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1. Introduction

This contribution deals with the link between mass media and language norms in the history of Dutch in Flanders. I am specifically interested in the role played by newspapers, radio and television in the formation, diffusion and acceptance of norms for written and spoken Standard Dutch in the 20th century. Citing a number of representative examples, I will try and illustrate Willemyns' and Haeseryn's (1998) claim that Sprachpflege and linguistic purism were omni-present in Flanders during the 1960s and 70s through the combined efforts of spoken, televised and written media. Previous publications in English on these issues are rare (Van den Bulck / Van Poecke 1996 is one of the exceptions). This article is heavily indebted, however, to two overview publications in Dutch that highlighted the specific relevance of radio and television in the Flemish norm debate: Beheydt (ed.) 1991 and Nies 2005 – much of the information listed below comes directly from those sources.

2. Historical Background

In order to grasp the complex character of the norm debate in the Dutch language area in the recent past (as well as the role played by the mass media in the process), a number of historical facts should be taken into account first.

From the end of the 16th century onwards the Dutch language evolved in two very different ways in the northern and southern parts of the present day Dutch

1 Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Fund for Scientific Research-Flanders, Belgium. I am indebted to the reviewers of this article for their comments on earlier draft versions. All mistakes and errors of judgement remain, of course, my own.

2 Similar media influence has, of course, also been described for other language communities, from Leitner's (1980) early study on English and German radio broadcasting, over Cotter's (1999) and Kelly-Holmes' (ed.) (2001) work on Irish media, to Jaffe's (2007) work on Corsican media. Both Herring (ed.) 2003 and Johnson/Ennslin 2007 provide an overall introduction to recent language and media studies.

3 A detailed history of the Dutch language is De Vries/Willemyns/Burger 1993. For the specific history of Dutch in Flanders, see Willemyns 2003a (in Dutch), 2003b (in English).
language territory. Due to military operations\(^4\) the Northern Low Countries (which coincide more or less with the present day Netherlands) became an independent state in 1585 (de iure in 1648), whereas the Southern Low Countries (comprising the present day territory of Flanders) remained under foreign rule up until 1814.

In the north, a Dutch standard language gradually began to take shape during the following centuries. The policies of the successive foreign southern rulers, however, prevented a parallel language standardisation process in Flanders. Although little is known about both the actual spread and the 'uniform nature' of the northern standard variety\(^5\), there was a sharp contrast around 1800 between a situation of standardisation-in-progress on the one hand (i.e. in the north) and the collection of southern dialects of Dutch which were not 'roofed' by a comparable southern standard variety. Various testimonies that have come to us from contemporaries indicate that the northern and southern varieties of Dutch were often perceived as (or claimed to be) mutually unintelligible (Willemyns 2003a: 189-190).

During the 19th century, massive attempts were made to further the standardisation of Dutch in Flanders, despite the clear preference of the Belgian government for the French language. The Belgian state came into being in 1830, but it took up until 1898 until the 'Equality Law' was passed that declared Dutch to be equal to French in official matters. Although a number of language planning efforts were also pursued in the north during this period, these mainly concerned corpus planning, whereas the overall southern focus was more of a status planning nature. One could say that the language planning efforts in the Netherlands were aimed at standardising a language that already carried prestige, whereas the so-called 'Flemish Movement' in the south was driven by motivations of social, cultural and political emancipation which could be realised by means of language standardisation and planning.\(^6\)

Despite the remarkable achievements of the Flemish Movement, the real massive spread of uniform Standard Dutch among the greater part of the population of Flanders only began in the period between the two World Wars. As such, the Flemish population continued to feel the need for normative guidance in linguistic matters throughout the greater part of the 20th century (at least up until the 1970s). Radio and television played a paramount role in the spread of positive attitudes towards Standard Dutch and served as the transmitter of the relatively unknown standard variety of Dutch for the larger part of the Flemish population (especially

---

4. Cf. the introduction of Vandenbussche 2004 for more information on these military operations.

5. The recently launched egodocument-project on late 18th century 'sailing letters' at the Universiteit Leiden (led by Marijke van der Wal) is expected to render evidence-based insights in this respect (van der Wal 2006).

so for the lower strata of society). Both the mass media and the speech community at large depended on a „standard language ideology“ to attain this goal.7

Towards the 1980s, „the gravity centre of the Belgian economy shifted to Flanders and the reform of the Belgian state led to the establishment of a largely autonomous Flemish region and community“ (Vandenbussche et al. 2005: 60). One could say that Flanders finally came of age on the cultural, social and political level.8 It has been claimed that this evolution led to a kind of new Flemish self-consciousness that not only changed the traditional Flemish „underdog attitude“ towards both the Netherlands and the French speaking part of Belgium but also had its impact on the evolution and evaluation of southern Dutch as such.

The final outcome of the distinct linguistic evolution in Flanders and the Netherlands is the present day situation in which both parts of the pluri-centric Dutch language area in Europe share one and the same language, with the same orthography and grammar norms. All language planning issues concerning the Dutch language are now administered by the Nederlandse Taalunie („Dutch Language union“: an official tri-national administrative body to which the governments of both Flanders and The Netherlands have delegated their political power in linguistic matters.9

Apart from a limited number of lexical differences, the main difference between Dutch in Flanders and in the Netherlands concerns pronunciation: the gravity centre of the Dutch language area clearly lies in the Randstad – the area around the so-called „Big Cities“ of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague and Utrecht – and the pronunciation of that area figures as the norm for Standard Dutch in the whole of the Netherlands. In the external periphery of the Dutch language area (Flanders), however, speakers have adopted the pronunciation of the Brabantic area (comprising the Flemish provinces of Vlaams-Brabant and Antwerp) as their norm for spoken Standard Dutch.

Both Flanders and the Netherlands have recently witnessed the rise of destandardisation processes in the Dutch language. The growing impact of a variety called tussentaal (a term which is hard to translate, but which partially conveys the same meaning as the German Zwischensprache) is causing concern among Flemish language advisors (Hendrickx 2000, 2001). This informal variety appears to take over the functions of the traditional L-variety, the Flemish dialects, at a time where the process of dialect loss is in full swing (Geeraerts / Penne / Vanswegenhoven 2000, Goossens 2000, Willemyns 2005). The main topic of destandardisation debates in the Netherlands is the so-called Poldernederlands („Polder Dutch“), a spoken variety

7 Cf. the various contributions by the Milroys on this topic, e.g. J. Milroy 1999 and L. Milroy 1999.
8 Cf. the relevant chapters in Witte/Craeybeckx/Meynen 2000 for a detailed account of this evolution.
9 Suriname joined the Dutch Language Union on January 1st, 2004 but is not discussed further in the present article. Cf. the Taalunie-website for more information: www.taalunieversum.org (last accessed on September 15th, 2007).
mainly characterised by a number of deviant diphthong pronunciations (Stroop 1998).

3. Language Planning on the Radio

From the very onset of Belgian radio broadcasting in 1931, the Flemish radio corporation considered attention for correct language use part of its core business. The NIR as it was first called (National Institute for Radio), later BRT, Belgian Radio and Television, BRTN, Dutch-speaking Belgian Radio and Television, and VRT, Flemish Radio and Television) deliberately adopted the task to play a paramount role in the process of the standardisation of Dutch in Flanders (Van de Velde / Gerritsen / van Hout 1995). Contrary to their colleagues in the Netherlands, Flemish broadcasters were explicitly expected to follow the norms of the most authoritative pronunciation guide (Blancquaert 1934) at the time, in order to spread 'civilised pronunciation' among the listeners and to fight 'Flutch' (litt. Vlaanderlands, short for Vlaams Nederlands, Flemish Dutch). Internal routine procedures aimed at language care have existed ever since, the most striking example of which surely was the nomination of a full-time language advisor in 1971.

The broadcasting company's efforts at Sprachpflege culminated in an offensive of language advice over the radio during the 1960s. From 1965 onwards, for example, the Flemish radio broadcasted a daily language advice programme at breakfast time that was repeated in prime time just before the 7PM news. It was called Voor wie haar soms geweld aandoet (For those who tend to violate her) and often consisted of strictly normative language tips of the 'don't say... but say...' style. The programme was an instant success: the raving reactions from listeners even inspired the broadcasting union to produce a set of 12 long play records with the integral recording of 235 radio columns. The programme was even exported three times per week to Lumbumbashi in the former Belgian Congo, for the Belgian citizens who had stayed in Zaire after the independence. The transcribed talks were also published in a very popular series of pocket books with the blurb advice 'read one or more language tips every day and listen to the records to test your pronunciation. It will help you to make your language even more careful and precise' (Galle 1968).

The underlying motivation for this programme was phrased as follows by broadcaster Marc Galle: 'It was our conviction that we rapidly needed to attain a
tighter language union with the Netherlands without sacrificing the variation beforehand" (Galle 1968: 8). Despite the controversy caused among the language community by this overt integrationist agenda, the programme makers were convinced that theirs was a missionary task: „It is our intention, in these days of democratisation (alas, still regretted by a few conservative doctors and professors here and there) to bring correct Dutch to the masses...“ (cited in Beheydt 1991a: 39). A cross-medial strategy was implemented to support this goal: next to his language column in the newspaper Het Laatste Nieuws, Galle also frequently appeared on television as an expert in language advice.

In retrospect, these radio programmes may seem amusing but their impact and authority can hardly be overestimated; the formula remained in use until the 1980s and most certainly contributed to a positive attitude towards the use of Standard Dutch in Flanders. When their success started to dwindle, alternative formats for language advice were tried and tested. One of the more amusing attempts was the advice for language and road users' combining traffic information and linguistic advice. A change of tone from the strictly normative, integrationist and purist to a less political and more informative approach accompanied this transition (for example in the programme BRT-Taalwenken (BRT language tips) from the late 70s’ / early 80s by Penninckx and Verrept) (Beheydt 1991a: 44).

4. Language Planning in Newspapers

Newspapers were equally involved in the norm diffusion process. Whereas the broadcaster mentioned above also had a column in the popular Flemish newspaper Het Laatste Nieuws, it was De Standaard – generally considered as the main quality newspaper in Flanders – which took the lead in this respect. In 1958 Jan Grauls started to publish regular pieces of language advice under the heading Taaltips (language tips), an activity he also pursued in a number of other local magazines and newspapers (Nies 2005, Van Causenbroeck 1998).

From 1959 onwards, De Standaard boasted a daily language advice column – a ‘first’ in the Dutch language area – entitled Uit de taaltn (From the language garden). With the sweeping statement that „Under the smiling direction of the one of the foremost language gardeners... readers and journalists of this newspaper will get the chance from today onwards to tend, ennoble and enrich language and style“

---

13 All translations are mine, WV.
14 The present author can vividly recall the daily radio language tips, as well as the dialect parody versions that were produced when local ‘free radio stations’ boomed in Flanders from 1980 onwards.
15 This horticultural imagery is a ‘classic’ in the history of language advice discourse in Flanders. Two of the most famous examples of purist publications from the late nineteenth-century
the newspaper explicitly affirmed that it considered attention for good language use to be an integral part of the struggle for Flemish emancipation (Van Nieuwenhuyse 2002). After Grauls’ death in 1960, the column was handed over to Maarten van Nierop. He would become and remain the most influential writer of this column and contributed his daily share of normative advice for 18 years, from 1961 until 1979 (ebd.). Much like the radio advice programmes at the time, his written articles were backed by an integrationist approach, thus strengthening the cross-medial front supporting the spread of Northern Dutch language norms. Van Nierop also made programmes on language care for both the Belgian and Dutch Radio World Service and the national broadcasting company, as well as for the local West-Flemish broadcasting company and various magazines (Durnez 1998a). Various collections of his language advice were published under titles as De taal als tuin en wildernis, ‘The language as garden and wilderness’.

After Van Nierop’s death in 1979, De Standaard continued to manifest itself as the main ‘keeper of the norm’ among Flemish newspapers. Through the nomination of a full-time language advisor, the ongoing regular publication of language tips and – more recently – an annual series of topical ‘language instalments’, language care very much remains one of the core elements of the newspaper’s public image.

Apart from its involvement in the diffusion phase of the standardisation process, De Standaard also continued to be actively engaged in the discussions relating to the (re)selection phase as far as orthography was concerned. In the context of the heated debate on the so-called ‘progressive’ vs. official, ‘preferred’ spelling for Dutch, the newspaper was the only one that radically opted for the adoption of the ‘progressive’ variant in 1954 because ‘it wanted to play in the forward line’ (Van Nieuwenhuyse 2002). This ‘progressive’ spelling was officially tolerated and, as such, included in dictionaries, but not taught in the schools. ‘De Standaard’ consistently and stubbornly used this alternative norm and only switched back to

---

16 There was a short intermezzo by Herman Oosterwijk, who also passed away later on that year. (Van Nieuwenhuyse 2002).

17 When the last language advisor (Ludo Permentier) retired at the end of 2006, his tasks were taken over by an editorial team led by Peter Cuypers. Permentier still contributes a weekly language column and supervises the language instalments (Belsack 2007).

18 The discussion involved, among other things, the decision to write ‘progressive’ <k> instead of ‘official’ <c> for /k/ in loanwords: aktie, ‘action’ vs. actie, e.g. Cf. Molewijk 1992 for an introduction to the history of the spelling of Dutch.

5. Language Advice on Television

The first TV programmes in Flanders with a clear linguistic undertone were two short-lived, educational but mainly entertaining quiz shows in the late 1950s/early 1960s (Quiz der Nederlandse taal, quiz of the Dutch language ' and 'Is maar een woord, it's only a word'). From 1960 onwards, however, public television also became a spearheading factor in the spread of integrationist norms for Dutch.

Teletaalles, 'telly language lesson' (1960) consisted of 2 items dealing with various aspects of linguistics, language norms and language use. Beheydt (1991b: 53) leaves no doubt about the integrationist agenda of the programme makers: "The norm was Dutch as spoken in Holland and it comes as no surprise that more than half of the first 'Teletaallessen' on Flemish television consisted of material that was copied from language courses on Dutch television." 15 minutes of comments on Northern Dutch were followed by a similar block on Southern Dutch; the title for the latter part of the programme Onze arme rijke taal, 'our poor rich language' reveals the makers' attitudes towards the state of Dutch in Flanders at the time (ebd.).

The weekly show (that would run until 1964) rapidly evolved towards a language advice programme in the broader sense of the word. True to the programme's tag line 'Better Dutch for every viewer', it became a combination of, among other things, interviews with linguists, information on the origin of language, a lexicological column (by the aforementioned Maarten Van Nierop) and satirical pronunciation lessons entitled 'Pronounce it like this' (ebd.). It is indexical of the ongoing, 'serious' intentions of the broadcasting company that this production was largely entrusted to a team of trained and highly respected academics (Frans van Coetsem, to name but one) who all favoured the integrationist norm view.

A few years later, part of the Teletaalles core team would sign for the biggest hit ever in the history of television language advice in Flanders. Hier spreekt men Nederlands was a five-minute sketch show, broadcasted three times a week in prime time just before the news. Beheydt calls it "the Neighbours or Sons and Daughters of the sixties" (ebd.: 55).

Presented by Joos Florquin (a professor of linguistics), the sketch was always set in the same living room with a series of visitors and family members who engaged in discussions on language-related issues. Even the family dog was synchronised (sic) to voice John Doe's Alltagswissen. At the end of each discussion, the professor would always demonstrate the correct Standard Dutch phrase and correct his interlocutors, often dismissing typical Flemish mistakes (Gallicisms, for example). Despite the show's overt pedagogical and norm-oriented backbone, the makers

19 The information in this section comes from Beheydt 1991b and Nies 2005.
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tried to reach out to their audience through a 'popular' approach, including the use of local dialects (Nies 2005).

The show enjoyed massive support amongst the viewers, the scenarios were published as pocket books, it won major television prizes and became even more popular than soccer broadcasts (!). It ran until 1972; more than 1100 sketches were produced (Vandewalle / Fraeters 1998: 1160-1161).

In a recent interview with one of the co-producers, it was remarked that the direct impact of the show on the quality of Dutch in Flanders was probably very limited, although it did present a major contribution to the fostering of positive attitudes towards Standard Dutch: „The inhabitant of Flanders wanted to speak Standard Dutch but having been raised in the local dialect, that language felt like a Sunday's dress... The Flemish had to learn to use Dutch in a normal way, as a normal language“ (Nies 2005).20

It took the broadcasting company five years before a new language programme, Klare taal („clear language“) was brought on air.21 Dealing with issues like „writing a letter“ and „speaking in public“, it was a sharp move away from the strictly normative approach of its predecessors (Beheydt 1991b: 60). Although it also was the last overtly „educational“ language programme as such on public television, the public broadcasting company did not drop its ambitions to guard and spread the norms of the standard language among its viewers. Once the language advice programmes had disappeared from the screen, the language advisors continued their work in the public sphere.

6. The Role of Media Language Advisors, Past and Present

Ever since public radio started in Flanders in the 1930s, a system of linguistic „quality control“ has operated within the national broadcasting company. At first this consisted of pronunciation checks by professor Edgard Blancquaert (succeeded from the 1950s onwards by Willem Pée),22 who would evaluate the quality of the broadcasters' spoken Dutch according to the norms of his own pronunciation guide (Van Poecke / Van den Bulck 1991: 91). „In the case of serious mistakes, one would receive a note with the correct pronunciation in phonetic script“ (quoted in ebd.).

This repressive approach was systematically intensified in the 1960s when a „rigid and ongoing system of internal control“ (ebd.: 95) was developed by Karel Hemmerechts, including the notorious „blue letters“ which were stiff reprimand notes of the following type: „During this programme you said the following... Knowledgeable people claim the correct form is: ...“ (Nies 1995). The broadcasting

20 Beheydt (1991: 59) cites academic research confirming these findings.
21 There was a brief Dutch course for immigrants in 1974, however (Nies 2005).
22 Both Blancquaert and Pée were professors of Dutch linguistics and dialectology at the University of Ghent (Pée 1968, Vanacker 1989).
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company’s wish to complement this post-factum repressive control with preventive linguistic advice became the major challenge for their first full-time language advisor (Éugène Berode) from 1971 onwards. Despite the ever-present mission to promote Standard Dutch and the ongoing fixation on the north as far as language norms were concerned, the advisor’s role was reoriented from the strictly penalising to a more supportive coaching function. Contrary to his predecessors, the advisor’s prime task was now to anticipate potential language issues, a goal that was accomplished, for example, by organising incentives to improve spoken and written language use (interview training sessions) and keeping track of relevant recent linguistic developments (Nies 2005).

Next to the changing political context in Belgium from 1980 onwards, Van Poecke and Van den Bulck (1991) consider the introduction of commercial Flemish television in 1989 to be one of the major factors that has redefined the public broadcasting company’s language policy. When Éugène Berode retired in 1997, the broadcasting company used the occasion to launch a broadly advertised project that affirmed and even reinforced the image of the VRT as the prime keeper and diffuser of the norms for Belgian Standard Dutch: „The VRT wants to remain the norm for the Belgian variety of Standard Dutch“ (Hendrickx 1998). The new (and current) language advisor Ruud Hendrickx developed a public web-database of approximately 3200 language issues complemented with strictly prescriptive advice: a is wrong, b is right; don’t use this, use that instead. This sharpened language advisory profile was consecrated in a ‘language charter’ that defines how the language of television and radio should sound. The whole document is based on the wish to consolidate the undisputed common opinion that VRT-Dutch is the ‚best‘ norm for Standard Dutch available. It should be noted that none of the commercial Flemish TV-stations was ever associated with this badge of quality, not even those which also have a full time language advisor. It is equally striking that the advisors from the commercial chains are virtually unknown in Flanders whereas the VRT-advisor is one of the most frequently consulted norm instances.

Apart from traditional language advice, the public broadcasting company has recently shifted the focus of its actions to the battle against the invussentaal, an infor-

23 Typical issues include using the correct article with specific nouns (‚het is het decolleté‘), Dutch alternatives for loanwords (‚Dutch alternatives for ladykiller are casanova, donjuan, hartenbreker, rokkenjager, vrouwenverleider, vrouwenversierder‘) correct verb tense forms (‚raadplegen, raadpleegt(t), raadpleegde(n), geraadpleegd‘), the spelling of and the adjectives derived from foreign place names (‚Seoel, Seoul – Seoels, Seouls‘), etc.

24 ‚VRT-Dutch‘ is in effect commonly used as a synonym for Standard Dutch in Flanders, both by linguists and lay speakers.

25 At the commercial chain VTM, for example, Jan Schoukens figures as full-time language advisor. He is a former VRT radio broadcaster and producer.

26 To my knowledge the only joint interview with the VRT and VTM language advisors was published in the e-journal Taalschrift (Permentier 2003): http://taalschrift.org/reportage/000458.html
normal spoken variety of Dutch. Linguists agree that this variety should be interpreted as a normal and natural product of an ongoing linguistic destandardisation process and that it fulfils a great number of informal communicative functions in Flanders today. It has also been remarked that there is a striking parallel between the rise of *tussentaal* and the spreading dialect loss in Flanders (Willemyns 2005). The VRT-language advisor, however, considers the existence of this informal variety as a problem, even as the major linguistic defeat for Flanders, and calls for a „Language signal for 6 million Flemings“ denouncing the use of tussentaal on air. As it is „sloppy“ and typical for a lack of effort to speak „carefully“, it should be dismissed as a valid variety for broadcasting purposes (Hendrickx 2001).

All of the above is perfectly reasonable from a normative point of view. I cannot escape the impression, however, that the current language advisor overestimates the power of the TV medium. Apart from banning *tussentaal* from its programmes, the VRT also wants to fight it back in society at large and actively replace it with another new informal variety (Hendrickx 2000). I quote: „We are convinced that with the further spread of the use of Standard Dutch in Flanders, this ‚tussentaal‘ will disappear ever more in its current form. It will be replaced by an informal variant of the standard language which relates in a natural and close way to the standard variety that is already accepted in Flanders in the formal register. The VRT considers it its duty to provide the Dutch language community in Flanders with the example for this informal variety as well“ (Hendrickx 1998, my translation). 9 years onwards, *tussentaal* still appears to be on the rise in Flanders and no major shift towards the informal VRT-variant has been reported, so far.

7. Concluding Remarks

Newspapers, radio and television have played an active and authoritative role in the diffusion of the standard norm in the recent history of Dutch in Flanders. The attempts at language planning mentioned above have one major thing in common: the conviction that the media should be used as a tool to contribute to the language unity of the northern and southern Low Countries, and essentially so through the adoption and the spread of one single norm. In the 1960s, Flemish television, radio and newspapers joined forces and „Joos Florquin, Marc Galle and Maarten van Nierop formed a ‚triumvirate‘ of language purifiers who wanted the Flemish to speak like the Dutch“ (Nies 2005). Language political motivations supported this policy: radio and television were intended to be emanations of the Flemish community and had to reinforce the idea of ongoing cultural integration with the north.

---

27 For further information on the linguistic aspects of this *tussentaal* (also labeled as *Soapvlaams*, *Schoon Vlaams* or *Verkavelingsvlaams*), cf. Geeraerts et al. 2000 and Goossens 2002.
28 Compare with Aitchison (1998) and Chambers (1998), who both argue that the commonly accepted massive influence of television on language is a persistent „language myth“.
29 See Willemyns 2005 for a further critical discussion of this campaign.
to reach political and cultural autonomy within the French-dominated Belgian state. Certain newspapers, including De Standaard, vigorously supported this view. When the main political, economic and cultural goals of the Flemish Movement were accomplished in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Flanders ‘came of age’. The interest in (and urgent need for) a media campaign on Sprachpflege to support Flemish emancipation moved to the background. Both the success and the presence of language advisory programmes and columns decreased accordingly. As far as public national radio and television are concerned, the rise of commercial broadcasting in the late 1980s provided a new impetus for language advice. Despite the (relatively recent) tolerance towards elements which lend a specific Flemish flavour to southern Dutch, there is no doubt that (apart from pronunciation) newspapers, radio and television nowadays still recognise the central and guiding role of the Dutch language as used in the north. In socio-historical terms one could say that the ‘integrationist’ idea continues to form the basis of the present day language policies in the Flemish media.
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