Kroon S. Tien stellingen over functie en status van tussentaal in Vlaanderen. *Taalvariatie en taalbeleid. Bijdragen aan het taalbeleid in Nederland en Vlaanderen*. Garant, Antwerpen: Apeldoorn Publ., 2002. P. 57–67.
- Clerck W. Nijhoffs Zuidnederlands Woordenboek. Anvers: 's-Gravenhage Publ., 1981. 854 p.
- Demedts A. *Stijn Streuvels, een terugblik op leven en werk*. Brugge: Orion-Desclée De Brouwer Publ., 1971. 387 p.
- Geeraerts D. Hoe gans het volk is de taal? De Vlaamse taalkloof. *Over Taal 38, nr. 2*. Heule: INNO publishers. 1999. P. 30–34.
- Ferguson Ch. Diglossia. *Word*. Vol. 15. New York: Publishing office Taylor & Francis. 1959. P. 325–340.
- Goossens J. De toekomst van het Nederlands in Vlaanderen. *Ons Erfdeel 43, nr. 1*. Den Haag: Ons Erfdeel, Rekkem Publ. 2000. P. 2–13.
- Grondelaers S. The Standard Language Situation in the Low Countries: TopDown and Bottom-Up Variations on a Diaglossic Theme. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. P. 199–243.
- Jaspers J. Het Vlaamse stigma. Over tussentaal en normativiteit. *Taal en tongval 53*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2011. P. 129–153.
- Lebbe D. Eksogeen taalgebruik in Vlaanderen: 25 jaar later. *Taal en Tongval, 49*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1997. P. 113–125.
- Lybaert Ch. *Hoe percipieert een taalkundige leek het Vlaamse taallandschap*. Brussel: Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal, Letterkunde en Geschiedenis, 2011. P. 123–147.
- Plievoets K. Tussen spreek en standaardtaal. *Een corpusgebaseerd onderzoek naar de situationele, regionale en sociale verspreiding van enkele morfo-syntactische verschijnselen uit het gesproken Belgisch-Nederlands*. Leuven: Doctoraal proefschrift. Katholieke Universiteit Publ., 2008. 198 p.
- Taeldeman J. Zich stabiliserende grammaticale kenmerken in Vlaamse tussentaal. *Taal en Tongval 60, nr. 1*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2008. P. 26–50.
- Van de Craen P. *Standaardnederlands en dialect op school, thuis en elders*. Brussel: VUB Publ., 1985. P. 107–125.

- Van Hoof S. *Feiten en fictie: een sociolinguïstische analyse van het taalgebruik in fictieseries op de Vlaamse openbare omroep (1977–2012)*. Antwerpen: Doctoraal proefschrift. Universiteit Antwerpen Publ., 2013. 526 p.
- Willemyns R. Verkavelingsbrabants. Werkt het integratiemodel ook voor tussentalen. *Neerlandica Extra Muros* 43. Muiderberg: Dick Coutinho BV Publ., 2005. P. 27–40.
- Willy S., Willy M. Prisma Handwoordenboek Nederlands. *Derde, herziene druk met onderscheid tussen Nederlands-Nederlands en Belgisch-Nederlands*. Houten: Prisma Woordenboeken en Taaluitgaven Publ., 2009. 1535 p.
- Yakovleva A. A. The speaking norm of modern Dutch language. *Skandinavian Philology*, 2015. No. XIII. P. 273–282. (In Russian)

INTERNET SOURCES

- Le flamand pour les initiés : ollemolle tegoare (tous ensemble) [Dutch for the initiated: all together]. Rassemblement Wallonie-France. 29.11.2017. Available at: <http://www.rwf.be/?p=9111> (accessed: 10.08.2019).

Любовь Ульяницкая

Санкт-Петербургский государственный электротехнический университет

**ФЛАМАНДСКИЙ ВАРИАНТ НИДЕРЛАНДСКОГО ЯЗЫКА:
БЕЛЬГИЙСКИЙ НИДЕРЛАНДСКИЙ, ИЛИ «TUSSENTAAL»**

- Для цитирования:** *Ulianitckaia L. The Flemish variant of the Dutch language: Belgian Dutch or “Tussentaal” // Скандинавская филология. 2019. Т. 17. Вып. 2. С. 247–263. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2019.204>*

Данная статья посвящена изучению современной языковой ситуации в Бельгии, где три языка — нидерландский, французский и немецкий — признаны государственными (с преимущественным использованием нидерландского и французского). Эта ситуация осложняется тем, что наряду с литературными нормами этих языков существуют многочисленные диалекты, а также такие варианты, как бельгийский нидерландский и бельгийский французский. Из-за языкового соседства с Францией, Германией и Нидерландами, а также из-за увеличивающейся значимости английского языка в Бельгии сложно говорить об общей языковой норме, которая бы использовалась всеми жителями страны, в частности на разговорном уровне. Бельгийский нидерландский находится в контакте не только с бельгийским французским, но и с нидерландской и французской литературными нормами, не говоря уже о фламандских диалектах. Все это приводит к весьма сложной языковой ситуации. Особое внимание в статье уделяется фламандскому варианту нидерландского языка, который имеет впечатляющие отличия от нидерландской нормы. Проводится сравнение северной (голландской) нормы — нидерландского нидерландского и южной (фламандской) нормы — бельгийского нидерландского. Описываются особенности промежуточного языка —

«tussentaal», которому практически во всех ситуациях, кроме, пожалуй, самых формальных, люди разного уровня образования отдают предпочтение. В статье делается вывод о том, что фламандский вариант нидерландского языка является ярким примером контакта фламандских диалектов с нидерландским и французским языками и представляет собой «взвесь» бельгийского нидерландского с «tussentaal» в содружестве с бельгийским французским, нидерландским нидерландским, французским французским, английским и немецким языками.

Ключевые слова: фламандский вариант, нидерландский язык, tussentaal, языковая ситуация, Бельгия.

Liubov Ulianitckaia

PhD in Philology, assistant,

St. Petersburg State Electrotechnical University,

5, ul. Professora Popova, St. Petersburg, 197376, Russia,

E-mail: ulianitckaia_liubov@mail.ru

Ульяницкая Любовь Александровна

ассистент, кандидат филологических наук,

Санкт-Петербургский государственный электротехнический университет,

Россия, 197376, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Профессора Попова, 5

E-mail: ulianitckaia_liubov@mail.ru

Received: July 30, 2019

Accepted: September 16, 2019